



# Assembly of States Parties

Distr.: General  
5 July 2011

Original: English

---

## Tenth session

New York, 12-21 December 2011

### **Report on programme performance of the International Criminal Court for the year 2010**

#### **Content**

I.	Introduction.....	2
II.	Main activities of the Major Programmes.....	2
A.	Major Programme I – Judiciary .....	2
B.	Major Programme II – The Office of the Prosecutor.....	5
C.	Major Programme III – The Registry .....	9
D.	Major Programme IV – The Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties...	14
E.	Major Programme V – Offices of the Permanent Premises Project.....	16
III.	Cross-cutting issues .....	16
IV.	Budgetary performance 2010.....	17

#### **Annexes**

Annex I:	Major programme I: Judiciary .....	30
Annex II:	Major programme II: Office of the Prosecutor .....	33
Annex III:	Major programme III: Registry.....	36
Annex IV:	Major programme IV .....	41
Annex V:	Major programme VI.....	44
Annex VI:	Major programme VII-1 .....	45
Annex VII:	Realization of assumptions 2005-2010.....	46
Annex VIII:	Registry: Consolidation of the number of defendants, victims' applications and duration of stay of witnesses.....	48

## I. Introduction

1. This report details the main activities conducted by each major programme of the International Criminal Court (“the Court”). It includes a breakdown of expenditure<sup>1</sup> by major programme and a staffing table that details actual versus budgeted staffing levels, as requested by the Committee on Budget and Finance<sup>2</sup> (“the Committee”). In addition, a detailed review of programme performance by section with reference to objectives, expected accomplishments, indicators of achievement and performance indicators is included in annexes I to VI.

2. The detailed descriptions of the main activities of each major programme in the first section of the report show that the Court undertook the activities projected for 2010. Additional unplanned activities, specifically the conduct of parallel trials and the development of the Kenya situation, were largely addressed within the constraints of the Court’s approved programme budget. Out of the €8.2 million notified by the Court to cover these unforeseen activities, €5.1 million has been spent. Finally, annex VII provides further details on the Court’s realization of its budgetary assumptions.

## II. Main activities of the Major Programmes

### A. Major Programme I – Judiciary

#### 1. The Presidency

3. In 2010, the Presidency continued exercising extensive functions in its three main areas of responsibility: legal and judicial tasks, external relations and administration. The intensity of legal and judicial tasks reached a new high in terms of the number of decisions issued (most of them confidential) and enforcement agreements negotiated and concluded. The Presidency also had a significant workload in constituting Chambers, supporting meetings of the judges and negotiating agreements with international organisations. Finally, the Presidency continued its review of all inter-organ draft administrative policies.

4. In the area of external relations, the Presidency engaged heavily with States, the Assembly of States Parties (“the Assembly”) and its subsidiary organs, intergovernmental and regional organisations and civil society. In particular, the Presidency promoted the key areas of universality, cooperation and complementarity as identified at the Review Conference. As the public face of the Court, the President (or one the Vice-Presidents) raised awareness about the ICC in a large number of events and meetings on different continents.

5. One of the Presidency’s key achievements in the area of administration was to initiate and coordinate the process which led to the adoption of the report of the Court on measures to increase clarity on the responsibilities of the different organs,<sup>3</sup> including the section on the corporate governance framework. The Presidency continues to be engaged in the latter’s proper implementation. Another major area of the Presidency’s administrative activity was efficient strategic oversight of the Registry and ongoing coordination of inter-organ issues through periodic meetings.

#### 2. Pre-Trial Division

6. There are currently five situations assigned to the two Pre-Trial Chambers. The situations in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in Darfur, Sudan, are assigned to Pre-Trial Chamber I. The situations in Uganda, the Central African Republic and Kenya are assigned to Pre-Trial Chamber II. It should be noted that only five judges were assigned to the Pre-Trial Chambers during the year 2010. Therefore, one judge had to sit in both Pre-Trial Chambers throughout the year. In addition, during the second semester of 2010, a

<sup>1</sup> Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures, which are subject to change.

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Fifth session, The Hague, 23 November –1 December 2006* (ICC-ASP/5/32/Corr. 1), part II.D.6(a), para. 23.

<sup>3</sup> ICC-ASP/9/CBF.1/12.

judge had to sit in Pre-Trial Chamber I and at the same time act as Presiding Judge of Trial Chamber III. Finally, judges assigned to the Pre-Trial Chambers also had to participate in several interlocutory appeals as ad hoc members of the Appeals Chamber.

7. In 2010, principal matters addressed by the Pre-Trial Chambers included a request for authorization to open an investigation pursuant to article 15 of the Statute, as well as requests for the issuance of two warrants of arrest and six summonses to appear. They further declined to confirm the charges brought by the Prosecutor against a suspect and held a confirmation hearing in a case involving two other suspects. This represents an increase in the workload of the Pre-Trial Chambers by comparison with 2009, where they had four situations, issued three summonses to appear and held two confirmation hearings, following one of which a decision on the confirmation of charges was issued.

8. A number of the decisions of the Pre-Trial Chambers required the review of several hundreds, or even thousands, of pages. Notably, the 31 March 2010 decision of Pre-Trial Chamber II authorizing the Prosecutor to open an investigation into the situation in the Republic of Kenya was issued after the review of (i) the request of the Prosecutor and the supporting material thereto, amounting to almost 2000 pages, and (ii) almost 400 victims' representations. On 28 September 2010, Pre-Trial Chamber I issued a warrant of arrest against Callixte Mbarushimana after reviewing almost 1100 pages of evidence and other information submitted by the Prosecutor in August 2010. Pre-Trial Chamber II was seized on 15 December 2010 of two requests from the Prosecutor for the issuance of summonses to appear for six individuals, supported by evidence and other information amounting to almost 5000 pages.

9. Throughout 2010, the Pre-Trial Chambers also held a number of hearings, including status conferences in relation to disclosure, protective measures for witnesses and victims and initial appearance hearings, issuing a significant number of oral decisions in both open and closed sessions. Such oral decisions were to a large extent prepared in advance by the legal staff of the Pre-Trial Division following deliberation by the judges.

### **3. Trial Division**

10. The Trial Division is composed of eight judges and three Chambers (one judge's term of office was extended so as to enable him to complete the Lubanga trial, while another, the Presiding Judge of Trial Chamber III, is formally assigned to the Pre-Trial Division); each Chamber is assigned a case to be tried. As noted in previous years, criminal proceedings are organic in character, and unexpected developments, although dealt with as expeditiously as possible by the respective Chambers, have caused unavoidable delays. Nonetheless, all three Chambers have ensured that their cases advance significantly and as fast as possible, while at the same time guaranteeing the integrity of the proceedings and the fair trial rights of the accused.

11. In the Lubanga trial, Trial Chamber I continued hearing evidence presented by the parties in the course of 2010: testimony was heard from 33 witnesses called by the defence and prosecution, including three participating victims called at the request of their legal representative.<sup>4</sup> The Chamber issued 61 written decisions and orders (including annexes but excluding transcript redaction orders), and delivered 125 oral decisions. In total, 1078 documents were filed in the record of the case in 2010 and the Chamber sat on 96 days. As of the end of 2010, 119 victims, represented by three teams of legal representatives including the OPCV, participate in the proceedings. Although it was originally anticipated that the presentation of the evidence would conclude in 2010, following the defence allegations on the role played by intermediaries used by the Prosecutor, and the subsequent refusal of the Prosecutor to disclose the name of one of the intermediaries, the Chamber had to deal with a number of unexpected issues which culminated in the 8 July 2010 decision staying the proceedings. The presentation of the evidence was only able to resume on 25 October 2010 following the disposal of the appeal on 8 October 2010. Between the end of October and early December, the Chamber heard ten witnesses.

---

<sup>4</sup> Figures provided are based on the *Tableau de bord* maintained by the Registry.

12. The trial of Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo started on 24 November 2009 before Trial Chamber II. In 2010 Chamber continued hearing the witnesses called by the Prosecutor (23 witnesses testified), who closed the presentation of his live evidence on 8 December 2010, within the time granted by the Chamber in 2009. The Chamber issued 75 decisions and orders (including annexes but excluding transcript redaction orders), and delivered 111 oral decisions. In total, 1485 documents were filed in the record of the case in 2010 and the Chamber sat on 142 days. As of the end of 2010, 364 victims, represented by two teams of legal representatives, participate in the proceedings.

13. Trial Chamber III had actively prepared in order to enable the trial of Jean-Pierre Bemba to start as soon as possible in 2010. However, due to the unexpected filing of a challenge to the jurisdiction of the Court (admissibility of the case) by the defence in February and given the time-limits necessary for the filing of all the written submissions, including by the concerned States, the start of the trial, which had been planned for April, was unavoidably delayed, initially until July 2010, then, following the change in the composition of the Chamber, to September 2010. It finally commenced, after 1233 additional victim applications for participation had been received, on 22 November 2010. As of the end of 2010, 1258 victims were authorized to participate in the proceedings. They are represented by two teams of legal representatives. By the end of the year, the Chamber had heard the testimony of three witnesses, and the presentation of evidence continues in 2011. The Chamber issued 75 written decisions and orders (including annexes but excluding transcript redaction orders), and delivered 19 oral decisions. In total, 4442 documents were filed in the record of the case in 2010 and the Chamber sat on 21 days.

14. In 2010, the three Trial Chambers sat a total of 259 hearing days, a significant increase as compared to 2009. Overall, the workload of the Chambers (especially taking into consideration the number of witnesses heard by the Trial Chambers and corresponding number of transcript pages to review) notably increased in 2010 as compared to 2009, in particular taking account of the fact that, as cases progress, preparatory work for the final judgment needs to be undertaken, so that the final decision may be issued speedily after the conclusion of the presentation of evidence and final submissions. In order to absorb the increased workload, staff were assigned flexibly and working methods were streamlined to the extent possible; in addition, recourse was had to the Contingency Fund so as to enable additional staff to be hired when the current staffing levels and framework were assessed as insufficient to reasonably undertake the additional work necessary.

#### **4. Appeals Division**

15. With six interlocutory appeals disposed of in 2010, the Appeals Chamber's workload was comparable to that in 2009, when the Chamber heard seven interlocutory appeals. By implementing efficiency measures, the Appeals Chamber was able to further reduce the time needed to dispose of interlocutory appeals. As no trial was completed in 2010, the Appeals Chamber did not hear any appeal from a final verdict.

16. The Appeals Chamber had to adjudicate a number of appeals in the Lubanga case, following the Trial Chamber's decision of 8 July 2010 to stay the proceedings for abuse of process. On 15 July 2010 the Trial Chamber also ordered the release of Mr. Lubanga, a decision appealed by the prosecution the next day. On 23 July 2010, the Appeals Chamber suspended the implementation of Mr. Lubanga's release pending determination of the appeal.

17. On 8 October 2010, the Appeals Chamber delivered its judgments on the appeals of the Prosecutor against the decision of Trial Chamber I of 8 July 2010 to stay the proceedings against Mr. Lubanga Dyilo and against the oral decision of 15 July 2010 to release him. The Appeals Chamber reversed both decisions. In relation to the stay of proceedings, the Appeals Chamber held that, even though the Prosecutor should have complied with the Trial Chamber's orders to disclose the identity of an intermediary, the Trial Chamber erred in resorting immediately to a stay of proceedings. Instead, the Trial Chamber should have first imposed sanctions to bring about compliance with its orders. Considering that the decision to release Mr. Lubanga Dyilo was predicated entirely on the decision to stay proceedings, which the Appeals Chamber reversed, it also reversed the

decision to release the accused. The proceedings recommenced with a status conference on 11 October 2010.

18. In the Katanga and Ngudjolo Chui trial, on 12 July 2010 the Appeals Chamber delivered its judgment on the appeal of Mr. Katanga against the decision of Trial Chamber II of 20 November 2009 entitled “Decision on the Motion of the Defence for Germain Katanga for a declaration on Unlawful Detention and stay of Proceedings”. The Appeals Chamber found, by majority, that, based on the facts and circumstances of the case, the Trial Chamber committed no error of law, fact or procedure when it held that the "Defence motion for a declaration on unlawful detention and stay of proceedings" had been filed too late.

19. On 16 July 2010, the Appeals Chamber delivered its judgment on the appeal of Mr Katanga against the decision of Trial Chamber II of 22 January 2010 on the modalities of victim participation at trial. The Appeals Chamber confirmed Trial Chamber II's decision, citing its judgment of 11 July 2008 in the case of *The Prosecutor v. Thomas Lubanga Dyilo*.

20. In the case of Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, on 19 October 2010 the Appeals Chamber delivered its judgment on the appeal of Mr. Bemba Gombo against the decision of Trial Chamber III of 24 June 2010 entitled “Decision on the Admissibility and Abuse of Process Challenges”. The Appeals Chamber confirmed the impugned decision, finding that, when a Trial Chamber is presented with the question of whether the outcome of domestic judicial proceedings was a decision not to prosecute in terms of article 17(1)(b) of the Statute, the Trial Chamber should accept *prima facie* the validity and effect of the decisions of domestic courts, unless presented with compelling evidence indicating otherwise.

21. On 19 November 2010, the Appeals Chamber delivered its judgment on the appeal of Mr. Bemba Gombo against the decision of Trial Chamber III of 28 July 2010 on the review of Mr. Bemba Gombo’s detention. The Appeals Chamber found that the Trial Chamber had not carried out this review properly and directed Trial Chamber III to carry out a new review of Mr. Bemba’s detention.

## **B. Major Programme II – The Office of the Prosecutor**

22. The Office of the Prosecutor had its most active year in 2010 and has, as in previous years, exceeded its assumptions. While the Office of the Prosecutor had planned to conduct five active investigations, it actually performed six, including two in a new situation which had also not been assumed. The number of investigations where suspects are at large or the case is on trial met the assumptions. In the area of analysis of potential situations, the assumed number of eight situations was exceeded; the Office of the Prosecutor analyzed a total of nine situations. In the area of trials, the assumptions were met in full.

23. The Office of the Prosecutor was able to perform all these activities within its approved budget and had no reason to make use of the Contingency Fund. On the contrary, being mindful of the fact that other organs of the Court had a need for additional resources, since the activities in their areas also exceeded the level planned, the Prosecutor exercised utmost care in his financial planning in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee on Budget and Finance as well as the resolutions of the Assembly, carefully prioritizing activities and exercising due diligence so as to contribute through savings to the additional financial needs of the Court as a whole.

24. The Office of the Prosecutor continued in 2010 to actively monitor national proceedings in various countries so as to ensure that alleged crimes are investigated and, where warranted, subsequently prosecuted and tried. This contributes to the end of impunity for core international crimes without expanding the activities and financial resources of the Court. The Prosecutor will continue this strategy in the current and following years.

**1. Preliminary analysis activities**

25. In addition to the monitoring of open-source material, the Office of the Prosecutor received, acknowledged and analyzed 418 new communications received under Article 15 of the Rome Statute. The Office of the Prosecutor conducted an in-depth analysis of situations in various countries, including:

**(a) Afghanistan**

26. The Office of the Prosecutor has received 13 new communications in relation to Afghanistan and has pursued analysis of these in addition to open-source material.

27. The Office of the Prosecutor has maintained and sought to develop contacts with Afghan officials and organizations, as well as other interested States and international NGOs, with a view to gathering additional information on crime patterns and complementarity issues.

**(b) Colombia**

28. The Office of the Prosecutor has received 11 new communications in relation to Colombia and has pursued analysis of those in addition to open-source material.

29. The Office of the Prosecutor has liaised regularly with the Colombian authorities to obtain information on national proceedings against those most responsible for crimes within the Court's jurisdiction.

30. The Office of the Prosecutor organized a session of the NGO roundtable of 20 October 2010 focused on complementarity within the preliminary examination of the Colombia situation, with panellists commenting on the response of Colombian authorities to fighting impunity, including through the Justice and Peace Law proceedings.

**(c) Georgia**

31. The Office of the Prosecutor has received 9 new communications in relation to Georgia and has pursued analysis of volumes of material provided by Russian and Georgian authorities.

32. The Office of the Prosecutor conducted two missions to Moscow and Tbilisi in March and June 2010 respectively, with a view to receiving information on the ongoing investigations performed by the competent authorities of both countries into alleged crimes falling under the Court's jurisdiction.

**(d) Cote d'Ivoire**

33. The Office of the Prosecutor has received seven new communications in relation to Cote d'Ivoire, a number of them pertaining to alleged crimes committed in the aftermath of the presidential run-off of 28 November 2010, and has pursued analysis of those, as well as of open-source material.

34. The Office of the Prosecutor has continued to monitor closely the situation in Cote d'Ivoire and has liaised with the main protagonists of the ongoing crisis with a view to preventing the commission of new crimes.

**(e) Palestine**

35. The Office of the Prosecutor has received 10 new communications in relation to the Palestinian territories as well as over 15 legal communications from experts, academics and NGOs on the question whether the declaration accepting the jurisdiction of the Court filed by the Palestinian National Authority in January 2009 meets the statutory requirements. The Office of the Prosecutor has published a summary of the legal opinions received.

36. The Office of the Prosecutor has pursued its analysis of the above-mentioned declaration and has sought to provide all interested parties with an opportunity to present their views. In the context of the NGO roundtable of 20 October 2010, the Office of the Prosecutor held a thematic session concerning the preliminary examination relating to Palestine.

37. In accordance with its policy of positive complementarity, the Office of the Prosecutor has also explored avenues for encouraging national proceedings by both sides, including through contacts with the relevant authorities and with international organisations.

**(f) Nigeria**

38. The Office of the Prosecutor has received 12 new communications in relation to Nigeria, and has pursued analysis of those, as well as of open-source material.

39. The Office of the Prosecutor made its preliminary examination of the situation in Nigeria public on 18 November 2010.

40. The Office of the Prosecutor has engaged in constructive consultations with the Nigerian authorities.

**(g) Republic of Korea**

41. On 6 December 2010, the Office of the Prosecutor announced that it had received communications pertaining to two incidents in the Yellow Sea in the course of the year.

42. Following the announcement of a preliminary examination, the Office of the Prosecutor has been seeking additional information from relevant sources.

**(h) Guinea**

43. The Office of the Prosecutor has received five new communications in relation to Guinea and has pursued analysis of those as well as available information on the national proceedings.

44. The Office of the Prosecutor has performed three missions to Guinea in February, May and November 2010 with a view to gathering and assessing information on the investigation carried out by the Guinean authorities into alleged crimes committed on 28 September 2009.

45. The Office of the Prosecutor has also sought to prevent the commission of new crimes in the context of the presidential election.

**(i) Honduras**

46. The Office of the Prosecutor has received five new communications in relation to Honduras and has pursued analysis of those, as well as of open-source material.

47. On 18 November 2010, the Office of the Prosecutor announced that the situation was under preliminary examination. The Honduran authorities immediately offered cooperation.

48. The Office of the Prosecutor has seconded a senior staff member to Honduras' Truth Commission.

**2. Investigative and prosecutorial activities**

49. In the context of the Uganda situation, the Prosecutor continued the monitoring of crimes committed after the issuance of the arrest warrants against Joseph Kony et al. in July 2005, including those committed by other parties such as the UPDF, and requested information from the Government on national proceedings.

50. The Prosecutor also continued the monitoring of the supply networks and direct or indirect assistance that could benefit suspects and help them abscond.

51. The Office of the Prosecutor continued its efforts to galvanize support for the arrest and surrender of the suspects, emphasising the importance of arrest with States and international actors in the region and more widely, and regularly highlighting the continuing problem in key international meetings.

52. In the context of the DRC situation, the Office of the Prosecutor conducted a total of 107 missions, which included investigative missions as well as missions related to the situation of OTP witnesses and missions to secure cooperation.

53. In the case of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, the Prosecutor litigated before the Trial Chamber during the presentation of the defence case and before the Appeals Chamber. In this connection, he filed 344 documents totalling 4,725 pages.

54. In the case of Germain Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui, the Prosecutor concluded the presentation of his case in 69 court days (versus a planned 100 days) and filed 530 documents with the Chamber, totalling 6,618 pages.

55. In the case of Bosco Ntaganda, the Prosecutor continued to galvanize support for the arrest and surrender of the suspect.

56. In the case of Callixte Mbarushimana, the Prosecutor advanced the investigation and applied for a warrant of arrest on 20 August 2010. With the authorization of the Pre-Trial Chamber, he was closely involved in the arrest of Mr. Mbarushimana and in the subsequent search and seizure operation conducted by the French police. The Office filed 16 documents with the Pre-Trial Chamber, totalling 635 pages.

57. In the context of the situation in Darfur, Sudan, the Office of the Prosecutor conducted 21 investigative missions in various countries.

58. In accordance with United Nations Security Resolution 1593 (2005), the Prosecutor reported twice to the United Nations Security Council, in June and December 2010, on the progress of his Office's investigation.

59. The Prosecutor continued consultations with governments, the African Union, the Arab League, the European Union and NGO coalitions to enhance efforts relating to marginalisation and arrest in cases where arrest warrants have been issued.

60. In the case of Omar Hassan Ahmad Al-Bashir, the Prosecutor filed seven documents, totalling 54 pages, into the court records of the case.

61. In the case of Bahar Idriss Abu Garda, the Prosecutor filed 13 documents totalling 47 pages into the court records of the case, and maintained contact with other relevant governments, including the governments of Libya, Egypt and Kenya, to facilitate official Court contact with Abu Garda, including with his chosen counsel, and to facilitate his travel to The Hague.

62. In the case of Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain and Saleh Mohammed Jerbo Jamus, after the issuance of a summons to appear, the Office of the Prosecutor worked together with the Registry in connection with the appearance of these two individuals in The Hague.

63. The Office of the Prosecutor litigated the case before Pre-Trial Chamber I in status conference and at the confirmation hearings. In this connection, the Office of the Prosecutor filed 111 documents, totalling 3,886 pages, into the court records of the case.

64. In the situation in the Central African Republic (the CAR) in the case of Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, the Office of the Prosecutor conducted 26 investigative missions in the CAR and other countries. It litigated the case before Trial Chamber III in status conferences and began the presentation of the prosecution case before that Chamber. In this connection, it filed 331 documents, totalling 4,014 pages, into the court records of the case.

65. The Prosecutor also continued the monitoring of other acts of violence committed more recently on the territory of the Central African Republic and requested information on the status of national proceedings.

66. In the situation in Kenya, after receiving authorization from the Pre-Trial Chamber the Prosecutor launched investigations into crimes allegedly committed by members of various groups. The Office of the Prosecutor conducted 52 investigative missions in Kenya and other countries and the Prosecutor personally conducted one mission to Kenya, meeting inter alia with the Prime Minister and other high-ranking government officials as well as with representatives of civil society.

67. Following nine months of investigations, the Prosecutor requested summonses to appear under Article 58 of the Rome Statute against six individuals in two cases. In this connection, the Office of the Prosecutor filed 58 documents, totalling of 5,473 pages, into the court records of the case.

## **C. Major Programme III – The Registry**

### **1. Court Management**

68. In the situation in Uganda, a total of four documents was registered and notified, as well as translations.

69. In the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, a total of 3,389 documents and 1,315 transcripts of hearings were registered and notified. Support (both procedural and technical) was provided for 238 hearings.

70. In the situation in Darfur, Sudan, a total of 865 documents and 19 transcripts of hearings were registered and notified. Support (both procedural and technical) was provided for six hearings.

71. In the situation in the Central African Republic, a total of 4,558 documents and 83 transcripts of hearings were registered and notified, as well as translations. Support (both procedural and technical) was provided for 21 hearings.

72. In the situation in Kenya, a total of 525 documents were registered and notified. The numbers quoted relate to the following: i) originals and translations of filings, and ii) documents concerning the situation and all the related cases.

### **2. Translation and interpretation**

73. The Court Interpretation and Translation Section provided interpretation for parallel trials and, in addition to French and English, arranged for interpretation from and into Swahili (2 booths for 2 different trials), Lingala and Sango (from November 2010).

74. To provide interpretation from and into Sango, it organised training for Sango trainee interpreters. Training was provided entirely in-house, following a training curriculum developed in-house, using wide Court expertise in the form of lectures and workshops. The actual interpretation training was given by staff interpreters, occasional external interpreters and consultants with specific expertise. The Sango interpreters were trial-ready on time for the start of the Bemba trial. The Sango terminology required for the trial was also worked on in-house, primarily by the Terminology and Reference Unit and the trainee Sango interpreters with the assistance of a Sango language expert. The Court is the only international organisation which trains interpreters in the above languages, and the only court where these languages are used in the simultaneous mode.

### **3. Legal aid and counsel issues**

#### **(a) Counsel Support Section**

75. While the assumptions used to establish the budget for 2010 included three indigent defendants (no assumption was included regarding the number of victims), the legal aid system accepted six defendants and 2,257 victims, and advanced the necessary funds to cover legal assistance to Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombi, who was declared non-indigent by the Registrar. The Registrar has continued to implement the order of the Chamber to advance the necessary funds for the legal representation of Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo and has continued with the investigation of Mr. Bemba's assets, which resulted in the recovery of

€25,700 in 2010. A breakdown of indigent defendants and victim applications is given in annex VIII.

76. The Registry also provided administrative support and assistance to all legal teams representing accused or victims.

77. The Registry held several consultations and activities with members of the legal profession, including a new Seminar of Counsel, complemented for the third time by a training programme targeting lawyers who might act as counsel before the Court.

78. In respect of its list of counsel, the Registry received 79 new applications. Of the complete dossiers processed, 38 persons were added to the list, bringing the total number of admitted counsel to 364. It further handled 73 applications for admission to the list of assistants to counsel. With the dossiers treated from 2010 and those received in the preceding years, the total number of admissions to the list of assistants to counsel is currently 78. The list of professional investigators comprises 27 members.

79. In this context, the campaign to encourage African female lawyers to apply for admissions to the list of counsel and the list of assistants has started to bear fruit, with 24 applications to the list of counsel resulting so far in seven admissions, as well as 25 applications to the list of assistants, resulting so far in ten admissions.

**(b) Office of Public Counsel for the Defence**

80. The Office of Public Counsel for the Defence (OPCD) provided ongoing representation of the interests of the defence in connection with the Darfur and DRC situations. It continued to provide legal advice, memoranda and real-time assistance during court hearings (through access to real-time transcripts) to the defence teams of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, Germain Katanga, Mathieu Ngudjolo, Jean Pierre Bemba, Bahar Idriss Abu Garda, Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain, Saleh Mohammed Jerbo Jamus, Calixte Mbarushimana and ad hoc counsel appearing in the situation phase. The OPCD was also instructed by Trial Chamber III to assist the defence team of Jean Pierre Bemba in submitting observations on 1233 victim applications.

**(c) Office of Public Counsel for Victims**

81. The work of the Office of Public Counsel for Victims (OPCV) significantly increased in 2010, with the number of victims represented by the OPCV increasing by 82%.

82. The OPCV has been involved in all situations and cases before the Court, providing:

(a) Support and assistance to 31 external legal representatives in all situations and cases before the Court;

(b) 150 items of legal advice and research to external legal representatives;

(c) Legal assistance to and representation of 109 victims in the DRC situation/cases;

(d) Legal assistance to and representation of 237 victims in the Uganda situation/case;

(e) Legal assistance to and representation of 1556 victims in the CAR situation/Bemba case;

(f) Legal assistance to and representation of 23 victims in the Darfur–Sudan situation/cases in accordance with the power of attorney signed by the external legal representatives;

(g) Legal assistance to around 100 victims in other countries; and

(h) Counsel of the Office attends daily the hearings in the Lubanga trial, all hearings in the Bemba case and some hearings in the Katanga and Ngudjolo/Chui trial.

83. The OPCV has published a manual for legal representative appearing before the Court, in English and French, and a booklet explaining its role and mandate.

#### 4. Victim participation

84. A total of 2,239 applications for participation in proceedings were received in 2010 by the Victims Participation and Reparations Section (VPRS), which acts as the entry point for applications from victims. This represents an increase of around 200% compared to the number received in 2009. Over the same period, the number of applications for reparation received increased more than five-fold. During the year a total of 1,436 victims were authorized by Chambers to participate in the different proceedings, the largest number being in the Bemba case in the period leading up to the start of the trial. A breakdown of victim participation applications is shown in annex VIII.

85. In the Uganda situation, a further 311 applications for participation from victims were received, bringing the total number of applications received to 1012.

86. In the situation in the DRC, a further 47 applications for participation from victims were received, bringing the total number of applications received to 1,068. In the case of Thomas Lubanga Dyilo, 15 new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Trial Chamber I, bringing the total number of victims accepted in this case to 118. In the case of German Katanga and Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui, five new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Trial Chamber II, bringing the total number of victims accepted in this case to 624.

87. In the situation in Darfur, Sudan, 63 new applications for participation from victims were received, bringing the total number of applications received to 204. In the case of Ahmad Muhammad Harun ("Ahmad Harun") and Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb"), six new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Pre-Trial Chamber I. In the case of Omar Hassan Ahmad Al Bashir, the VPRS filed eight redacted documents. In the case of Bahar Idriss Abu Garda, nine new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Pre-Trial Chamber I, bringing the total number of victims accepted in this case to 87. In the case of Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain and Saleh Mohammed Jerbo Jamus, 89 new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Pre-Trial Chamber I.

88. In the situation in the CAR, 1,761 new applications for participation from victims wishing to participate in the proceedings were received, bringing the total number of applications received to 1928. In the case of Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo, 1,312 new applicants have been granted the status of victims by Trial Chamber III.

89. In the Kenya situation, 645 applications for representation and 52 applications for participation from victims wishing to participate in the proceedings were received, bringing the total number of applications received to 54.

90. The VPRS undertook 46 missions during the year. The section's field activities were aimed primarily at providing accurate information on victim participation and reparation before the Court, making available copies of the standard application forms, following up on incomplete applications, and providing training and support to intermediaries assisting victims with their applications and to legal representatives of victims.

91. In September 2010, revised versions of the standard application forms for participation and reparations were approved by the Presidency, and were subsequently made available for use in the field. The preparation of the new forms was the result of an extensive consultation process both within the Court and with external interlocutors, whilst at the same time responding to the needs of the judicial proceedings.

92. The Prosecutor's request for authorization of an investigation relating to Kenya gave rise to the possibility (envisaged under rule 50(3) of the Rules) for victims to make representations to the Pre-Trial Chamber in the context of its consideration of the request. Almost 400 victims' representations were facilitated by the VPRS, 76 of which were collective representations made by community leaders on behalf of affected groups.

## **5. Victims and Witnesses**

93. With regard to the protection of victims and witnesses, the Victims and Witnesses Unit (VWU) provided expert advice to the various Chambers, parties and participants. Eleven new requests for access to the ICC Protection Programme (ICCPP) were received, as well as four new requests for local protection measures.

94. With regard to victims and witnesses activities related to trial operations, the number of witnesses supported by VWU in 2010 was 60 (33 for DRC I, 24 for DRC II and 3 for CAR), five more than assumed by the Court in its budget preparation. The number of expert witnesses stood at six, exceeding the budget assumptions by two. Similarly, the number of accompanying persons reached six, exceeding the budget assumptions by one. A breakdown of stay per witness at HQ appears in annex VIII.

95. The maximum duration of stay per witness at HQ was 22 days for DRC I, 41 days for DRC II and 19 days for the CAR. The Court had assumed a maximum duration of stay per witness of 10 days.

96. In its interaction with Chambers, during 2010 the VWU submitted 51 filings to Chambers: Lubanga case – 10 filings; Katanga/Ngudjolo Chui case – 29 filings; Bemba case – 11 filings; and Abu Garda case – one filing. In addition, the VWU submitted to the Chambers by email 27 other formal reports.

97. VWU representatives also attended in total 13 hearings. In relation to relocation agreements, the VWU developed a new approach on relocation of witnesses and created a Special Fund for Relocations. The VWU has already collected voluntary contributions to the Fund from four States.

98. With regard to the operational side, the VWU maintained local response measures in Uganda and the DRC, in the Darfur situation and in the Central African Republic. Towards the end of 2010 the Unit began assessing the feasibility of establishing local response measures in the Kenya situation.

99. In total, in 2010 the VWU facilitated the appearance of 33 witnesses and victims in the Lubanga case (DRC I), 26 witnesses in the Katanga/Ngudjolo case (DRC II) and three witnesses in the Bemba case (CAR).

100. With regard to the psycho-social/support side, the VWU support team has been helping witnesses in two simultaneous trials since the beginning of 2010. In November and December 2010, the support team provided services to witnesses for three simultaneous trials, using the resources allocated for two trials.

## **6. Public Information and Outreach**

101. Public information and outreach plans were implemented to explain the mandate, role, functioning and activities of the Court in connection with five situations and ten cases, with 15 warrants of arrest publicly issued. Action plans also included making judicial proceedings accessible in situation-related countries and publicizing them worldwide through the media and the internet.

102. The Court was able to engage with thousands of affected populations across all of the situation-related countries. In the course of 537 outreach sessions, 53,263 participants received answers to their questions, while an estimated audience of nearly 70 million<sup>5</sup> people was regularly exposed to Court information through local radio and television programmes. For outreach purposes the Court produced 98 radio programmes and 77 television programmes, including weekly summaries of the proceedings in two trials.

103. The Court increased the number of key groups and global audiences regularly informed in non-situation-related countries by enhancing its communication tools, launching the ICC YouTube web-based page and Flickr and Twitter sites, and by developing and implementing projects tailored to the legal and academic communities. In partnership with the International Bar Association, the Court helped legal communities to

---

<sup>5</sup> This figure includes 25 million reached in Kenya, a new situation-related country not included in the ICC 2010 proposed budget programme.

increase their knowledge and understanding of the ICC through information sessions held in the context of the campaign Calling African Female Lawyers. There was further engagement with the law and academia through study visits to The Hague by university groups, through the internship and visiting professional programme funded by the European Commission and others, and through the holding at ICC Headquarters of the finals of the international competition, The Moot Court.

104. A Court-wide Public Information Strategy for the period 2011 to 2013 was developed and endorsed by the Assembly at its ninth session. The strategy further develops existing tactics, improves approaches and defined operational objectives and strategies within four programmatic action lines intended to hold sustainable communication programmes with the media, global audiences and the legal and academic communities.

## **7. External Relations and Cooperation**

105. The Registry, through its Immediate Office, participated and actively engaged in all the Hague Working Group sessions it was invited to, ensuring that States Parties received a coordinated input from the Registry and the Presidency and, where appropriate, also the Office of the Prosecutor on matters of mutual concern. This work was crucial to ensuring a successful 9<sup>th</sup> session of the Assembly. The Immediate Office also maintained good relations and liaised with international and regional organizations, so as to ensure broader support for the work of the Registry at the political and operational level.

106. All requests for cooperation to States Parties as ordered by Chambers were transmitted and followed up. In addition, the voluntary cooperation of States in areas within Registry mandate such as witness protection was sought. In this respect, a new Trust Fund was opened in order to fund relocations to third States that do not have the resources to do so, and substantial donations were received to the Trust Fund.

## **8. Field Operations**

107. In 2010, 146 missions in Uganda received support and assistance from the Registry's Field Office Section (FOS). The office in Kampala was instrumental in providing assistance and support to the Court's staff on mission during the Review Conference of the Rome Statute, including visits by Principals of the Court and other high-level States Parties officials to the northern part of Uganda and parts of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Immediate Office was also instrumental in assisting increased work in other situations such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Kenya.

108. A review of the resources allocated to the Kampala Field Office to support activities undertaken in the situation of Uganda was completed and submitted to the Committee in April 2010.<sup>6</sup>

109. In the DRC, 396 missions undertaken by the Office of the Prosecutor, Registry, defence teams and Trust Fund for Victims received support and assistance from FOS. Due to increased judicial activities and the arrest of Callixte Mbarushimana, the Forward Field Office in Bunia assisted a number of missions in the two Kivu provinces. Additionally, 25 requests for judicial cooperation and assistance were notified and followed up by the Kinshasa Field Office.

110. As mentioned in paragraph 105 above, in connection with the Review Conference of the Rome Statute, FOS organised and coordinated a mission for 15 representatives of States Parties to the Bunia Forward Field Office. It was the first time States Parties had been able to visit a Court Field Office and acquaint themselves with the activities and challenges faced by the Court in the field.

111. In the Central African Republic, 82 missions were provided with support and assistance from FOS. With the commencement of the Bemba case, the Bangui Office assisted all the parties and participants in the proceedings. In addition, the Bangui Office notified 20 requests for judicial cooperation and assistance to the Ministry of Justice.

---

<sup>6</sup> Report of the Court on the Kampala Field Office: activities, challenges and review of staffing levels; and on memoranda of understanding with situation countries (ICC-ASP/9/11).

112. In respect of Kenya, FOS conducted an analysis of the most effective way to support its operations in relation to the situation in that country. The decision to open a small, temporary field support structure in Nairobi was approved by the Presidency on 23 September 2010. Between September and November 2010, FOS coordinated negotiations with the United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON) with respect to the services to be offered to the field office once formally established within the UNON compound.

#### **9. E-court and ICT**

113. Following up on the consultant's report on the eCourt, an inter-organ working group has been established, chaired by the Chief of the Court Management Section, and attended by focal points from Pre-Trial, Trial and Appeals Divisions of Chambers, Office of the Prosecutor, Counsel Support Section, Office of Public Counsel for Victims, Office of Public Counsel for the Defence, and ICT Section. This working group meets on a monthly basis in order to secure improvements for all users of the electronic systems in place to support proceedings.

114. ECOS enhancements have also progressed, with the deployment of the module supporting scheduling and notification of court activities planned for the end of February 2011. Development of the document management module was scheduled to start in early February 2011, in-house, with the assistance of the ICT Section. Development of the interpretation module started in the summer of 2010 and is still ongoing. Testing of the module supporting VWU activities started as of late December 2010.

#### **10. Human Resources**

115. Implementation of the Court's human resources strategy continued throughout 2010. Recruitment was maintained at targeted levels, with 55 new staff joining the Court in established posts; at the same time, the percentage of staff leaving the institution was lower than in previous years (about 8 per cent). In support of its objective of attracting and retaining professionals of the highest calibre, the Court introduced improved conditions of service for internationally-recruited professional staff serving in field locations. Performance management was further enhanced by introducing a rebuttal mechanism and providing training to managers. Strategic learning plans were established and implemented in all organs and a number of staff well-being activities were carried out. A Leadership Development Programme, designed for managers at all levels, commenced with a comprehensive needs assessment phase and will be rolled out in 2011.

#### **11. Security and Safety**

116. In 2010, the Security and Safety Section continued to manage and ensure the security and safety of Court personnel, assets and information both at Headquarters and for operations in the field. The section has provided for security and safety of Court proceedings as required by the hearing schedule and by decisions of the Chambers. In the field the section has ensured that all relevant security and safety risks to Court personnel, assets, information and premises are managed appropriately following the Court's protocols and relevant security and safety frameworks.

117. In the area of information security, the section has implemented and delivered information security awareness training and continued the monitoring and testing of the information security infrastructure. The section has also continued to work towards improving information security in the field by conducting assessments of information security infrastructure and practices in the Court's field offices and by testing secure communications solutions for the support of activities outside Headquarters.

### **D. Major Programme IV – The Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties**

118. The Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties ("the Secretariat") continued to provide substantive and conference servicing to the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies. In this respect, it:

(a) Organized and serviced the Assembly's resumed eighth session, which had not been foreseen in the 2010 budget, as well as the ninth session, both held in New York, for periods of four and five working days respectively;

(b) Serviced the subsidiary bodies of the Assembly, in particular the Bureau and its Working Groups, the Committee on Budget and Finance and the Oversight Committee on permanent premises;

(c) Organized and serviced two sessions of the Committee on Budget and Finance in The Hague;

(d) Provided legal and substantive secretariat services, such as the provision of documentation, reports and analytical summaries, to the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies, including the preparation of documentation relating to the election of six members of the Committee on Budget and Finance;

(e) Provided advice to the Assembly, the Bureau and their subsidiary bodies on legal and substantive issues relating to the work of the Assembly;

(f) Discharged its mandate regarding the Plan of action pursuant to resolutions ICC-ASP/5/Res.3, ICC-ASP/6/Res.2, ICC-ASP/7/Res.3 and ICC-ASP/8/Res.3, resulting in the accessibility of information provided on the Assembly's website;

(g) Secured contributions to and managed the trust fund for the participation of the least developed countries and other developing States in the work of the Assembly, thus facilitating the participation of a total of 50 representatives in the Review Conference, as well as at the ninth session of the Assembly; and

(h) Corresponded with governments, the Court, intergovernmental organizations, other relevant bodies, individuals and non-governmental organizations on matters relating to the work of the Assembly.

119. In 2010, the Secretariat also provided substantive and conference servicing to the Review Conference as well as support to the Bureau in its preparations for the Review Conference. In this connection, it

(a) Organized the Review Conference, with the assistance of the United Nations Office at Nairobi and the Government of Uganda, held in Kampala for a period of ten working days; and

(b) Provided legal, technical and substantive support for the Assembly's preparations for the Conference, including meetings of the Bureau and the Working Groups of the Bureau (see paragraph 120 below); the scope, financial and legal implications, as well as practical and organizational issues;<sup>7</sup> the preparation of the stocktaking panels and the participation of the panelists;<sup>8</sup> organized the convening of a high-level segment;<sup>9</sup> provided legal and substantive secretariat services to the Review Conference; prepared the documentation for the Conference; conducted activities to disseminate information about the Conference and corresponded with governments, the Court, intergovernmental organizations, other relevant bodies, individuals and non-governmental organizations on matters relating to the Review Conference.

120. In addition to the plenary meetings of the Assembly and the Review Conference and the related informal consultations, the Secretariat serviced 119 meetings as follows:

- (a) Bureau.....24 (including Review Conference);
- (b) The Hague Working Group .....46;
- (c) New York Working Group .....17; and
- (d) Oversight Committee.....32.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Official Records ... Eighth session ... 2009* (ICC-ASP/8/20), vol. I, part II, ICC-ASP/8/Res.6, para. 8.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, para. 6 and *Official Records ... Resumed eighth session ... 2010* (ICC-ASP/8/20/Add.1), part II ICC-ASP/8/Res.9, paras. 3 - 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records ... Eighth session ... 2009* (ICC-ASP/8/20), vol. I, part II, ICC-ASP/8/Res.9, para. 1.

121. The Secretariat processed a total of 165 documents and 2,501 pages (in the six official languages) for the resumed eighth session, the Review Conference and the ninth session, broken down as follows:

- (a) Pre-session ..... 265 documents and 3,865 pages;
- (b) In-session ..... 351 documents and 2,172 pages; and
- (c) Post-session ..... 25 documents and 2,998 pages.

122. For the two sessions of the Committee on Budget and Finance, the Secretariat also processed a total of 198 documents and 1,782 pages, in three official languages.

## **E. Major Programme V – Offices of the Permanent Premises Project**

123. The contract process with the architect was concluded, the project manual was completed and the Preliminary Design of the permanent premises was finalised within budget.

# **III. Cross-cutting issues**

## **A. Strategic Plan**

124. In 2010 the Court continued the development of operational strategies in key areas, such as Public Information. In addition, the Court is further developing a strategy on the operations of its field offices. An initial report was presented at the fourteenth session of the Committee.

125. Internally, the Court has continued the process of familiarising its managers and staff with the Strategic Plan and the process of strategic planning. In parallel, all organs of the Court have further strengthened the connection between the Court's strategic plan and the workplans of their units.

126. The Court, in part as a result of the ongoing constructive dialogue with the Hague Working Group, has developed an annual strategic planning process at all levels which will guide the formation of the annual budget in a more comprehensive manner. This process will be incorporated immediately into preparation for the 2012 budget.

127. The Court has also begun the process of bringing together its planning cycles. The 2012 budget cycle will be the first budget exercise in which strategic planning, risk management and budget planning will be brought together systematically to produce a more comprehensive, strategically driven process.

## **B. Risk management**

128. The initial risk management project of the Court is nearly complete. The project consists of three phases: identification of risks, analysis and strategy selection and risk treatment (planning and implementation).

129. Project management has made its recommendations to the Coordination Council, which has agreed on measures to be implemented. The implementation process will be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure that the planned results are achieved.

130. In partnership with the Audit Committee, the Court has investigated best practices among other international organisations of similar size and begun developing an enterprise risk management system. The first step, which was initiated at the end of the year in preparation for the annual budget cycle, is the development of risk registers at all levels of the Court. Managers have received basic training in risk management. From the section level cascading up, risk registers are being developed at all levels of the Court. These will also be used to inform the annual budget preparation cycle. The risk registers will be part of the Court's management tools and will be regularly updated. The Court will further develop its Enterprise Risk Management structure.

### C. Transfers of funds

131. An amount of €200,000 was transferred from the Outreach Unit in the Public Information and Documentation Section to the Furniture and Equipment category in the Field Operations Section. This was to cover material costs for the start-up / set-up of the Kenya field office. Due to the late start, the intended investments were not realized before the end of the year.

132. An amount of €300,000 was transferred from the Staffing category in the Security and Safety Section to contractual services in Counsel Support Section, so as to fund legal aid costs.

133. Another transfer of €275,000 was made, from general operating expenses of the Detention Section to contractual services in the Counsel Support Section, in order to cover legal aid costs.

### D. Annual inventories

134. The General Services Section visited and conducted a full physical check of equipment at Headquarters and the field offices during December 2010, with the exception of Kinshasa and Bangui, where inventory checks were carried out in October 2009 and March 2010 respectively. Office Managers in these two locations, and at the in New York office, were requested to conduct a full inventory. This exercise was due to be completed in early 2011, so as to ensure strict Asset Management control.

135. As of 31 December 2010, the total number of assets in use was 8,250 pieces, with an acquisition value of €15.1 million, representing an increase of €0.6 million over 2009. This includes the actual acquisition of assets in 2010 amounting to €1.1 million after adjusting actual write-off against acquisition value due to obsolescence, damage, loss or theft (€0.5 million). As a first result of this Asset Management control exercise, 294 items are recommended to be written-off, with a corresponding original acquisition value of €0.3 million.

## IV. Budgetary performance 2010

### Overview of the budgetary performance of the Court

136. The overall implementation rate of the Court, including the Review Conference and actual Contingency Fund expenditure (see para. 3 below), was 100.8 per cent, or a total of €104.5 million against an approved budget of €103.6 million, resulting in an overspend of €0.9 million. After taking into consideration the Court's interest income of €0.4 million and other income of €0.1 million, an amount of €0.4 million was accessed from the Contingency Fund, subject to completion of the external audit certification. Thus for the year 2010, for the first time in its history, the Court fully exhausted its programme budget.

137. The implementation rate of the Court, excluding the Review Conference and Contingency Fund expenditure, was 95.7 per cent, or a total of €97.9 million against an approved budget of €102.3 million. The implementation rate for the Review Conference was 107.2 per cent, representing an overspend of almost 0.1 million against an approved budget of approximately €1.37 million.

138. On 18 December 2009 and 15 April and 10 May 2010, the Court had submitted notifications to the Committee for authorization to access the Contingency Fund, in a total amount of €8.24 million. The implementation rate against Contingency Fund notifications was 62.4 per cent, or a total of €5.1 million. The Court could not foresee parallel trial hearings at the time of the 2010 budget preparation and decided to prepare the budget on the assumption of consecutive trials. Also, the Court could not foresee the development of the Kenya situation. Nevertheless, the Court made every effort to absorb the associated costs within the approved programme budget.

139. The Court's 2010 annual average vacancy rate was 9.3 per cent. However, the actual implementation rate was 92.6 per cent in terms of staff salary costs. Vacancy rates in the major programmes were fairly stable throughout the year. Judiciary's annual average vacancy rate was 8.0 per cent, with a staff costs implementation rate of 89.5 per cent. The Registry's annual average vacancy rate was 9.4 per cent. Its staff costs implementation rate was 94.9 per cent. Annual average vacancy rate for the Office of the Prosecutor was 6.5 per cent, and staff costs implementation rate was 92.5 per cent.

140. In 2010, the Court changed its accounting policy to include the liability of accrued annual leave for its staff. An amount of €0.6 million, an increase in the annual leave from 2009, was included in staff-related costs.

141. The Judiciary achieved a high implementation rate of 98.8 per cent, or a total of €10.6 million against an approved budget of €10.7 million. The comparably low implementation rate for the Liaison Offices was mainly the result of a resolution issued by the African Union denying accreditation of an African Union Liaison Office and the Court's subsequent decision not to move ahead with the establishment of such an office in the circumstances.

142. The Office of the Prosecutor had a 94.2 per cent implementation rate, identical to the previous year's. Expenditure totalled €25.3 million, against an approved budget of €26.8 million. The costs of investigation-related activities in Kenya were fully absorbed by redeploying existing staff to the new situation.

143. The Registry achieved a high implementation rate of 98.0 per cent, or a total of €8.3 million against an approved budget of €9.5 million. The Division of Court Services showed underspend at 93.0 per cent, or €1.29 million. There was a major underspend of €0.45 million in the Detention Section for the costs of rental of cells due to actual engagement of six cells instead of the planned twelve. The other major underspend, of €0.47 million, was in the Court Interpretation and Translation Section, due to delayed recruitment of Professional staff and a reduced need for general temporary assistance, as a result of developments in judicial proceedings.

144. The Secretariat had a 75.2 per cent implementation rate, attributable to delays in recruitment and savings generated through enhanced efficiency in documentation processes.

145. The implementation rate of the Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims was lower still at 74.7 per cent. This was mainly due to posts being filled later than anticipated.

146. The low implementation rate at 67.7 per cent for the Project Director's Office for the Permanent Premises was due to: (a) underspend in contractual services because of delayed implementation processes; and (b) lower interest costs due to early repayment of fund loan to host State.

147. The Independent Oversight Mechanism is in the process of setting up the office and its only expenditure was for the staff costs of one official on reimbursable loan from the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services in New York from June 2010. Thus it has a low implementation rate of 31.4 per cent.

148. Table 1-1 provides a summary of budget implementation rates 2010, excluding expenditure for the Contingency Fund, by major programme and programme.

**Table 1-1: Budget Performance 2010 by Major Programme and Programme (€000)**

Major Programme/Programme	Appropriation	Expenditure*	Variance	Implementation rate in %
<b>Major Programme I</b>				
<b>Judiciary</b>	<b>10,719</b>	<b>10,587</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>98.8</b>
Presidency	2,318	2,387	-69	103.0
Chambers	7,758	7,908	-150	101.9
Liaison Offices	643	292	351	45.4
<b>Major Programme II</b>				
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>	<b>26,828</b>	<b>25,259</b>	<b>1,569</b>	<b>94.2</b>
Prosecutor	6,414	5,926	488	92.4
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division	2,214	2,128	86	96.1
Investigation Division	13,086	11,676	1,410	89.2
Prosecution Division	5,114	5,529	-415	108.1
<b>Major Programme III</b>				
<b>Registry</b>	<b>59,541</b>	<b>58,333</b>	<b>1,208</b>	<b>98.0</b>
Office of the Registrar	17,206	17,767	-562	103.3
Common Administrative Services Division	20,784	20,446	339	98.4
Division of Court Services	18,276	16,991	1,285	93.0
Public Information and Documentation Section	3,276	3,130	146	95.5
<b>Major Programme IV</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>2,271</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>75.2</b>
<b>Major Programme VI</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>74.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>				
<b>Project Director's Office</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>67.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>				
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>31.4</b>
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>102,254</b>	<b>97,863</b>	<b>4,391</b>	<b>95.7</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change. The appropriation and actual expenditure figures in Major Programme III relating to the Office of the Registrar and Division of Court services have been restated to reflect the restructuring of the Victims Participation and Reparations Section, through which the legal aid activities were moved to Counsel Support Section under the Office of the Registrar. This will facilitate a like-to-like comparison of budget and actual expenditure.

149. Table 1-2 provides a summary of budget implementation rates for the Review Conference held in June 2010, by major programme and programme.

150. The Secretariat incurred an overspend, due to the additional costs incurred for travel for panellists, and costs for consultancy and translations which had not been originally budgeted, while the Secretariat for the Trust Fund for Victims also substantially overspent, because more participants than planned attended the Review Conference.

**Table 1-2: Budget Performance for the Review Conference 2010 by Major Programme and Programme (€000)**

Major Programme / Programme	Approved Budget 2010 for Review Conference	Expenditure for Review Conference*	Variance	Implementation rate in %
<b>Major Programme I</b>				
Judiciary	<b>24.5</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>-5.1</b>	<b>120.8</b>
Presidency				
Chambers	24.5	29.6	-5.1	120.8
Liaison Offices				
<b>Major Programme II</b>				
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>				
Prosecutor				
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division				
Investigation Division				
Prosecution Division				
<b>Major Programme III</b>				
Registry	<b>89.8</b>	<b>89.8</b>		<b>100.0</b>
Office of the Registrar	83.8	70.4	13.4	84.0
Common Administrative Services Division				
Division of Court Services	2.7	2.4	0.3	88.9
Public Information and Documentation Section	3.3	17.0	-13.7	515.2
<b>Major Programme IV</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>	<b>1,251.0</b>	<b>1,319.1</b>	<b>-68.1</b>	<b>105.4</b>
<b>Major Programme VI</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>-25.9</b>	<b>731.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>				
<b>Project Director's Office</b>				
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>				
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>				
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>1,369.4</b>	<b>1,468.5</b>	<b>-99.1</b>	<b>107.2</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

151. Table 2-1 provides an overview split by basic and situation-related expenditure, excluding expenditure for the Contingency Fund. The basic component shows a 94.7 per cent implementation rate, whereas the situation-related element comes out at 96.7 per cent.

**Table 2-1: Budget Implementation 2010 by Basic and Situation-related Expenditure (€000)**

<i>Major Programme and Programme</i>	<i>Basic</i>			<i>Situation-related</i>		
	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>
<b>Major Programme I</b>						
Judiciary	<b>10,057</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>99.4</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>88.6</b>
Presidency	2,318	2,386	102.9		1	
Chambers	7,096	7,322	103.2	663	586	88.5
Liaison Offices	643	292	45.4			
<b>Major Programme II</b>						
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>4,834</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>21,778</b>	<b>20,425</b>	<b>93.8</b>
Prosecutor	2,956	2,703	91.4	3,458	3,223	93.2
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division	903	779	86.3	1,312	1,349	102.9
Investigation Division	410	430	104.9	12,676	11,246	88.7
Prosecution Division	782	922	117.9	4,332	4,607	106.3
<b>Major Programme III</b>						
<b>Registry</b>	<b>30,865</b>	<b>29,754</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>28,676</b>	<b>28,580</b>	<b>99.7</b>
Office of the Registrar	8,004	7,856	98.2	9,203	9,915	107.7
Common Administrative Services Division	14,946	14,632	97.9	5,838	5,808	99.5
Division of Court Services	6,071	5,515	90.8	12,204	11,478	94.0
Public Information & Documentation Section	1,845	1,751	94.9	1,431	1,379	96.4
<b>Major Programme IV</b>						
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>2,271</b>	<b>75.2</b>			
<b>Major Programme VI</b>						
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>77.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>						
<b>Project Director's Office</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>67.7</b>			
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>						
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>31.4</b>			
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>50,331</b>	<b>47,645</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>51,923</b>	<b>50,218</b>	<b>96.7</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change. The appropriation and actual expenditure figures in Major Programme III relating to the Office of the Registrar and Division of Court services have been restated to reflect the restructuring of the Victims Participation and Reparations Section, through which the legal aid activities were moved to Counsel Support Section under the Office of the Registrar. This will facilitate a like-to-like comparison of budget and actual expenditure.

152. Table 2-2 shows an overview split for the Review Conference expenditure by basic and situation-related expenditure. The basic component shows a 105.0 per cent implementation rate.

**Table 2-2: Budget Implementation for the Review Conference 2010 by Basic and Situation-related Expenditure (€000)**

<i>Major Programme and Programme Appropriation</i>	<i>Basic</i>	<i>Situation-related</i>			
	<i>Expenditure*</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>	<i>Implementation rate in %</i>
<b>Major Programme I</b>					
Judiciary	<b>24.5</b>	<b>29.6</b>	<b>120.8</b>		
Presidency					
Chambers	24.5	29.6	120.8		
Liaison Offices					
<b>Major Programme II</b>					
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>					
Prosecutor					
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division					
Investigation Division					
Prosecution Division					
<b>Major Programme III</b>					
Registry	<b>89.8</b>	<b>59.6</b>	<b>66.4</b>		<b>30.2</b>
Office of the Registrar	83.8	42.6	50.8		27.8
Common Administrative Services Division					
Division of Court Services	2.7				2.4
Public Information & Documentation Section	3.3	17.0	515.2		
<b>Major Programme IV</b>					
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>					
	<b>1,251.0</b>	<b>1,319.1</b>	<b>105.4</b>		
<b>Major Programme VI</b>					
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>					
	<b>4.1</b>	<b>30.0</b>	<b>731.7</b>		
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>					
<b>Project Director's Office</b>					
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>					
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>					
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>1,369.4</b>	<b>1,438.3</b>	<b>105.0</b>		<b>30.2</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

153. Table 3-1 illustrates the implementation of the 2010 budget, excluding the Contingency Fund, by expenditure type.

154. The GTA implementation rate exceeded the approved budget at 111.0 per cent Court-wide. It is in line with the previous year's implementation rate of 112.8 per cent.

155. Overspend for legal counsel of 152.4 per cent was due to the need to engage additional legal assistance for Bahar Idriss Abu Garda, Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain and Saleh Mohammed Jerbo Jamus. Certain additional resources were also provided to legal teams in light of the circumstances of the cases, and in accordance with the applicable regulations. An amount of €10.5 thousand is included as a doubtful receivable for recovered legal defence fees for Jean-Pierre Bemba Gombo.

156. The furniture and equipment category overspent at 129.7 per cent. This was for two main reasons: the purchase of three vehicles for field offices in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda, and equipment replacement charged to this category rather than to general operating expenses, which inversely shows an underspend in that category in the Information and Communication Technologies Section.

**Table 3-1: Budget Implementation 2010 by Expenditure Type (€000)**

Item	Approved Budget 2010	Expenditure*	Variance	Implementation Rate in %
Judges	5,634	5,905	-271	104.8
Judges' Travel	154	116	37	75.7
<i>Salaries &amp; allowances of Judges</i>	<i>5,788</i>	<i>6,021</i>	<i>-233</i>	<i>104.0</i>
Professional staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
General Service staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<i>60,172</i>	<i>55,746</i>	<i>4,427</i>	<i>92.6</i>
General temporary assistance	7,865	8,728	-864	111.0
Temporary assistance for meetings	1,151	914	237	79.4
Overtime	390	350	40	89.8
Consultants	393	470	-77	119.6
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<i>9,797</i>	<i>10,462</i>	<i>-664</i>	<i>106.8</i>
Travel	4,844	4,262	582	88.0
Hospitality	58	43	15	74.5
Contractual services	3,790	3,260	530	86.0
Training	945	844	100	89.4
Counsel **	2,711	4,131	-1,420	152.4
General operating expenses	12,122	11,064	1,058	91.3
Supplies and materials	1,236	1,005	231	81.3
Furniture and equipment	790	1,025	-235	129.7
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<i>26,496</i>	<i>25,634</i>	<i>862</i>	<i>96.7</i>
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>102,254</b>	<b>97,863</b>	<b>4,391</b>	<b>95.7</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

\*\* A detailed breakdown of the Counsel budget is not available. Overall expenditure for Defence Counsel was €2,896 thousands, and for Counsel for Victims €1,235 thousands.

157. Table 3-2 shows the budget implementation for the Review Conference 2010 by expenditure type. An amount of €400,000 was transferred from general temporary assistance to contractual services, so as to cover the cost of staff resources, which were deployed by the UNON after being originally budgeted under GTA.

**Table 3-2: Budget Implementation 2010 by Expenditure Type (€000)**

Item	Approved Budget 2010	Expenditure*	Variance	Implementation rate in %
Judges				
Judges' Travel				
<i>Salaries &amp; allowances of Judges</i>				
Professional staff				
General Service staff				
<i>Subtotal staff</i>				
General temporary assistance	670.2	141.5	528.7	21.1
Temporary assistance for meetings		103.6	-103.6	
Overtime	16.6	7.2	9.4	43.4
Consultants		11.0	-11.0	
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	686.8	263.3	423.5	38.3
Travel	253.5	277.4	-23.9	109.4
Hospitality		3.6	-3.6	
Contractual services	341.0	889.6	-548.6	260.9
Training				
Counsel for Defence				
Counsel for Victims				
General operating expenses	76.7	34.5	42.2	45.0
Supplies and materials	11.4	0.1	11.3	0.5
Furniture and equipment				
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	682.6	1,205.2	-522.6	176.6
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>1,369.4</b>	<b>1,468.5</b>	<b>-99.1</b>	<b>107.2</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

158. Table 4-1 provides a summary of budget implementation rates for the Contingency Fund 2010 by major programme. The implementation rate is 62.4 per cent, or a total of €5.1 million against the requested amount of €8.2 million.

**Table 4-1: Budget implementation for the Contingency Fund 2010 by Major Programme (€000)**

Major Programme	Requested Budget 2010	Expenditure*	Variance	Implementation rate in %
Major Programme I				
Judiciary	473	266	207	56.3
Major Programme III				
Registry	7,768	4,878	2,890	62.8
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>8,241</b>	<b>5,144</b>	<b>3,097</b>	<b>62.4</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

159. Table 4-2 provides a summary of budget implementation for the Contingency Fund 2010 by expenditure type.

**Table 4-2: Budget implementation for the Contingency Fund 2010 by expenditure type (€000)**

Item	Requested Budget 2010	Expenditure*	Variance	Implementation Rate in %
<b>Judges</b>				
<b>Judges Travel</b>				
<b>Salaries &amp; allowances of Judges</b>				
<b>Professional staff</b>				
<b>General Service staff</b>				
<b><i>Subtotal staff</i></b>				
General temporary assistance	6,280	2,473	3,807	39.4
Temporary assistance for meetings	256	1,158	-902	453.1
Overtime	32	4	28	11.2
Consultants	95	71	24	74.7
<b><i>Subtotal other staff</i></b>	<b>6,663</b>	<b>3,706</b>	<b>2,957</b>	<b>55.6</b>
Travel	477	389	88	81.5
<b>Hospitality</b>				
Contractual services	339	452	-113	133.4
Training	86		86	
Counsel	94		94	
General operating expenses	195	191	4	97.8
Supplies and materials	42		42	
Furniture and equipment	345	406	-61	117.7
<b><i>Subtotal non-staff</i></b>	<b>1,579</b>	<b>1,438</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>91.1</b>
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>8,241</b>	<b>5,144</b>	<b>3,097</b>	<b>62.4</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

160. Table 5 provides a summary of staffing per major programmes. As at 31 December 2010, a total of 696 posts or 91.2 per cent were filled, against the approved total of 763, excluding five elected officials.

**Table 5: Staffing - Approved versus filled posts by post type (P and G staff)\***

	Approved [1]	Filled [2]	Under recruitment [3]	Advertised not under recruitment [4]	Vacant not advertised [5]
Major Programme I	50	45	2	1	2
Major Programme II	215	199	9	0	7
Major Programme III	477	437	27	3	10
Major Programme IV	9	7	0	1	1
Major Programme VI	7	6	1	0	0
Major Programme VII.1	3	2	0	1	0
Major Programme VII.5	2	0	1	0	1
<b>Total ICC</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>696</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>

\* The above table excludes five elected official posts (three in MP II and two in MPIII).

161. Table 6 shows a summary of status of trust funds at year-end 2010.

**Table 6: Status of trust funds 2010**

2010	Trust Funds	Allotment	Total Expenditures*	Variance
T000	General Trust Fund	8,850	8,387	463
T001	Internship and visiting professionals programme	1,697,096	1,100,257	596,839
T202	Legal tools project	204,867	170,944	33,923
T305	Seminar of Counsel	125,250	115,783	9,467
T308	Regional Seminar in Yaoundé (Cameroon)	77,500	40,782	36,718
T401	Least developed countries	218,000	94,504	123,496
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,331,563</b>	<b>1,530,657</b>	<b>800,906</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures which are subject to change.

162. T000 General Trust Fund was used for the Victims and Witnesses Unit to organize a one-day seminar on protection in November 2010.

163. T001 programme is to support interns and visiting professional in Judiciary, Office of the Prosecutor and Registry. This programme runs from April through March for a period of 2 years. Allotment covers two periods: January-March and April-December. The remaining balance will be carried forward to the period of January through March 2011.

164. T202 project is run by the Office of the Prosecutor to facilitate and coordinate the introduction, implementation and use of the Legal Tools project, in particular the Case Matrix, by users outside the Court.

165. T305 seminar is run by the Registry to finance consultations between the Court and the legal profession, represented by the counsel on the Court's list of counsel.

166. T308 programme is run by the Registry to support the organisation of local seminars for significant civil society members and groups (judges, lawyers, politicians, NGOs, etc), to raise awareness and knowledge of the Court around the world. The first seminar took place in Senegal at the end of 2009.

167. T401 programme is run by the Secretariat and covers travel costs related to the participation of representatives of least-developed countries and other developing States at the Assembly. Since this is an ongoing programme, any remaining balance will be carried forward to the following year.

168. In addition, in 2010 the Court received a total amount of €66,077 for the Special Fund for Relocation in cash contributions from three countries. This fund is established to finance relocations of persons at risk to hosting States, and to the extent possible, to finance capacity building in eligible States Parties.

169. The Assembly decided to establish a special fund within the Registry for the purpose of funding family visits for indigent detainees entirely through voluntary donations, with contributions from States Parties, other States, non-governmental organizations, civil society, individuals and other entities.

**Additional information on the budget performance, including Contingency Fund expenditure, for the year 2010.**

170. Table 7-1 provides a summary of budget implementation rates for 2010, including the Contingency Fund expenditure, by major programme and programme. Including the Contingency Fund expenditure for simultaneous trials and the Kenya situation, totalling €1 million, the Court implemented at 100.7 per cent, or a total of €103.0 million.

**Table 7-1: Budget Performance 2010, including Contingency Fund expenditure, by Major Programme and Programme (€000)**

<i>Major Programme and Programme</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Implementation rate incl. Contingency Fund in %</i>
<b>Major Programme I</b>				
Judiciary	<b>10,719</b>	<b>10,853</b>	<b>-134</b>	<b>101.2</b>
Presidency	2,318	2,387	-69	103.0
Chambers	7,758	8,174	-416	105.4
Liaison Offices	643	292	351	45.4
<b>Major Programme II</b>				
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>	<b>26,828</b>	<b>25,259</b>	<b>1,569</b>	<b>94.2</b>
Prosecutor	6,414	5,926	488	92.4
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division	2,214	2,128	86	96.1
Investigation Division	13,086	11,676	1,410	89.2
Prosecution Division	5,114	5,529	-415	108.1
<b>Major Programme III</b>				
Registry	<b>59,541</b>	<b>63,212</b>	<b>-3,671</b>	<b>106.2</b>
Office of the Registrar	17,206	18,207	-1,001	105.8
Common Administrative Services Division	20,784	20,926	-142	100.7
Division of Court Services	18,276	20,587	-2,311	112.6
Public Information & Documentation Section	3,276	3,492	-217	106.6
<b>Major Programme IV</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>2,271</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>75.2</b>
<b>Major Programme VI</b>				
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>	<b>1,218</b>	<b>910</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>74.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>				
<b>Project Director's Office</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>67.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>				
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>31.4</b>
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>102,254</b>	<b>103,008</b>	<b>-754</b>	<b>100.7</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures, which are subject to change. The appropriation and actual expenditure figures in Major Programme III relating to the Office of the Registrar and Division of Court services have been restated to reflect the restructuring of the Victims Participation and Reparations Section, through which the legal aid activities were moved to Counsel Support Section under the Office of the Registrar. This will facilitate a like-to-like comparison of budget and actual expenditure.

171. Table 7-2 provides a summary of budget implementation rates for 2010, including Contingency Fund expenditure, by major programme and programme. The basic component shows a 94.7 per cent implementation rate, whereas the situation-related element comes out at 106.6 per cent.

**Table 7-2: Budget Performance 2010, including Contingency Fund expenditure, by Basic and Situation-related Expenditure (€000)**

<i>Major Programme and Programme Appropriation</i>	<i>Basic</i>		<i>Implementation rate in %</i>	<i>Situation-related</i>		<i>Implementation incl. Contingency Fund rate in %</i>
	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>		<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure*</i>	
<b>Major Programme I</b>						
Judiciary	<b>10,057</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>99.4</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>853</b>	<b>128.7</b>
Presidency	2,318	2,386	102.9		1	
Chambers	7,096	7,322	103.2	663	852	128.7
Liaison Offices	643	292	45.4			
<b>Major Programme II</b>						
<b>Office of the Prosecutor</b>	<b>5,050</b>	<b>4,834</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>21,778</b>	<b>20,425</b>	<b>93.8</b>
Prosecutor	2,956	2,703	91.4	3,458	3,223	93.2
Jurisdiction, Complementarity & Cooperation Division	903	779	86.3	1,312	1,349	102.9
Investigation Division	410	430	104.9	12,676	11,246	88.7
Prosecution Division	782	922	117.9	4,332	4,607	106.3
<b>Major Programme III</b>						
<b>Registry</b>	<b>30,865</b>	<b>29,754</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>28,676</b>	<b>33,458</b>	<b>116.7</b>
Office of the Registrar	8,004	7,856	98.2	9,203	10,354	112.5
Common Administrative Services Division	14,946	14,632	97.9	5,838	6,290	107.7
Division of Court Services	6,071	5,515	90.8	12,204	15,072	123.5
Public Information & Documentation Section	1,845	1,751	94.9	1,431	1,741	121.7
<b>Major Programme IV</b>						
<b>Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties</b>	<b>3,022</b>	<b>2,271</b>	<b>75.2</b>			
<b>Major Programme VI</b>						
<b>Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>807</b>	<b>626</b>	<b>77.7</b>
<b>Major Programme VII.1</b>						
<b>Project Director's Office</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>67.7</b>			
<b>Major Programme VII.5</b>						
<b>Independent Oversight Mechanism</b>	<b>342</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>31.4</b>			
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>50,331</b>	<b>47,645</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>51,923</b>	<b>55,363</b>	<b>106.6</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures, which are subject to change. The appropriation and actual expenditure figures in Major Programme III relating to the Office of the Registrar and Division of Court services have been restated to reflect the restructuring of the Victims Participation and Reparations Section, through which the legal aid activities were moved to Counsel Support Section under the Office of the Registrar. This will facilitate a like-to-like comparison of budget and actual expenditure.

172. Table 7-3 illustrates the implementation of the 2010 budget performance, including Contingency Fund expenditure, by expenditure type.

**Table 7-3: Budget Implementation 2010, including Contingency Fund expenditure, by Expenditure Type (€000)**

<i>Item</i>	<i>Appropriation</i>	<i>Expenditure *</i>	<i>Variance</i>	<i>Implementation rate incl. Contingency Fund in %</i>
Judges	5,634	5,905	-271	104.8
Judges Travel	154	116	37	75.7
<i>Salaries &amp; allowances of Judges</i>	<i>5,788</i>	<i>6,021</i>	<i>-233</i>	<i>104.0</i>
Professional staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
General Service staff	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
<i>Subtotal staff</i>	<b>60,172</b>	<b>55,746</b>	<b>4,427</b>	<b>92.6</b>
General temporary assistance	7,865	11,201	-3,337	142.4
Temporary assistance for meetings	1,151	2,072	-921	180.0
Overtime	390	354	36	90.7
Consultants	393	541	-148	137.7
<i>Subtotal other staff</i>	<b>9,797</b>	<b>14,167</b>	<b>-4,370</b>	<b>144.6</b>
Travel	4,844	4,651	193	96.0
Hospitality	58	43	15	74.5
Contractual services	3,790	3,712	78	97.9
Training	945	844	100	89.4
Counsel **	2,711	4,131	-1,420	152.4
General operating expenses	12,122	11,255	867	92.8
Supplies and materials	1,236	1,005	231	81.3
Furniture and equipment	790	1,431	-641	181.1
<i>Subtotal non-staff</i>	<b>26,496</b>	<b>27,073</b>	<b>-577</b>	<b>102.2</b>
<b>Total Court</b>	<b>102,254</b>	<b>103,008</b>	<b>-754</b>	<b>100.7</b>

\* Expenditure 2010 is based on preliminary, unaudited figures, which are subject to change.

\*\* A detailed breakdown of the Counsel budget is not available. Overall expenditure for Defence Counsel was €2,896 thousands, and for Counsel for Victims €1,235 thousands.

## Annex I

### Major programme I: Judiciary

#### A. Programme 1100: Presidency

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
			2010	
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A model of international criminal justice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide legal and logistical support to all plenaries of the judges.</li> <li>- Issue high quality decisions on Presidency appeals and adjudications in a timely manner.</li> <li>- Negotiate bilateral enforcement strategies.</li> </ul>		<p>The Presidency provided legal and logistical support to seven meetings of the judges.</p> <p>The Presidency issued 14 judicial and legal decisions, most of which were confidential due to their nature.</p> <p>2 Four enforcement agreements were negotiated and three concluded in 2010.</p>
Constantly increase support for the Court through enhancing communication and mutual understanding with stakeholders, stressing the court's role and its independence (SO 6).	<b>Objective 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well-recognized and adequately supported institution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement external relations strategy.</li> <li>- Host official visits.</li> <li>- Conduct foreign visits.</li> <li>- Hold diplomatic briefings.</li> <li>- Participate in NGO briefings.</li> <li>- Grant interviews and press conferences.</li> </ul>		<p>The Presidency conducted intensive external relations activities throughout the year.</p> <p>50 The President and the Vice-Presidents hosted ca. 115 official visits in total.</p> <p>10 The President and the Vice-Presidents conducted a total of 30 foreign visits.</p> <p>3 The President addressed both diplomatic briefings hosted by the Court in 2010.</p> <p>2 The President addressed both NGO briefings hosted by the Court in 2010.</p> <p>12 + 3 Members of the Presidency gave 19 media interviews and participated in 4 press conferences.</p>
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Model of public administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well-designed, targeted staff training programmes.</li> <li>- Annual meeting with all Court staff.</li> <li>- Court-wide communications from the President.</li> </ul>		<p>Several staff members attended language training. Specialised training for Presidency staff was postponed to early 2011.</p> <p>1 The President addressed a meeting of all staff on 30 June 2010.</p> <p>3 The President sent 4 communications to all staff.</p>

## B. Programme 1200: Chambers

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
			2010	
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A model of international criminal justice.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staffing in Chambers recruited.</li> </ul>	100% With the use of effective administrative approaches, such as the use of rosters and GTA contracts, delays in recruitment were significantly reduced and staffing levels remained responsive to the fluctuation of workload in Chambers throughout 2010.
	<b>Objective 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Model of public administration.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Find a new structure for Chambers.</li> </ul>	Areas requiring changes to the staffing structure and working methods of Chambers were identified in 2009 and the matter remained under further consideration in 2010.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Chambers structure implemented, including more teamwork for legal officers, to enhance flexibility within divisions.</li> </ul>	100%	Implementation of changes to the Chambers staffing structure and working methods began in 2010, increasing efficiency, teamwork and flexibility.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training for legal officers and research assistants.</li> </ul>		Chambers conducted 8 days of substantive legal training in 2010. Chambers staff also attended language training.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Procedures implemented to streamline process of cataloguing decisions and research documents.</li> </ul>		Databases and indexes of jurisprudence that facilitate research were developed by Chambers. In addition, discussions were initiated about a possible Court-wide collection and indexing of all decisions.

### C. Programme 1300: Liaison Offices

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
			2010	
Constantly increase support for the Court through enhancing communication and mutual understanding with stakeholders, stressing the court's role and its independence (SO 6).	<b>Objectives 1 and 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Well-recognized and adequately supported institution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pursue all requests of the Court for cooperation with relevant interlocutors at United Nations Headquarters until completion of requests.</li> </ul>	The New York Liaison Office pursued to completion two requests for conclusion of agreements in specific areas of cooperation and several requests for information from the Court as well as from the UN.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hold briefings for States in New York.</li> </ul>	3	The NY Liaison Office provided support to 6 briefings by Court principals or senior officials to States in New York, as well as to one briefing by ASP leadership. Head of the Liaison Office gave two briefings to NGOs and one to the Friends of the ICC.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide support to visiting Court officials.</li> </ul>	6 – 10 visits	The NY Liaison Office provided support to 12 high-level visits by Court officials and 2 visits by the Secretariat of the Assembly.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor and participate in relevant United Nations meetings, follow up on items bilaterally and provide weekly reports to the Court.</li> </ul>		The NY Liaison Office monitored all relevant UN meetings and the Head of the Liaison Office held numerous bilateral meetings to follow up on pertinent issues. The Liaison Office reported regularly to the Court on relevant developments.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Participate and intervene in seminars and discussions on Court-related subjects.</li> </ul>		The Head of the NY Liaison Office participated frequently in seminars, roundtable discussions and other events on relevant topics organised by the UN, States, NGOs or other actors.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide logistical support to the Assembly, its Bureau and the New York Working Group.</li> </ul>		The NY Liaison Office provided logistical support to two sessions of the Assembly, and substantive support to 19 meetings of the Bureau and 16 meetings of the New York Working Group. The substantive support included taking notes and preparing summaries of the meetings. Logistical support involved preparation, distribution, as well as transportation and storage of documents and publications.

## Annex II

### Major programme II: Office of the Prosecutor

#### A. Programme 2100 – The Prosecutor (incl. LAS and Services Section)

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	
			2010	<i>Achievements</i>
Develop policies for implementing the quality standards specified in the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence with respect to all participants in proceedings and persons otherwise affected by the Court's activities, in a manner that is respectful of diversity (SO 3).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Further development of the Operations Manual finalized and implemented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actual proportion of planned protocols/standard operating procedures (SOPs) developed and implemented.</li> </ul>	100%	<p>All developments were progressed in accordance with plans.</p> <p>The Operations Manual review widened the scope of the manual to support and administrative activities of the Office.</p>
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delivery of at least the level of service indicated in the service-level agreements (SLAs) relevant to the units.</li> <li>- All OTP-specific language, administrative, budgetary and technical development and improvement objectives for 2010 implemented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actual service standards compared to published service standards.</li> <li>- Actual proportion of improvements/developments implemented.</li> </ul>	100% > SLA	<p>All service levels were maintained at 2009 or higher levels.</p> <p>No operations were delayed as result of service delays.</p> <p>All objectives were implemented as planned and on time.</p>

## B. Programme 2200: Jurisdiction, Complementarity and Cooperation Division

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>		<i>Achievements</i>
			<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received (SO 1).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All requested and periodic analytical reports on situations of interest or admissibility or interests of justice for situations under investigation delivered on time and substantiated by the Executive Committee.</li> <li>- Efficient and compliant requests for assistance.</li> <li>- Expand range of providers of information and other support (through general and situation-specific agreements) including assistance for investigative/trial purposes.</li> <li>- Conclusion of expected 2010 cooperation agreements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Actual percentage of reports delivered on time and substantiated by the Executive Committee.</li> <li>- Proportion of requests that are not timely or where conformity issues identified; rate of compliance</li> <li>- Range available in 2010 vs. range in 2009.</li> <li>- Proportion of expected cooperation agreements established.</li> </ul>	100%	< 5%      1%	All reports delivered on time and substantiated.
Develop mechanisms to provide for all necessary cooperation, in particular the arrest and surrender of persons, witness protection and the enforcement of sentences (SO5).	<b>Objective 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adequate progress made in the implementation of cooperation and arrest strategies developed for each situation.</li> </ul>	- Actual implementation vs. planned implementation.	> 10% increase	11% increase (range of information providers expanded in furtherance of requirements in the context of additional situations under investigation and preliminary examination).	No OTP-specific agreements were sought and/or required for the period 2010 other than ad hoc arrangements concluded for individual requests for assistance, which were all concluded satisfactorily. JCCD also contributed 100% to court wide planned cooperation agreements, which are still in progress.
Constantly increase support for the Court through enhancing communication and mutual understanding with stakeholders, stressing the court's role and its independence (SO 6).	<b>Objective 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At least 85% implementation of annual objectives contained within cooperation and external relations strategies directly involving OTP.</li> </ul>	- Actual implementation rate of annual objectives.	> 85%	95%	JCCD has increased its interaction with its stakeholders resulting in increased support for the Court in general and the Office of the Prosecutor in particular.

### C. Programme 2300: Investigation Division

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received (SO 1).	<p><b>Objective 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collection and analysis objectives set out in the joint team investigation plan reached for the five investigations and preliminary examinations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planned collection vs. actual collection.</li> </ul>	0% deviation assuming no unforeseen events	In 2010 the Investigations Division advanced five active investigations and met all deadlines with respect to these investigations. Three of the five resulted in applications to the Pre-Trial Chamber for arrest warrants or summonses. In addition, ID supported three cases in trial and three cases where the Accused are at large.
Maintain and further develop the system to address all security risks, striving for maximum security of all participants and staff consistent with the Rome Statute (SO 2).	<p><b>Objective 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement the strategy on victims in relation to investigations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Half-yearly survey of satisfaction with analytical products (joint team, trial team and Executive Committee).</li> <li>- Level of implementation of strategy according to plan.</li> </ul>	> 90% satisfaction 0% deviation assuming no unforeseen events	The development of products, collection & analysis of evidence, and support to trials provided to the Prosecution Division were considered satisfactory and within target.  All victims strategy objectives implemented (0% deviation).

### D. Programme 2400: Prosecution Division

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received (SO 1).	<p><b>Objective 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High-quality and compact applications delivered within the stipulated timeframes (on time and approved by peer review/ Deputy Prosecutor).</li> <li>- Efficient presentation of evidence before the Pre-Trial and Trial Chambers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proportion of draft submissions approved by a peer review board and delivered on time.</li> <li>- Proportion of bi-monthly reviews of case progress and updates to case-approach approved by the Prosecutor and Deputy Prosecutor.</li> </ul>	100%	All draft submissions were approved and delivered on time. Increased standardisation facilitated reviews and reduced revisions.  All reviews were approved by the Prosecutor. Increased standardisation facilitated reviews.

## Annex III

### Major programme III: Registry

#### A. Programme 3100: Office of the Registrar

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>		<i>Achievements</i>
			<i>2010</i>	<i>2011</i>	
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received (SO 1).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Support of investigations and trials delivered in keeping with the statutory framework.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Regular assessments with stakeholders conducted as foreseen in the bi-annual plan.</li></ul>		100%	
Maintain and further develop the system to address all security risks, striving for maximum security of all participants and staff consistent with the Rome Statute (SO 2).	<b>Objective 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Maintenance of a secure and safe environment at the seat of the Court.</li><li>- Field security management system in accordance with UN/international standards.</li><li>- Controlled and consistent information security management process.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Screening of all persons and items entering the Court's premises.</li><li>- Response by a security officer to all emergencies within two minutes.</li><li>- Compliance with UN Field Security training programmes (both basic and advanced).</li><li>- Compliance with Minimum Operating Security Standards (MOSS) and Minimum Operating Residential Security Standards (MORSS).</li><li>- Conduct of Network penetration test and decrease in level of vulnerability.</li><li>- Increased maturity score during periodic ISO 27001 assessment.</li></ul>	100%	100%	
			100%	100%	97 % for all persons travelling to the field.
			100%	85 – 94 % depending on the location.	Network test was conducted and reported. Recommendations are integrated in ICTS projects and programs. The 2010 risk assessment was not conducted to prevent duplication: Contractor Deloitte & Touche reported in 2010 on an ICT risk assessment and Contractor ACT Management reported on the issues with eCourt systems.
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received (SO 1).  Develop policies for implementing the quality standards specified in the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence with respect to all participants in proceedings and persons otherwise affected by the Court's activities, in a manner that is respectful of diversity (SO 3).	<b>Objectives 1 and 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Protection of the Court's legal interests.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Number of framework agreements concluded in support of the Court's operations.</li><li>- Number of cases resolved satisfactorily.</li></ul>	10	8	
			50	23	

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>		<i>Achievements</i>
			2010		
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reduced financial and management risks.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Percentage of issues identified by internal audit addressed by action plans.</li><li>- Delivery of independent, assurance-based performance audits, objective information and advice.</li></ul>	100%	43%	

## B. Programme 3200: Common Administrative Services Division

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Implement integrated management information systems with 100% use of Business intelligence (BI).</li><li>- Implement efficiency savings measures.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Number of information system modules available.</li><li>- Number of available BI reports.</li></ul>	50 20	40  9 - Efficiency savings measures implemented include the flexible use of existing resources (reassignments and redeployments). Other efforts include review and standardization of procedures and services.
Submit sound, accurate and transparent budget proposals necessitating only minor adjustments to the proposed amount and distribution of resources by the Assembly (SO 9).	<b>Objective 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Submit sound, accurate and transparent budget proposals.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Adjustment to the proposed amount and distribution of resources.</li></ul>	Maximum of 5% reduction or redistribution.	The reduction or redistribution of the Court's budget proposal by the CBF and the ASP were within the target 2010.
Attract, care for, and offer career development and advancement opportunities to a diverse staff of the highest quality (SO 10).	<b>Objective 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Implement strategy for advancement opportunities.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Number of 2010 objectives implemented with no budgetary implications.</li><li>- Number of 2010 objectives implemented with budgetary implications.</li></ul>	80% of all objectives. 20% of all objectives.	Strategic Learning Plans were developed and implemented across the Court; a Leadership Development Programme was started; new human resources related policies adopted and the conditions of service for internationally-recruited professional field staff were improved.

## C. Programme 3300: Division of Court Services

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Conduct 4 to 5 new investigations into cases, within existing or new situations, and at least 4 trials, subject to external cooperation received. (SO 1)	<b>Objective 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Support to Court sessions in accordance with the Regulations of the Court and the Regulations of the Registry. Support of 200 court days for 2009.</li><li>- Efficient and effective services to requesting parties and to Chambers.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Number of trial days successfully completed.</li><li>- Requests responded to within a week.</li></ul>	100%		Support provided successfully by CMS. 100% support.

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Maintain and further develop the system to address all security risks, striving for maximum security of all participants and staff consistent with the Rome Statute (SO 2).	<b>Objective 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Efficient and effective support, protection and operational/logistical services to victims, witnesses and others at risk, regardless of location, subject to assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of successfully protected witnesses and victims.</li> </ul>	100% 100% successful implementation of procedural protective measures.
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<b>Objective 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terminological accuracy and consistency in translated texts and interpreted events in all used languages.</li> <li>- Comprehensive and resource-effective use of all translation services.</li> <li>- Adequate number of staff and freelance interpreters and field interpreters available for assignments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of searches performed in language tools per month by active users.</li> <li>- Number of duplicated requests in the workflow.</li> <li>- Number of fulfilled interpretation and field interpretation requests.</li> </ul>	200 (minimum) Some 400 searches performed per month per user. 0% 82 requests cancelled due to duplication. 90% Interpretation had 169 fulfilled interpretation requests.

## D. Programme 3400: Public Information and Documentation Section

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Further cultivate a level of awareness and understanding of the Court appropriate to the stage of the Court's activities in affected communities (SO 4).	<b>Objective 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased awareness and understanding at grass-roots level of Courts activities.</li> <li>- Increased applications by victims to participate in proceedings</li> <li>- Realistic expectations about the scope of the work of the Court.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of interactive sessions conducted.</li> <li>- Estimated population reached via radio and television.</li> <li>- Proportion of properly completed victim applications submitted.</li> <li>- Number of publications distributed.</li> </ul>	50 per situation 80% of affected communities per situation. 75% 20,000 per situation. UG: 136 DRC: 221 SUD: 70 CAR: 96 UG : 8.5 million DRC : 25 million SUD : 10 million CAR : 1 million  66% of applications evaluated were properly completed.  UG: 21,489 <sup>1</sup> DRC: 23,206 <sup>2</sup> SUD: 8,446 <sup>3</sup> CAR: 3,647 <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Of the total texts distributed in Uganda, 17,645 were information kits and 3,844 ICC legal compendia.

<sup>2</sup> Of the total texts distributed in the DRC, 15,320 were information kits and 7,886 legal compendia.

<sup>3</sup> Of the total texts distributed in connection with the situation in Darfur, Sudan, 8,147 were information kits and 319 legal compendia.

<sup>4</sup> Of the total texts distributed in the CAR, 3,488 were information kits and 159, 319 legal compendia.

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Ensure publicity of all proceedings for local and global audiences (SO 7).	<b>Objective 2</b>			
	- Increased access to Court judicial proceedings.	In countries concerned: - Number of hours of radio broadcast of audio summaries.	40 hours	UG: N/A <sup>5</sup> DRC: 49 hours SUD: N/A <sup>6</sup> CAR: 67 hours
		- Number of hours of TV broadcast of video summaries.	50 hours	UG: N/A DRC: 48.53 hours SUD: N/A CAR: 61.38 hours
		- Number of projections of video summaries.	50	UG: N/A DRC: 73 SUD: 19 CAR : 83
		- Number of participants reached directly at interactive sessions.	20% more than in 2009 per situation	UG : 23,100 (11% +) DRC : 21,122 (9% +) SUD : 1.899 (66% +) CAR : 6.836 (32% +)
		- Number of viewing sites operating.	2	N/A sites are linked to projections of video summaries (see above).
		- Number of raw-cut videos used by media.	60	70
		- Increased number of visitors to the Court's website video-streaming service.	15%	113,233 (95,000 in 2009)
		- Number of visitors attending hearings/briefings at the seat of the Court.	10% more compared to 2009	10,302 (6,276 in 2009)
		- Increased number of interviews given to the media.	100	UG: 65 (67 in 2009) DRC: 841 (1,001 in 2009) SUD: 49 (3 in 2009) CAR: 305 (273 in 2009) HQ: 1,339 (415 in 2009)

<sup>5</sup> Uganda did not broadcast ICC audio summaries of trial or pre-trial proceedings related to the cases in other situations. However, there were 168 hours of locally produced ICC radio programmes aired in 2010.

<sup>6</sup> The ICC does not have paid agreements with radio stations broadcasting audio and television summaries of programmes produced by the Court. Nevertheless, it is estimated that radio stations and websites of partners broadcasted in 2010 the following productions prepared at Headquarters: Al Bashir case – Appeals judgment – summary in English, French and Arabic for radio and television (“In the courtroom” programme and AV summary); “Adam will not attend school on Saturday” – in Fur (2 discs), Zagawa, Masalit and Arabic; summary of the situation and cases in Darfur (Sudan) – English and Arabic versions (for the refugee camps in Chad)- Outreach; 21 programmes for radio – Ask the Court in Arabic and summaries of the proceedings in the case of Abu Garda.

## E. Programme 3500: Division of Victims and Counsel

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
Develop policies for implementing the quality standards specified in the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence with respect to all participants in proceedings and persons otherwise affected by the Court's activities, in a manner that is respectful of diversity (SO 3).	<b>Objective 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of legal representations and/or advice for the purpose of proceedings before the Court.</li> <li>- Preparation of suitable material for legal representatives' teams or for defence teams.</li> <li>- Compliance to strict confidentiality by all staff members of the units within the programme.</li> <li>- Availability of transparent criteria for providing legal support to legal teams.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Number of appointments of legal representatives.</li> <li>- Number of reports and documents filed before the Chambers.</li> <li>- Number of incidents of improper handling of confidential information.</li> <li>- Number of justified claims in relation to breach of confidentiality.</li> </ul>	<p>30 CSS: 9 VPRS: 2 up to 28/02/2010</p> <p>150 CSS: 91 VPRS: 77</p> <p>None CSS: None VPRS: 2 (1 from a legal representative, 1 for loss of DHL mail).</p> <p>None CSS: None VPRS: 1 (by a legal representative).</p>
Cultivate a level of awareness and understanding of the Court appropriate to the stage of the Court's activities in affected communities (SO 6).	<b>Objective 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suspects, accused persons, and victims' communities made aware of their rights relating to fair trial, participation and reparations.</li> <li>- Effective system for legal assistance paid by the Court.</li> <li>- Effective system to process applications from victims.</li> <li>- Training of legal professionals and lawyers in targeted countries on proceedings before the Court.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Percentage of applications from victims using the standard application forms.</li> <li>- Percentage of suspect and accused persons using the relevant application forms for legal assistance paid by the Court.</li> <li>- Number of intermediaries.</li> <li>- Number of requests for legal assistance paid by the Court.</li> <li>- Percentage of payment for legal assistance made within one month.</li> <li>- Percentage of applications from victims registered and acknowledged within seven days of receipt.</li> <li>- Percentage of applications from victims entered into the database within 30 days of receipt.</li> <li>- Number of lawyers trained per annum.</li> <li>- Number of international associations receiving briefings from Court representatives per annum.</li> </ul>	<p>&gt;95% 100%</p> <p>&gt;75% 100%</p> <p>10 80</p> <p>CSS: 12 VPRS: 8 victims applied for legal aid (up to 28/02/2010).</p> <p>95% 100%</p> <p>95% 80% forms are acknowledged from the Court HQ only where a legal representative is representing the interest of the applicants.</p> <p>95% 80%</p> <p>&gt;40 150 (seminar)</p> <p>&gt;5 19</p>

## Annex IV

### Major programme IV: Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
			2010	
Organize quality conferences, in particular the eighth resumed and ninth sessions of the Assembly in New York, as well as two sessions of the Committee on Budget and Finance in The Hague. In addition, the Secretariat serviced meetings of a number of subsidiary bodies of the Assembly, in particular the Oversight Committee for the Permanent Premises and The Hague Working Group.	- Conferences and sessions held as planned.	- Meetings run smoothly, end on time and adopt reports. - All agenda items are considered. - Participants are supported substantively and logically at meetings, including with registration, provision of documentation and language services. - Session participants are satisfied with the arrangements and information provided.	n/a	High-quality conference and meeting services were provided to the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies. All pre-session documents, in-session and post-session documents were edited, translated and made available to States in a timely manner, despite delays in receipt of some documents. Positive feedback from participants was received.
Enable the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies to carry out their mandates more effectively by providing quality servicing and support, such as planning and coordinating conference services; preparing, coordinating and submitting documentation; monitoring the compliance of various organs of the Court with regulations governing the timely preparation and submission of documents; identifying and acquiring additional resources to enable the Secretariat to carry out its mandate effectively and efficiently; and ensuring that States Parties have access to conference and documentation services in accordance with the Statute.	- Quality edited and translated documents released for processing, production and distribution in a timely manner.	- States and CBF members are provided and satisfied with quality conference services and with the editing, translation and timely issuance of documents, in the official languages, as appropriate, which fully support them in their functions. - States and CBF members are assisted as required, in particular with the provision of information and documentation regarding the Assembly and Court.	n/a	For the fourteenth and fifteenth sessions of the Committee on Budget and Finance, the Secretariat processed the pre-session, in-session and post-session documents <sup>1</sup> set out in the table below (1,782 pages). For the resumed eighth and the ninth sessions of the Assembly, the Secretariat processed the pre-session, in-session and post-session documents <sup>2</sup> set out in the table below (6,496 pages). All available information and documentation requested regarding the work of the Assembly and the Court were provided upon request. States and CBF members were thus facilitated in fulfilling their role. Positive feedback from participants was received.
Research and prepare analytical studies on the application and interpretation of the provisions of the Statute relating to the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies.	- Quality legal advice provided to the Assembly and its subsidiary bodies.		n/a	

<sup>1</sup> In three official languages.

<sup>2</sup> In six official languages.

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
			2010	
Enable effective dissemination of documentation and information to States Parties and other interested organizations via, inter alia, the Internet.	- Effective dissemination of documentation and information to States Parties via, inter alia, the Internet.	- Session participants are satisfied with the arrangements and information provided. - Information and documentation can be accessed without delays.	n/a	All official documents and useful information were uploaded to the website. In addition, extranet is available for use at all times for ASP and CBF members.  The Secretariat distributed to the delegations at the ninth session of the Assembly USB flash drives that contained the majority of available pre-session documents, reducing the 11,000 pages of printed documents normally distributed. The Secretariat will continue to adopt all measures and ways to achieve efficiency in documentation.  Positive feedback from participants was received.
<i>Review Conference</i>				
Organize the Review Conference in Kampala, a venue far from the regular Assembly sessions, and provide it with quality servicing and support, such as planning and coordinating conference services; preparing, coordinating and submitting documentation.	- Review Conference held as planned.	- The Conference and meetings of its subsidiary bodies run smoothly, end on time and adopt reports.  - Panel discussions run smoothly and on time. Panellists and facilitators receive substantive and logistical support.  - All Review Conference agenda items are considered.  - Participants are supported substantively and logically at meetings, including with registration, provision of documentation and language services.  - Participants are satisfied with the arrangements and information provided.	n/a	
Organize four panel discussions, held over two days.				
Identifying and acquiring additional resources to enable the Secretariat to carry out its mandate effectively and efficiently; and ensuring that States Parties have access to conference and documentation services in accordance with the Statute.				
The Secretariat was also involved in facilitating preparatory work for the Review Conference during the first semester of 2010.				
	- Quality edited and translated documents released for processing, production and distribution in a timely manner.	- States are provided and satisfied with quality conference services and with the editing, translation and timely issuance of documents, in the six official languages, which fully support them in their functions.	n/a	For the Review Conference, the Secretariat processed the pre-session, in-session and post-session documents <sup>3</sup> set out in the table below (2,539 pages).

<sup>3</sup> In six official languages.

**Number of documents and pages, produced in 2010**

	<i>English</i>		<i>French</i>		<i>Spanish</i>		<i>Arabic</i>		<i>Chinese</i>		<i>Russian</i>		<i>Total</i>
	<i>Documents</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>Pages</i>										
CBF													
14 <sup>th</sup> session	36	333	25	263	23	248	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>84</b>
15 <sup>th</sup> session	62	473	33	312	19	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>114</b>
<i>CBF total</i>	<b>98</b>	<b>806</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>198</b>
<i>ASP Resumed 8<sup>th</sup> session:</i>													
Pre-session documentation	9	82	9	82	9	82	9	82	4	49	4	49	<b>44</b>
In-session documentation	20	92	19	72	19	72	19	72	3	17	3	17	<b>83</b>
Post-session documentation	2	111	1	67	1	67	1	67	1	67	1	67	<b>7</b>
<i>ASP Resumed 8<sup>th</sup> session: total</i>	<b>31</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>134</b>
<i>Review Conference:</i>													
Pre-session documentation	13	75	12	72	12	72	8	32	7	28	7	28	<b>59</b>
In-session documentation	55	593	31	209	28	153	28	153	22	127	22	127	<b>186</b>
Post-session documentation	2	200	1	134	1	134	1	134	1	134	1	134	<b>7</b>
<i>Review Conference: total</i>	<b>70</b>	<b>868</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>359</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>252</b>
<i>ASP 9<sup>th</sup> session:</i>													
Pre-session documentation	40	781	40	781	38	770	38	770	3	15	3	15	<b>162</b>
In-session documentation	21	140	17	96	13	74	13	74	9	42	9	42	<b>82</b>
Post-session documentation	3	427	2	385	2	385	2	385	1	50	1	50	<b>11</b>
<i>ASP 9<sup>th</sup> session: total</i>	<b>64</b>	<b>1348</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>1262</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1229</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>1229</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>2010 total</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>3307</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>2473</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>2210</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>1769</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>529</b>	<b>839</b>
													<b>10817</b>

## Annex V

### Major programme VI: Secretariat of the Trust Fund for Victims

Objectives	Expected results	Performance indicators	Target 2010	Achievements
Develop policies for implementing the quality standards specified in the Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence with respect to all participants in proceedings and persons otherwise affected by the Court's activities, in a manner that is respectful of diversity (SO 3).	<p><b>Objective 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reparations paid to victims, their families, and victims' communities, when ordered by Chambers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Basic mechanism in place for timely payment, control and reporting on reparation payments based on the implementation of rehabilitation assistance.</li> </ul>	85% implementation rate	<p>In the absence of a Court order for reparations in 2010, no implementation took place. TFV autumn 2010 report anticipates the parameters of reparations based also on the implementation of rehabilitation assistance.</p>
Constantly increase support for the Court through enhancing communication and mutual understanding with stakeholders, stressing the Court's role and its independence (SO 6).	<p><b>Objective 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved communications to the Board of Directors, States Parties, senior management and other stakeholders.</li> <li>- Broader understanding of the role of the TFV, its Board of Directors and the Secretariat of the Trust Fund and its activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Positive feedback received from external stakeholders and staff on quality of communications.</li> <li>- Increased use of communication materials by partner organizations, intermediaries and other stakeholders, and increased visits to the Funds website.</li> </ul>	<p>Timely reports and analysis available to external stakeholders and staff.</p> <p>&gt; 10% increase in number of visitors by the end of the year to the Fund's website.</p>	<p>Reporting has been timely; TFV programme progress reports have become more comprehensive, resulting in positive feedback from internal and external audiences.</p> <p>Considering means available, TFV communications have positively contributed to the wider understanding of the role and mandates of the TFV. Two TFV Programme Progress Reports were published in 2010 and disseminated widely. TFV website has been linked to ICC website. Visitor count: steady rise, 240% improvement Feb-Dec 2010.</p>
Become a non-bureaucratic administration focused on results rather than processes, relying on rules where necessary to guarantee rights or minimize risks (SO 8).	<p><b>Objective 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Efficient administrative structure and operations in place in conformity with applicable regulations and rules.</li> <li>- Smooth transition to the new SAP Grants Management System.</li> <li>- Enhanced effectiveness of functions, including grants management, Chamber notifications, and tendering.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Satisfactory report from the External Auditor and Internal Auditor concerning the Secretariat's control and management practices.</li> <li>- Full documentation of new procedures.</li> <li>- Significant reduction of processing times compared to the previous year.</li> </ul>	<p>No remarks from the External Auditor or the Internal Auditor concerning the Secretariat's control and management practices.</p> <p>Significant progress made in the implementation of the required changes to the SAP system; basic financial reporting system in place.</p> <p>&gt; 25% reduction.</p>	<p>Satisfactory audit reports received and recommendations implemented.</p> <p>Progress has been made notwithstanding severe delays. Planned date for go-live deferred from 1 January to 1 April 2011.</p> <p>All TFV projects were managed through the ICC's Procurement Review Committee (PRC) and contracts were reviewed by LASS. TFV project reporting processes were also reviewed and strengthened.</p>

## Annex VI

### Major programme VII-1: project Office for the Permanent Premises

<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Performance indicators</i>	<i>Target 2010</i>	<i>Achievements</i>
The objective of the Project Director's Office (PDO) is to provide the Court with the necessary permanent premises.	- To provide the Court with the necessary permanent premises to meet the organization's strategic goals and objectives.	- Project performs in line with agreed budget. - Preliminary design of the permanent premises finalised.	100% 100%	The project in 2010 has been performing within the agreed budget The preliminary design has been finalised and approved.

## Annex VII

### Realization of assumptions 2005-2010

<i>Financial year</i>	<i>Approved budget (in million euros)</i>	<i>Budget performance (in %)</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Realization of assumptions</i>
2005	66.9	92.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor eight situations</li> <li>- Two situations in the pre-trial, trial and appeals phase.</li> <li>- Two situations in the investigation phase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitored/analysed eight situations.</li> <li>- Pre-trial proceedings and interlocutory appeals in three situations.</li> <li>- Three situations in the investigation phase – Uganda, DRC I and Darfur (following referral from UNSC).</li> </ul>
2006	80.4	80.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor up to eight situations.</li> <li>- Opening of fourth investigation.</li> <li>- Start of two trials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitored/analysed five situations.</li> <li>- Opening of fourth investigation – DRC II.</li> <li>- Pre-trial proceedings and interlocutory appeals in the case of Lubanga Dyilo (DRC I).</li> <li>- Pre-trial proceedings in the other three investigations.</li> </ul>
2007	88.9	87.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor at least five situations</li> <li>- No opening of investigations into new situations.</li> <li>- Within the four situations, investigation of at least six cases, including the two cases in which arrest warrants have been issued.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Five situations under preliminary/advanced analysis.</li> <li>- One new investigation into a new situation opened (CAR).</li> <li>- Seven cases within four situations under investigation (DRC I, DRC II, Darfur I, Darfur II, Uganda, CAR).</li> <li>- Continuation of pre-trial proceedings (Confirmation of charges hearing) in the case of Lubanga Dyilo (DRC I).</li> </ul>
2008	90.4	92.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitor at least five situations.</li> <li>- No opening of investigations into new situations.</li> <li>- In four situations, pursue investigative steps, in a total of at least five cases, including the three cases in which arrest warrants have been issued.</li> <li>- At least one trial.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Six situations under preliminary/advanced analysis.</li> <li>- No new situations opened.</li> <li>- Seven cases within four situations under investigation (Uganda, DRC I, II, Darfur I, II, III, CAR).</li> <li>- Lubanga Dyilo case before the Trial Chamber; proceedings stayed (DRC I).</li> <li>- Pre-trial proceedings (Confirmation of charges hearing) in case of Katanga and Ngudjolo Chui (DRC II).</li> <li>- Pre-trial hearings (status conferences) in case of Bemba (CAR).</li> </ul>

<i>Financial year</i>	<i>Approved budget (in million euros)</i>	<i>Budget performance (in %)</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Realization of assumptions</i>
2009	101.2	92.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Five investigations in three existing situations.</li> <li>- No opening of investigations into new situations.</li> <li>- Analysis of up to eight other situations.</li> <li>- Two trials. Not envisioned to start third trial in 2009.</li> <li>- Consecutive trials.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Five active investigations conducted: DRC II (Katanga/Ngudjolo), DRC III (Kivus), CAR (Bemba), Darfur II (Al Bashir) and III (Haskanita).</li> <li>- One request for Judges' authorization to open an investigation in Kenya (<i>proprio motu</i>).</li> <li>- Situations under preliminary examination, including Kenya, Colombia, Afghanistan, Georgia, Guinea, Cote d'Ivoire and Palestine, have been made public. In order to increase impact, the OTP has systematized publicity of its monitoring activities.</li> <li>- Two trials: Lubanga case, OTP presentation completed; Katanga/Ngudjolo case, OTP presentation commenced.</li> <li>- Two confirmation of charges proceedings completed: Bemba Case and Abu Garda Case.</li> </ul>
2010	103.6	100.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Five active investigations in three situations currently before the Court.</li> <li>- Five residual investigations where either trial proceedings ongoing or where suspects are at large.</li> <li>- No investigations in a new situation.</li> <li>- Analyze up to eight potential situations.</li> <li>- Up to three trials consecutively (parallel hearings over several weeks may occur)</li> </ul>	<p>DRCIII, IV and V (Kivus); Darfur III; and Ken I and II.</p> <p>Residual investigations/witness management in cases where suspects are at large:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Uganda.</li> <li>- Darfur I and II.</li> </ul> <p>Residual investigations in support of cases at trial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DRC I and II.</li> <li>- CAR.</li> <li>- Investigation in the new situation of Kenya authorized by the Pre-trial Chamber on 31 March 2010.</li> <li>- Active investigation of two cases: Ken I and Ken II.</li> <li>- Applications for summons to appear made on 15th December 2010.</li> <li>- Nine situations under preliminary examination (phase 2b), including Afghanistan, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Georgia, Guinea, Honduras, Nigeria, Republic of Korea, and Palestine have been made public</li> <li>- In order to increase impact, the OTP has systematized publicity of its monitoring activities.</li> <li>- Confirmation of charges hearing completed for case of Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain and Saleh Mohammed Jerbo Jamus – decision pending.</li> <li>- Trials continued in Thomas Lubanga Dyilo case and Germain Katanga/Mathieu Ngudjolo Chui cases. Prosecution cases concluded in both.</li> <li>- The trial in the Jean Pierre Bemba Gombo case commenced 22 November 2010.</li> <li>- 4 months of parallel trials.</li> </ul>

## Annex VIII

### Registry: Consolidation of the number of defendants, victims' applications and duration of stay of witnesses

#### Number of indigent defendants and victim applications

	Actuals 2010	2010 budget assumptions	Actuals 2009	2009 budget assumptions	Actuals 2008	2008 budget assumptions	Actuals 2007	2007 budget assumptions
Number of indigent defendants	6	3	4	3	3	1	2	2
Victim applications	2257	no assumption	74	no assumption	66	no assumption	1	no assumption

#### Victim participation applications

	New victim applications for participation in 2010	Total number of applications	New victim applications for participation in 2009	New victim applications for participation in 2008	New victim applications for participation in 2007
Uganda	311	1,012	272	216	108
DRC	47	1,068	331	270	212
Darfur - Sudan	63	204	118	0	18
CAR	1,761	1,928	34	133	0
Kenya	57	54	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,239</b>	<b>4,266</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>338</b>

#### Stay per witness at HQ

	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2010	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2010	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2009	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2009	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2008	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2008	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2007	Budget Max. assumption duration stay per witness at HQ 2007
DRC I	22	10	39	10	0	7	0	7
DRC II	41	10	21	10	0	7	0	7
CAR	19	10	0	10	0	7	0	7