



Assembly of States Parties

Distr.: General
5 December 2025

Original: English

Twenty-fourth session

The Hague, 1-6 December 2025

Report of the Court on Cooperation

I. Introduction

1. The Report of the Court on Cooperation is submitted by the International Criminal Court (“ICC” or “Court”) pursuant to paragraph 43 of resolution ICC-ASP/23/Res.5 (“2024 Resolution on Cooperation”). It covers the period of 16 September 2024 to 15 September 2025, and provides an update on the different cooperation efforts undertaken by the Court with the support of States and other stakeholders during the reporting period, including disaggregated data pertaining to different types of requests for cooperation.¹

2. The report should be read in conjunction with the latest ICC annual report to the United Nations General Assembly, providing, *inter alia*, information on the Court’s recent cooperation with the United Nations (“UN”). The Court also refers to the final report of the Group of Independent Experts dated 30 September 2020,² which touches upon relevant matters for this current report including the relationship between the Court and the UN, cooperation between the Court and international organisations and agencies, assistance in evidence collection, as well as the capacity of the Office of the Prosecutor (“OTP”) and increased inter-organ coordination in the field of financial investigations and the tracking of suspects.

3. Cooperation is a key component in the Rome Statute and in the various Strategic Plans for the period 2023-2025 as well as for 2026-2029. It is directly linked to the Court’s goal to foster political support and develop the modalities of cooperation and operational support for all parties as regards preliminary examinations, investigations, protection of witnesses, implementation of arrest warrants and judicial proceedings. Related Key Performance Indicators (“KPIs”) were and continue to be identified and measured.

4. The Court is undertaking various concrete steps to reinforce its capacity to achieve these goals and taking into account mandate implementation demands. The Court organs are strengthening internal coordination and collaboration in various regards, and renewing organisational structures, where appropriate.

5. The Registry has advanced its goal to ensure a coordinated strategic approach to judicial cooperation and towards facilitating the smooth running of Court proceedings, whether involving the cooperation of States Parties and States not parties to the Rome Statute or from international organisations. In this context, the Registry has been actively engaged in a wide array of judicial cooperation activities, including with respect to the recovery of assets, the execution of arrest and surrender of suspects, authorisation to conduct judicial activities on the territory of States, and support and assistance to defence teams. The Court also sought the engagement of States Parties for the conclusion of cooperation agreements on matters pertaining to release, interim release and relocation of witnesses and the enforcement of sentences. Finally, with a view to enhancing best practices and lessons learned, the Registry and the OTP have jointly taken a number of concrete steps and measures

¹ ICC-ASP/20/25.

² As per the format adopted for the Report on Cooperation submitted in 2021, ICC-ASP/20/16.

together with States Parties and partner organisations to reflect, in a structured and systematic manner, on the experience developed in national systems, the international ad hoc and mixed tribunals, as well as by the Court, on both tracking efforts and operational support for the arrest and surrender of suspects.

6. In this reporting period, the OTP has taken progressive steps to strengthen its cooperation activities and progress in the implementation of relevant strategic objectives in this field. Since the promulgation of its new policy on Complementarity and Cooperation in April 2024, the OTP has renewed its approach through a range of measures and initiatives aimed at positioning itself as a hub for global efforts to deliver justice for international crimes. This has been the first full year of implementation of this policy, as reflected in various activities under the OTP Complementarity and Cooperation Forum, the holding of three sessions of the OTP-CSO Structured Dialogue, the strengthening of support to States through responses to incoming requests for assistance under article 93(10) of the Rome Statute and the implementation of further activities under the framework of cooperation agreements concluded with States.

7. The Court as a whole has continued to rely on cooperation with States Parties, civil society, victims' groups and international and regional organisations as the central tool in the realisation of its mandate. This dialogue, including in the context of the Hague Working Group ("HWG"). To amplify its messaging, the Court used, where appropriate, the booklets and factsheets it has produced over the years, with the financial support from the European Union ("EU"), to disseminate information and promote cooperation in the key areas: cooperation agreements, financial investigations and recovery of assets, arrest and surrender, and the Trust Fund for Family Visits ("TFFV").

8. Using as a compass the seven priority areas for cooperation identified in the flyer produced by the co-facilitators of the working group on cooperation in 2015,³ based on the 66 recommendations on cooperation adopted by States Parties in 2007,⁴ this report (i) provides data on cooperation priority areas two and three⁵; (ii) provides an update on the efforts undertaken by the Court during the reporting period to strengthen cooperation in those areas; (iii) highlights the main challenges identified; and (iv) provides a short update on the five other priority areas⁶ that are not linked to data collection. Finally, the report identifies recommendations for a way forward for the aforementioned cooperation priorities, based on the Court's experience and lessons learned in the more than 20 years of operation.

II. Presentation of the disaggregated data, focusing on cooperation in support of investigative, prosecutorial and judicial activities; as well as arrest and surrender – update on ICC efforts and challenges identified

1. General overview of data collected for requests for cooperation and assistance sent and received by the OTP and the Registry during the reporting period

2.

<i>Office of the Prosecutor</i>	
Total number of Requests for Assistance ("RFAs") sent during the reporting period (16/09/2024 to 15/09/2025)	391 RFAs (including 171 notifications of missions)
Evolution based on the last reporting period (16/09/2023 to 15/09/2024)	- 24.66% (with notifications) and - 33.13% (without notifications)
Average time needed to execute an RFA	68.37 days

³ "Recommendations on States' Cooperation with the International Criminal Court (ICC): Experiences and Priorities", <https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/2022-04/66-Recommendations-Flyer-ENG.pdf>

⁴ Resolution ICC-ASP/6/Res.2, annex II, https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/Resolutions/ICC-ASP-ASP6-Res-02-ENG.pdf.

⁵ Area 2: Cooperation in support of preliminary examinations, investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings (including with the Defence); area 3: Arrest and surrender.

⁶ Area 1: Enacting the legal mechanisms set in the Rome Statute and setting up effective procedures and structures regarding cooperation and judicial assistance; area 4: Identification, seizing and freezing of assets; area 5: Cooperation agreements, area 6: Diplomatic and public support in national, bilateral, regional and international settings; area 7: Inter-State cooperation in the context of the Rome Statute system.

Registry	
Total number of Requests for Cooperation (“RFCs”) sent during the reporting period (16/09/2024 to 15/09/2025))	527 RFCs (including 207 RFCs sent by the relevant sections in HQ, 8 notifications of missions and 312 operational requests sent by the Country Offices) ⁷
Evolution based on the last reporting period (16/09/2023 to 15/09/2024)	- 33.54% for RFCs in total and - 49.76% for RFCs sent by the HQ.
Average time needed for reply to requests sent by the HQ⁸	37 days
% of positive replies to RFCs sent by the HQ during the reporting period	30.43%
Number of notifications of decisions/orders sent during the reporting period	31

3. **Priority area 2: Cooperation in support of preliminary examinations, investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings (including with the Defence)**

Office of the Prosecutor	
Total number of RFAs sent during the reporting period	391 RFAs (including 171 notifications of missions) – <i>same as above since all the OTP RFAs relate to investigations, prosecutions and judicial proceedings</i>
Total number of Requests for Information (“RFIs”) concerning preliminary examinations for the reporting period	31 RFI
% of replies for the RFAs during the reporting period	49.36% (a total of 193 RFAs executed out of the 391, between 16/09/2024 and 15/09/2025) ⁹
Average time needed to execute an RFA	68.37days

⁷ This number does not reflect notifications of judicial documents, missions and efforts deployed concerning the signature of voluntary cooperation agreements.

⁸ The average time (in this table and the following) is calculated on the basis of requests which received a reply – pending requests are excluded from the calculation.

⁹ It is normal that all RFAs sent during a specific time period are not executed during the same time period, given the time needed to receive, process, consult, execute the requests. In addition, the closer to the end of the period it is sent, the least likely an RFA will be executed within the same time period. *The choice was made here to only include the RFAs that were sent AND recorded as executed during the period of reference, i.e. this excludes all those RFAs executed during the period of reference but sent before it and all those sent during the period of reference but executed after it and the RFAs for which the record process is ongoing.*

Registry	
<i>Total number of Requests for Cooperation sent during the reporting period for specific requests</i>	
Number of requests for cooperation	207
Defence teams' requests transmitted by the Registry	16
Legal Representatives for Victims teams' requests transmitted by the Registry	5
Witness protection requests	65
Support to judicial proceedings' requests	32
Average time needed for reply to request from defence teams	37 days

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

9. The Court underlines that cooperation in support of investigative activities and judicial proceedings is vital to the mandate of the Court and requires constant engagement throughout the entirety of ICC procedures. For the OTP, requirements start when investigations are launched, whereas for Registry it typically commences with the issuance of arrest warrants or summonses to appear. The central role of cooperation continues through the Registry's support to the Chamber, legal representatives for victims and defence teams at pre-trial, trial, appeal and reparations stages. Moreover, such cooperation remains the subject of the Court's concerted action even after a case has been terminated, such as for ongoing protection duties and cooperation necessary for the protection of witnesses, for the transfer of the convicted person to the State of enforcement of sentence, or in the event of withdrawal of charges or acquittal, or as part of ongoing support to the Trust Fund for Victims ("TFV").

10. The Court welcomes the initiative of the cooperation co-facilitators in recent years of developing and collecting questionnaires among States Parties regarding their cooperation legislation and modalities, as well as their experiences so far, and of developing a database compiling this information, allowing for further information sharing between States, and between States and the Court, including in the areas of financial investigation, asset recovery and assistance to the Defence. A total of 40 States have replied to the questionnaire, providing information that will be drawn by the Court to enhance cooperation strategies.

11. The Court continues to consult with relevant State authorities and companies to identify suitable procedures that would allow for a diligent execution of its requests.

Initiatives OTP

12. The reporting period reflected a continued and focused implementation of the OTP policy on complementarity and cooperation. OTP has taken concrete steps forward in implementing new ways of partnering with States Parties; non-States Parties; international and regional organisations; civil society, academia, private sector, and other relevant stakeholders to pursue its mandate and enhance its efforts to ensure effective delivery of justice at the ICC, and to contribute to accountability initiatives in other fora including at the domestic level. These combined efforts reflect an attempt to position itself as a hub at the centre of accountability, with national jurisdictions and OTP functioning effectively together through partnership and vigilance.

13. The OTP has continued to enjoy good cooperation from various domestic authorities in the support of its investigation and prosecutions. This cooperation has spanned various forms of assistance, including the facilitation of witness interviews and other evidence gathering activities. In parallel, OTP continues to make progressive efforts with relevant authorities and other stakeholders to render the cooperation more effective, where possible, key forward-looking priority area identified is to ensure effective collaboration with national authorities and private sector partners in order to facilitate access to relevant information and evidence stemming from social media and other communications platforms.

14. OTP has continued to expand activities under the Complementarity and Cooperation Forum, a new, enhanced platform for the two-way sharing of information and experiences between OTP and national authorities, aimed at strengthening collaboration in key thematic

areas. Building on the establishment of the first thematic group in the Forum in 2024 addressing cooperation with immigration authorities, OTP has established two additional groups within the Forum over the last 12 months: the Witness Security Group and the Financial Investigations Group.

15. OTP has welcomed the participation of a wide range of national authorities across these Groups and their contributions on the efforts to deepen constructive dialogue in these thematic areas. Structured exchanges on these platforms have allowed OTP, together with its national counterparts, to reinforce its network of partners for cooperation, develop new tools that have streamlined cooperation working methods, and catalyse the creation of cooperation communities in these new areas. This has in turn had a practical and positive impact of the OTP capacity and ability to collect a wider range of evidence.

16. The OTP intends to extend this model in 2026 to incorporate an additional thematic area in the form of the Gender and Children Group. This will provide a platform for dedicated discussion aimed at supporting the development of a cooperation strategy for the OTP Gender and Children Unit. It will also provide a space in which OTP can share its expertise and provide information to States and other relevant partners regarding ways in which it can support national proceedings through the execution of incoming requests for assistance and the sharing of expertise in relation to specific situations.

17. The OTP-CSO Structured Dialogue framework established under the Policy on Complementarity and Cooperation has been an effective platform. During the reporting period, three sessions were held on 14 November 2024, 28 May and 8 September 2025 respectively, addressing topics including the submission of Article 15 communications to the OTP and Resources and Innovation.

18. A more detailed overview of activities under these two key initiatives will be provided in the OTP Annual Report to be published in December 2025.

19. Additionally, OTP works closely with the other Organs of the Court to actively strengthen ties and deepen partnerships with key institutional partners such as Eurojust, Europol, Interpol, and the United Nations, aiming to streamline operations and processes, as well as to enhance dialogue and cooperation.

20. OTP has taken important steps to reinforce its relationship with Interpol. To this effect, representatives of OTP SALTT and EAU units attended the 92nd Interpol General Assembly held in Glasgow, United Kingdom, with 196 participating member States and Observers. The delegation held fruitful meetings aimed at renewing the ICC-Interpol partnership under the framework of the existing institutional cooperation agreement. From 15-17 September 2025, representative of OTP and Registry jointly participated in a first annual seminar at Interpol to strengthen cooperation and collaboration between the two institutions on areas of common interest. Discussions focused on enhancing joint efforts to track, locate, and apprehend fugitives wanted for core international crimes, and to explore further opportunities for improved information sharing, coordination and operational support.

21. Similarly, OTP has conducted activities aimed at deepening its engagement with Europol in the reporting period. On 9 September 2025, the OTP organised Europol Day at the ICC headquarters, welcoming a range of Europol experts who engage with ICC counterparts on several topics of interest. Building on the establishment of a direct SIENA connection at the Court, this event contributed to enhancing mutual understanding with respect to the activities of Europol on core international crime investigations, and in thematic areas of mutual investigative interests.

22. The OTP has conducted various activities aimed at strengthening its work to harness cooperation mechanisms, such as its engagement in the Joint Investigation Team (“JIT”) under the auspices of Eurojust in relation to the situation in Ukraine, and the Joint Team aimed at supporting investigations into crimes against migrants and refugees in Libya.

23. The JIT enables the Ukraine Unified Team to conduct rapid and real-time coordination and cooperation with a number of domestic authorities under the auspices of Eurojust. Through its participation in the JIT, OTP has engaged in regular coordination meetings to ensure relevant information is shared on a rolling basis as JIT parties and participants progress in their investigation.

24. Since joining a Joint Team Agreement in 2022 with national authorities from Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Spain, supported by Europol, OTP continued its good cooperation with members of the Joint Team on crimes against migrants. Based on the JT's efforts, with the Netherlands in the lead, it is anticipated that a suspect will be extradited from a third country for national trial proceedings in the Netherlands on charges that include extortion, smuggling of migrants and membership in a criminal organisation. OTP continues to inform on the progress of this cooperation as part of its biannual reports to the United Nations Security Council on the situation in Libya.

25. In the fields of forensic science and medicine, the OTP has continued to engage with national authorities and has actively participated in support and coordination activities with national and multilateral forums, including deployments, training and meetings held under the framework of its Global Forensic Network ("GFN"), established in 2024. Three multidisciplinary and multinational forensic deployments took place in 2025 under the GFN, encompassing a range of forensic disciplines in the context of complementarity efforts with national authorities. In particular, through the GFN there has been increased coordination and collaboration with other international entities working in Ukraine to ensure equality of access to forensic expertise and non-duplication of OTP's assistance measures. The GFN will continue to serve as a platform for mobilizing forensic expertise and engagement in a number of situation countries.

26. Overall, OTP notes that cooperation received from States has been positive, while in some areas the coercive measures against the Court have led reductions in cooperation levels from a limited number of partners. OTP continues to observe that gaining access to information collected a range of private sector counterparts, and the efficient and timely execution of requests for interviewing witnesses in secure environments, are priority areas for further improvement in order to support visible results in its investigative and prosecutorial activities.

Ongoing efforts Registry

27. With the creation and strengthening of a dedicated Section within the Registry for Judicial Cooperation Support, the Registry has prioritised, as part of its regular activities, both strategic and operational engagement with States and partner organisation in order to incorporate and exchange on lessons learned and best practices in the area of judicial cooperation. This has typically occurred as part of pre-briefing and debriefing exercises for specific operations or particular requests for cooperation and have allowed the Court to deepen its engagement with and operational relationship with domestic and international counterparts. In its efforts to enhance and systematize its practices related to the arrest and surrender of suspects at large, the Registry, in coordination with the OTP, had dedicated engagements with 35 States and non-States Parties on the Court's efforts to secure the arrest and surrender of suspects at large. These engagements occurred along different parameters ranging from submitting Requests for Arrest and Surrender, Requests for Cooperation on the Identification and Whereabouts of Suspects, initiating discussions with Ministries of Justice/Foreign Affairs on national procedures in place to execute the Registry's requests, or collaborating with operational counterparts at national level to engage in joint tracking activities or learning exercises, enabling the Court to learn how to re-model existing mechanisms at national level for cross-border fugitive tracking.

28. The Registry has also collaborated closely during the reporting period with the Pre-Trial Division to consult on concrete practices and lessons learned that have arisen in the implementation by States Parties of judicial orders issued by the Court, with a view to ensuring that cooperation can be made more effective and efficient.

29. In the area of the Registry's mandate to support and assist defence counsel, the Registry has continued seeking the cooperation of States with Defence teams in order to ensure the fairness of the proceedings as well as to contribute to the expeditiousness and efficiency of the proceedings.¹⁰ The Registry continues to support the work of counsel both by requesting States to grant them privileges and immunities during their missions, assisting them in meeting with relevant authorities, and by transmitting requests for assistance

¹⁰Resolution ICC-ASP/23/Res.5, https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/asp_docs/ICC-ASP-23-Res.5-ENG.pdf.

pertaining to the investigations of the Defence, including both to States and international organisations.

30. It has been the Registry's experience that cooperation with Defence teams is not easily forthcoming for several reasons. States typically indicated that they lack the internal mechanisms to respond directly to such requests in the absence of a judicial order by the Court to that effect. States have also at times indicated that they lack the resources needed to effectively respond to the significant volume and wide scope of some requests transmitted by defence teams. This can become an even greater challenge when the requested States are not party to the Rome Statute. To facilitate the process, the Registry seeks to provide Defence teams with the national requirements to process requests, so that defence teams can be advised in due time and their requests are handled efficiently. Most States consulted have to date also indicated that they prefer to continue receiving defence requests through the Registry.

Court-wide activities

31. The Court continued to receive crucial support and cooperation from the United Nations. The Court is grateful for the important role that the Office of Legal Affairs plays in coordinating its requests for assistance to various departments of the UN Secretariat, to the UN funds, programmes and offices, as well as to Specialized Agencies and to the UN missions deployed in various parts of the world where the Court is involved. The Court draws on its Liaison Office in New York to support dialogue with relevant UN offices and member States. The Liaison Office follows up on urgent requests for cooperation upon request by various sections of the Court including to support Defence's investigations. To maintain and strengthen this crucial relationship, Principals from all three organs visited New York during the reporting period and held discussions with senior UN officials, as well as with representatives of member States.

32. The Court continues its work to ensure maximum flexibility and optimising operations in relation to its offices and presences in situation countries. This includes more effective allocation of resources across all situations before the Court, including with respect to those situations where the Court does not have a continuous field presence, to ensure that its mandated tasks are performed to the highest standards. The Court maintains a full-time physical presence in five situation countries, namely the Central African Republic, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ukraine and Mali. As of mid-2025, the Registry has closed its full-time physical presence in Côte d'Ivoire, following the conclusion of the Trust Fund for Victims' assistance programme. The OTP has also worked to strengthen its engagement with Colombia.

33. The Country Offices and field presences provide in-country security, administrative and logistical support to the activities of the parties and participants to the proceedings before the Court, notably the OTP, defence teams, legal representatives for victims, and the Trust Fund for Victims. The Country Offices also handle a number of Registry functions in relation to witness protection, victim and witness participation and reparations related activities, outreach and cooperation. Engagement and cooperation with national and local authorities, international organisations and the diplomatic community are among the key aspects in the work of the Country Offices and field presences, without which the Court could not maintain sustainable operations in situation countries.

34. Besides cooperation in support of the Court's activities, the Court wishes to recall also the substantial challenges stemming from non-cooperation. In this regard, the Court welcomes the ASP's request for the Bureau in the context of the 2019 Resolution on the Review of the ICC and the Rome Statute system to address the issues of cooperation and non-cooperation with the ICC "as a matter of priority in 2020 through its working groups and facilitations, in a fully inclusive manner [and] in line with their mandates".¹¹ In furtherance of prerogatives and obligations under the Statute, the Court recognizes the work of the Bureau and the focal points on non-cooperation, and hopes that the ASP will continue to consider opportunities to increase its efforts with a view to preventing non-compliance, especially in the critical matter of the arrest and surrender of persons subject to warrants issued by the

¹¹ Resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res/7, para. 18, https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/ASP18/ICC-ASP-18-Res7-ENG.pdf.

Court. The Court hopes that further consultations will take place with a view to reviewing and strengthening the ASP procedures relating to non-cooperation, as well as to continue developing guidelines regarding the formal dimension of the ASP procedures regarding non-cooperation.

35. The capacity of the UN Security Council to refer a situation to the Court is an important tool to promote justice and accountability. At this juncture, the Court has concluded the first trial at the Court stemming from a UN Security Council referral in the case of Mr. Abd-Al-Rahman. In reports to the Security Council in relation to the situations in Darfur and Libya, the Office has outlined key cooperation opportunities and challenges faced by OTP, emphasizing in both situations the need for deepened cooperation with national authorities while noting significant progress in both situations.

36. It is essential that there is active follow-up to referrals by the Council to assist the Court ensuring cooperation from all relevant stakeholders and for as long as the warrants have not all been executed, so as to secure that effective justice can be delivered when peace, security and well-being of the world are threatened.

4. Priority area 3: Arrest and surrender

<i>Registry</i>	
Total number of RFCs sent during the reporting period for arrest and surrender	11
% of positive replies to RFCs during the reporting period	81.81%

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

37. The implementation of arrest and surrender requests remains a key priority for the Court. During the reporting period, three ICC suspects were arrested. While one surrender did not occur, one surrender did take place, while another surrender process is underway pending the conclusion of the domestic procedures. In addition, in relation to another suspect who was arrest by the Central African Republic authorities in 2024 with the assistance and support of the Registry and the OTP, and whose surrender was postponed pending the consideration of an admissibility challenge, on 12 September 2025 Pre-trial Chamber II determined that the Central African Republic is willing and able to genuinely investigate and prosecute the case and that therefore the case was inadmissible before the ICC. Currently, more than 30 publicly known suspects remain at large. At the same time, the number of arrest warrant applications from the OTP has maintained historically high levels.

38. In the context of the joint mandate entrusted to the Registry and the OTP, both Organs have taken significant steps, during the reporting period, to enhance both internal consultation and coordination as well as external strategic and operational partnerships on the tracking of suspects and on cooperation required for the execution of pending warrants. The support of France and Senegal, the co-facilitators of the HWG on Cooperation, have been instrumental in emphasizing and highlighting the importance of State cooperation and in particular, in relation to the implementation of arrest warrants.

39. Such close inter-organ consultation and coordination between the Registry and the OTP, which is essential for the implementation of judicial orders issued by Chamber of the Court, has involved the development and implementation of tailored strategies aimed at securing the arrest of each suspect at large. It also requires the rapid and continuous real-time exchange of information with competent law enforcement and judicial agencies at the national level and the fostering of enabling environments that are conducive to arrest and surrender. In the past year, efforts have also been undertaken by the Court to implement, together with States Parties, a set of recommendations for increased engagement with States Parties on the implementation of outstanding ICC arrest warrants. These combined and collective efforts remain crucial for the fulfilment of the Court's judicial mandate.

40. Reflecting on the identified strategic risk and taking into account practice and lessons from other international tribunals, the OTP and the Registry are seeking to strengthen their capacity to more effectively support tracking and arrest efforts, with a view to ensuring a more robust analysis, enabling the Court to work closely together with States Parties and other stakeholders to ensure greater effectiveness in the arrest of suspects at large. In that vein, the inter-organ Suspects At Large Working Group was revitalized and convenes on regular basis to ensure a continuously systematic and coordinated approach on suspects at large within the Court. Furthermore, given its role as the executive arm of the Court, the Registry consults regularly with, seeks guidance from the relevant Chambers with respect to steps and actions taken or required for the implementation of judicial decisions and orders (including arrest warrants) and regularly conveys technical level feedback solicited from States on issues that could enhance operational best practices. In addition, the Registry Suspects at Large Unit, which forms part of the Registry's Judicial Cooperation Support Section, has organised post operational debriefs and table-top exercises with the agencies responsible for the implementation of arrest warrants in a number of States, and acting in coordination with the OTP, in order to test and strengthen the procedures in place. It has also convened the working level coordination meetings with States Parties to consult on collective strategies and actions, at both the diplomatic and operational level, that could foster an enabling environment for the execution of arrest warrants, in line with the Court recommendation.

41. The OTP has continued its efforts to significantly strengthen its tracking function in this reporting period, both as relevant to its investigative activities and in support of the eventual arrest of suspects. The Tracking and Information Fusion Section, established in 2024, has introduced new tracking strategies across key suspects and supported the integration of advanced analytical capacities in this area, leading to results in the form of identification of location of suspects and subsequent arrests achieved through joint action with Registry. In light of the expanding number of arrest warrants issued by the Court, these efforts will be further intensified in the coming reporting period.

42. Arrest warrants against 34 publicly known suspects at large remain outstanding:

- i. Afghanistan: Haibatullah Akhundzada and Abdul Hakim Haqqani, since 2025;
- ii. Central African Republic II: Edmond Beina,¹² since 2018, Mahamat Nouradine Adam, since 2019, unsealed in 2022;
- iii. Darfur: Ahmad Muhammad Harun, since 2007; Omar Al-Bashir, since 2009 and 2010; Abdel Raheem Muhammad Hussein, since 2012; Abdallah Banda Abakaer Nourain, since 2014;
- iv. Democratic Republic of the Congo: Sylvestre Mudacumura, since 2012;¹³
- v. Georgia: David Georgiyevich Sanakoev, Gamlet Guchmazov and Mikhail Mayramovich Mindzaev, since 2022
- vi. Kenya: Walter Barasa, since 2013 and Philip Kipkoech Bett, since 2015;
- vii. Libya: Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, since 2011, Saif Suleiman Sneidel, since 2020; Abdurahem Khalefa Abdurahem Elshgagi, Makhlof Makhlof Arhoumah Doumah, Nasser Muhammad Muftah Daou, Mohamed Mohamed Al Salheen Salmi, Abdelbari Ayyad Ramadan Al Shaqqaqi and Fathi Faraj Mohamed Salim Al Zinkal, since 2023, unsealed in 2024; Osama Elmasry Njeem and Khaled Mohamed Ali El Hishri, since 2025 (surrender pending finalization of national judicial proceedings);
- viii. Mali: Iyad Ag Ghaly, since 2017;
- ix. Palestine: Benjamin Netanyahu and Yoav Gallant, since 2024.
- x. Uganda: Joseph Kony, since 2005; and,
- xi. Ukraine: Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin and Maria Alekseyevna Lvova-Belova, since 2023; and Sergei Ivanovich Kobylash, Viktor Nikolayevich

¹² On 12 September 2025, Pre-trial Chamber II determined that the Central African Republic is willing and able to genuinely investigate and prosecute the case against Mr Beina and that the case against Mr Beina is inadmissible. On 6 October 2025, the Counsel of Mr Beina filed the Defence appeals brief.

¹³ Efforts are being undertaken to verify the reported death of Sylvestre Mudacumura (in 2019).

Sokolov, Sergei Kuzhugetovich Shoigu and Valery Vasilyevich Gerasimov, since 2024.¹⁴

43. The Court calls upon States Parties and others to provide the necessary cooperation and assistance for the arrest of the suspects and their surrender to the Court and encourages States to engage in effective consultations with the Court in accordance with Article 97 of the Rome Statute when facing difficulties on its execution. as a result of its inter-organ retreat. The Court thanks the NGOs that support this crucial area for the Court by providing information, engaging in domestic litigation and drawing the attention of the public and authorities to the existence of arrest warrants.

44. Through its dedicated Working group and its external relations efforts, the Court on its side will continue to promote further informal exchanges and coordination with States and relevant intergovernmental organizations to share information and develop concrete strategies towards arrests. At the same time, the Court encourages all relevant stakeholders to re-commit and make meaningful strides to address this crucial challenge to the cooperation regime and the credibility of the Rome Statute system.

III. Update and key recommendations on the three other cooperation priority areas not linked to data collection (legal mechanisms and procedures for cooperation; identification, freezing or seizure of assets; cooperation agreements; diplomatic and public support; and inter-State cooperation)

1. Priority area 1: Enacting the legal mechanisms set in the Rome Statute and setting up effective procedures and structures regarding cooperation and judicial assistance

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

45. The enactment by States of legal mechanisms and the setting up of effective procedures to facilitate cooperation and judicial assistance remains of paramount importance to the Court.

46. The Court continued to benefit from the generous financial support of the European Union for activities aimed at enhancing cooperation. This support enabled the Court to organise several seminars, trainings and other events, including the Ninth Seminar on Cooperation with national focal points held in The Hague from 16 to 18 September 2024. This annual gathering plays a crucial role in maintaining close working relations between the ICC and government officials in charge of practical cooperation matters in situation countries and other States of relevance for the Court's investigations and judicial proceedings. The Seminar provided an opportunity for Court officials and State representatives to hold constructive exchanges on mutual needs and challenges, good practices, ways to promote effective and efficient cooperation, and recent developments in the Court's jurisprudence. The Court welcomes the ASPs recognition of the importance of the work of the national focal points within the 2024 Resolution on cooperation and considers it as a testament to the hard work, commitment, and cooperation of the State officials working closely with the International Criminal Court.¹⁵

47. Other events organised with EU support during the reporting period included an ICC Conference on Victim and Witness Protection and Support, a hybrid Training for Counsel, a Seminar on Revised Victims' Strategy, a Seminar on Medical Matters in Detention, and a seminar with partner universities from the Asia-Pacific region, consistent with the Court's aim to broaden collaboration with academic institutions.

48. Missions to States Parties and other States provide important opportunities for engagement with counterparts from different ministries and other government services that are part of the national effort to cooperate with the Court and allow the Court to identify

¹⁴ While the warrants are secret, the Chamber has authorized the Registry to make public their existence, the names of the suspects and the legal qualification of the alleged crimes, considering that public awareness of the warrants may contribute to the prevention of the further commission of crimes pursuant to Article 58, paragraph 1 (b) (iii) of the Rome Statute.

¹⁵ Resolution ICC-ASP/23/Res.5 para. 11, https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/asp_docs/ICC-ASP-23-Res.5-ENG.pdf

specific focal points and discuss areas of further cooperation, including cooperation agreements. Missions can also be used as opportunities to raise awareness of the Rome Statute and the Court with a variety of interlocutors. With funding from the EU, the Court organized several high-level and working level missions, including a mission of the Registrar to Colombia, as well as Court participation in a meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Global Initiative Against Impunity in Brussels.

49. As paragraph 21 of the 2024 Resolution on Cooperation stresses, it is a matter of priority that States that have not yet done so become parties to the Agreement on Privileges and Immunities of the ICC (“APIC”), and that they incorporate it in their national legislation, as appropriate. States Parties are under an obligation stemming from article 48 of the Rome Statute to “respect such privileges and immunities of the Court as are necessary for the fulfilment of its purposes”. Paragraphs 2-4 of article 48 furthermore provide for the privileges and immunities of specific categories of Court officials and other persons. However, the general nature of article 48 may give rise to differing interpretations of the exact scope of the Court’s privileges and immunities in concrete situations.

50. Indeed, the Court faces various challenges in the context of its operations relating to the interpretation or application of the relevant legal provisions, or the absence of necessary privileges and immunities. In instances of travel to States that have not become parties to the APIC, the Registry has to send note verbales based on article 48 and invite States to grant the privileges and immunities, instead of relying on existing legal protections covered by the APIC. Given the current and potential future contexts of operation of the Court, as well as the liability issues that can be attached, the lack of these legal protections for staff can have clear legal, financial and reputational consequences for the Court and States. The APIC increases legal clarity and security by specifying in detail the scope of the Court’s privileges and immunities. By becoming parties to APIC, States can ensure consistent and unambiguous application of the Court’s privileges and immunities on their territory.

2. Priority area 4: Identification, freezing and seizing of assets

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

51. The Registry continued reviewing its process and practices related to the identification, freezing or seizure of assets. In this regard, it established an Indigence Assessment Officer within the Counsel Support Section, responsible for collecting and analysing information from persons applying for legal aid to determine on a prima facie basis whether the applicant is indigent in order to benefit from the legal aid. Such analysis may be conducted with the assistance of States, which may provide information related to the assets of the defendant upon the Registry’s request. Regarding the recovery of assets for the purpose of their eventual reparations to victims and other purposes outlined in article 93(1)(k) of the Rome Statute, the Registry continued its effort to analyse existing case law and replies from States in order to identify lessons learnt and applicable national procedures that could be used by the Court and States when working on the issue of the recovery of assets. In this spirit, the Registry continues to liaise with one State to develop a *vademecum* retracing the procedure to be followed to execute a request for identification, freezing, seizure and confiscation of assets at the domestic level in consultation with the different stakeholders concerned. The Registry hopes to replicate this initiative with other States. The Court also updated the forms sent to all States in the context of the facilitation on cooperation to obtain more information regarding the existing systems at the national level in this area.

52. In May 2025, in line with its Strategic Plan for 2023-2025, the OTP dedicated Financial Investigations Unit was established, benefiting from positions approved in the 2024 budget. The Unit provides specialised support to teams and units; develops standards and training in this field; coordinates with the Registry and develops specialised external cooperation/support networks to advance the work and activities of the OTP. This unit will contribute bolstering OTP’s expertise to collect financial evidence related to crimes under investigation, and to identify and trace proceeds, property, assets and instrumentalities of crime for the purpose of potential Court ordered forfeiture. The Unit is developing its cooperation strategy and welcomes the positive engagement with national and international partners in this effort.

3. Priority area 5: Cooperation agreements

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

53. During the reporting period, the Court signed agreements on the enforcement of sentences with the Government of the Republic of Poland and the Government of the Republic of Latvia. Similar agreements on the enforcement of sentences are currently in force between the ICC and 14 States Parties. The Court is grateful to the governments of the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Latvia for concluding these agreements and encourages all States Parties to conclude an agreement on the enforcement of sentences with the Court, in the spirit of article 103(3)(a) of the Rome Statute according to which the “States Parties should share the responsibility for enforcing sentences of imprisonment, in accordance with principles of equitable distribution”. During the reporting period, the Presidency of the Court continued to actively raise this important aspect of voluntary cooperation with a large number of States, including with a focus to ensure improved equitable geographical representation.

54. The Registry continues its efforts and actively engages with State’s representatives and cooperation focal points in order to provide information in relation to the framework agreements on interim release, release and witness relocation, and encourages States to sign the mentioned voluntary cooperation agreements. Despite these efforts, the number of States signatories remain unchanged since the last report and significant resources of the Registry are allocated in order to identify and implement *ad hoc* solutions.

55. As emphasized repeatedly by the Court, the consequences of the lack of agreements paired with the reluctance of States Parties to cooperate with the Court for the purpose of accepting released persons, still poses a serious risk to the Court on its possibility to implement its mandate and respect the right of the defendants.

56. Although during the reporting period no order granting an interim release was issued, the very low number of States who signed the agreement on interim release is not satisfactory. In the case that the Pre-Trial or Trial Chamber grants a person under ICC custody with interim release, in order for it to be effective, the Court must rely on States Parties and their willingness to accept the person on their territory. If States Parties are unwilling to do so, this could hamper the possibility of interim release or render it impossible.

57. The Registry has concluded 24 relocation agreements with States Parties to facilitate the safe relocation of victims and witnesses of the Court. While the number of individuals requiring relocation remains relatively limited, identifying States willing to host them continues to pose a significant challenge. Notably, several States that have signed relocation agreements have not receive any victims or witnesses yet, which limits the effectiveness of the Court’s protection framework. The Registry encourages these States to re-engage with the Court and consider reactivating their existing agreements. It also invites other States to explore the possibility of entering into relocation agreements, which can be tailored to their specific legal, cultural, and operational contexts. A modest yet impactful commitment, such as the acceptance of one family per year, would substantially ease the logistical and protection challenges faced by the Registry. Such cooperation would directly support the Court’s mandate and strengthen the protection of those who contribute to its judicial processes. The ICC’s witness protection system relies on the sustained commitment of States. Their cooperation is essential to ensuring that witnesses can testify, and victims participate in the proceedings without fear of reprisal. The Registry continues to pursue new relocation agreements and *ad hoc* cooperation arrangements with States not yet engaged and is grateful to those currently considering such commitments. To further support relocation efforts, the regulations of the Special Fund for Relocations were recently amended to allow for more flexible use of donated funds, enabling more responsive coverage of direct relocation costs.

58. Another matter of key importance is the Trust Fund for Family Visits. As family visits to indigent detainees are subsidized entirely through voluntary contributions by States, non-governmental organizations and individuals to the TFFV, the full and timely implementation of these essential rights is intrinsically linked to the availability of adequate funding. During the reporting period, the TFFV received 30,247 Euros. The Court is very grateful to all the contributing States over the years for all contributions, small or large. In order to be able to continue organizing funded family visits for all indigent detained persons in 2026 it is vital

that stakeholders, States and others, cognisant of the current situation, maintain efforts towards a sustainable and adequate funding. Only a perennial funding will ensure the integrity of the proceedings, the proper management and administration of the ICC Detention Centre and avoid the Court incurring additional cost.

59. Another increasing area relates to the operational support to the Court. The Court operations have expanded in war zones requiring adequate training of the staff deployed in the area of medical emergency, use of specific firearms for example to secure the guarantee of sensitive operations and urgent need for transportation. These needs translate into the issuance by States Parties of authorisations and licences in relation to these firearms, specific flights authorisations and loans of aircrafts. The Court thanks the States Parties for their general support to the Court and those States that accepted to include ICC staff in relevant national trainings.

4. Priority area 6: Diplomatic and public support in national, bilateral, regional and international settings

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

60. The Court continued to engage with its long-standing partners, notably including the States Parties to the Rome Statute, the UN, and international and regional organisations as well as civil society. The Court welcomes Ukraine as its 125th State party after ratification of the Rome Statute on 25 October 2024, entering into force on 1 January 2025.

61. The Court's overall security posture has undergone a significant transformation in view of its recent activities in multiple situations, most notably those relating to Ukraine and the State of Palestine. Consequently, ensuring the safety and security of the Court, its officials and operations remained among the highest priorities of the Court's leadership during the reporting period. This prioritization reflects the increasing number of external threats directed against the institution, which have compounded existing unwarranted and unjustified coercive measures. These include, *inter alia*, the arrest warrants issued by the Russian Federation against several ICC judges and the Prosecutor in response to the performance of their independent mandates, unilateral coercive measures imposed by the United States, as well as targeted cyber-attacks aimed at compromising its information systems. Such developments underscore the increasingly complex, hostile, and challenging operational environment in which the Court carries out its work.

62. In response to the heightened threats and attacks directed against the Court and its officials, the institution has intensified its efforts to reinforce resilience and protection across all areas of operation. Building on lessons learned from recent incidents, including targeted cyber-attacks, intimidation campaigns, and coercive measures against elected officials, the Court has adopted a comprehensive strategy aimed at safeguarding its independence, operational continuity, and institutional and judicial integrity. Central to this approach are enhanced prevention, preparedness, and mitigation frameworks designed to strengthen both physical and digital security, protect personnel, and ensure the uninterrupted delivery of the Court's judicial and administrative functions. The Court has also deepened coordination with the Host State and other supportive States Parties, whose timely and concrete assistance has been instrumental in addressing these evolving challenges. In parallel, the Court continues to assert its legal protections under the Rome Statute and relevant agreements, while expanding its diplomatic and technical capabilities to deter and respond effectively to external interference. In light of the continued risk of unilateral coercive measures and other forms of pressure, the Court's leadership remains firmly committed to building institutional resilience and calls upon all States Parties and the international community to uphold their collective responsibility to defend the Court's independence and enable it to fulfil its mandate free from obstruction or intimidation.

63. The Court continued to develop its interaction and cooperation with international and regional organizations as key partners for promoting universality of the Rome Statute, raising awareness of the Court's work, adopting national implementing legislation, enhancing cooperation and promoting wider geographical representation.

64. The Presidency of the Court continued to entertain intensive and meaningful relations with States Parties, both in The Hague, by engaging with embassies and hosting dignitaries

of States Parties at the Court, as well as with intergovernmental organizations and civil societies at the highest level, and by travelling to State capitals of all regions. Particularly in view of the unprecedented level of threats and coercive measures directed at the Court and its elected officials, the President underlined the significance of firm and continued political support for the Court and its independence, as well as the crucial importance of cooperation for the Court's ability to carry out its mandate in an impartial manner and urged all partners to do their utmost in this respect. The Presidency also maintained close cooperation with the Host State with a view to addressing *inter alia* issues concerning the security of the Court and sanctions. The Presidency is undertaking steps to enhance its external relations capacity, in view of the extraordinary circumstances the Court currently operates under and the unique functions of the Presidency.

65. OTP's biannual briefings to the Security Council on the Darfur situation and Libya situation provided opportunities to inform the Council and the UN membership of progress and challenges in relation to OTP's investigations, and the importance of cooperation including with regard to the outstanding arrest warrants. On 28 January and 10 July 2025, respectively, the Prosecutor and Deputy Prosecutor briefed the Security Council on the Situation in Darfur, placing significant focus on the alleged crimes related to the escalation of the conflict in Darfur after 2023 and emphasising the landmark moment of the completion of the trial of Mr. Abd-Al-Rahman. On 9 November 2024 and 15 May 2025, the Prosecutor briefed the Security Council on the Situation in Libya, addressing progress in OTP's investigations in accordance with its roadmap for action in the situation and noting the submission by Libya of a declaration pursuant to article 12(3) of the Rome Statute as representing a renewed commitment for cooperation in this situation. The Court believes that, building on past exchanges, the dialogue between the Court and the Council on matters of mutual interest, both thematic and situation-specific, could be enhanced, with a view to strengthening synergies.

66. The Court, and the OTP in particular, is grateful for the support demonstrated by the States Parties and other States serving at the Council. OTP has benefitted from fruitful exchanges and support, including in the context of media stakeout sessions organised by the ICC focal points on the Council, Sierra Leone and Denmark, on behalf of the ICC State Parties Caucus members following briefings by OTP to the Council.

67. The Court continued its efforts to enhance its engagement with regional groups of States via different meetings with States' representatives in The Hague, New York and Brussels, as well as in capitals. The President of the Court addressed the Bureau of the Assembly of States Parties as well as the Hague Working Group and the New York Working Group, convened meetings with Ambassadors from different groups of States in The Hague, engaged with various entities of the European Union including at the highest political level and with the European Parliament, and met with representatives of civil society. The Members of the Presidency have also continued engaging at the highest political level, both in The Hague and in capitals. The OTP and the Registry also continued its practice of meeting at regular interval with different groups of States, in various formats and venues, including at the HWG. Such engagements have included meetings with Ambassadors from various regional groups and subgroups, and bilateral visits to situation countries and other States, including non-States Parties to the Rome Statute, across all continents. Representatives of the Court's organs engaged in many forms of interaction and cooperation with various entities of the European Union.

68. OTP has continued working closely with civil society organisations benefiting from their expertise and input, both with respect to its investigative and prosecutorial function as well as in the course of the development of its policy framework. In 2024, it established a Complementarity and Civil Society team within its External Affairs Unit and designated an OTP-wide point of contact to facilitate exchanges on transversal matters and engagements with new organisations.

69. In support of its efforts to ensure consistent and coordinated engagement, the OTP established the OTP-CSO Structured Dialogue initiative, which aims at facilitating quarterly sessions where OTP and a broad range of civil society organisations can enhance dialogue and cooperation on matter relevant to the work of the Office.

70. In addition, OTP, in partnership with Eurojust, the Genocide Prosecution Network and the National Authorities Against Impunity project, delivered three regional briefings for civil society organisations based in the African and Asia-Pacific regions to disseminate and obtain feedback on the use of the ‘Guidelines for Civil Society Organisations Documenting International Crimes and Human Rights Violations for Accountability Purposes’. Two sessions with international CSOs working across multiple countries were also held, during which additional substantive feedback was provided. Sessions for the MENA region, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Eastern Europe and the Caucasus are to be delivered in the coming months.

71. The OTP has also held thematic consultations in furtherance of its efforts to enhance its policy framework. In 2025, OTP engaged in bilateral and regional consultations with more than 30 experts and civil society organizations as part of the drafting process for its Policy on Environmental Crimes. These consultations were designed to capture a wide range of perspectives and constituencies. 15 CSOs submitted written comments on the draft. In developing its Policy on Cyber-Enabled Crimes, OTP held multiple meetings with over a dozen civil society organizations, State representatives, and academics. These discussions focused on key elements of the policy, such as the application of the Rome Statute to cyber operations, and the gravity and jurisdictional assessments, contributing thus to the refinement of the draft.

72. The Court greatly values the activities that civil society partners undertake to raise awareness about the Court, to promote the universality of the Rome Statute and to encourage the Statute's full implementation and continued to participate in those activities. From 16 to 20 June 2025, the Court held, in hybrid format, the annual round table with non-governmental organizations.

5. **Priority area 7: Inter-State cooperation in the context of the Rome Statute system**

Update on ICC efforts during the reporting period

73. To make progress on the concrete areas of cooperation of concern for the Court, it would be beneficial for States to exchange their practical experience and expertise, provide mutual assistance, and collaborate not only with each other but also with the Court and other essential partners. The Court attempts to promote these exchanges in the context for instance of the annual focal points’ seminar, in the cooperation agreements it negotiates with States; as well as by availing the expertise it has developed in the many areas of its work in its twenty-two years of operations. Some of these aspects are further detailed in the Court’s 2012 report on complementarity.¹⁶

74. In this context, the Court provides assistance to national jurisdictions in accordance with the Rome Statute for the purpose of supporting domestic proceedings. In line with its policy on Complementarity and Cooperation, the OTP has increased its support to national authorities in their efforts to fight impunity, including by providing tangible assistance to domestic proceedings in relation to core international crimes and other serious crimes, in a manner consistent with the Rome Statute. This has included enhanced efforts in the context of the JIT for Ukraine and the JT for Libya; cooperation and provision of support to the Special Criminal Court in the CAR; renewed engagement with DRC authorities to support effective approaches in addressing international crimes through national efforts; and steps taken in implementation of the Cooperation Agreement signed between OTP and the Government of Colombia including the holding of a number of events and engagements in line with the complementary workplan in place with the Special Jurisdiction for Peace. OTP has also continued its support to Ukrainian national authorities in the field of forensics.

75. This year, the Registry, OTP and the Secretariat of the Assembly of States Parties also continued their coordination in line with the agreed standard operating procedure to handle requests stemming from the ASP Complementarity Platform. This more structured approach to the triage and actioning of requests has continued to show benefits to engagements with national authorities interested in receiving the support of the Court.

¹⁶ ICC-ASP/11/39.

IV. Conclusion

76. The Court looks forward to continuing its active engagement with States Parties, including through the Bureau's cooperation facilitation, to identify additional creative, tangible and concrete solutions to address the cooperation priorities enumerated above and in view of the new challenges faced by the Court. In the current context of heightened threats and attacks against the Court's independence, such engagement remains vital to further reinforcing the Court's resilience, protection, and operational continuity. The Court warmly welcomes any initiatives by States to engage in dialogue with the Court on the issues addressed in this report, to provide feedback, or to discuss proposals for the purpose of enhancing cooperation and for addressing any obstacles that may exist, including, *inter alia*, in the context of the work plan of the cooperation facilitation for the year 2025 with a view to strengthening the Court and the Rome Statute system. The Court is thankful to the Assembly and the States Parties, as well as many non-States Parties and other stakeholders and partners, for their cooperation and support, and remains available for further discussion or information on the basis of this report, as well as previous reporting activities.

V. Recommendations on the way forward

77. Based on the analysis of the main challenges regarding cooperation in support of investigative, prosecutorial and judicial activities, and in the set-up of effective procedures and structures regarding cooperation and judicial assistance, the Court has identified the following recommendations which remain relevant:

- Recommendation 1: States should strive to maintain a high level of cooperation for all requests from the Court, including requests that might be perceived as sensitive or technically complicated at first glance.
- Recommendation 2: States are urged to facilitating consultations between the Court organs formulating requests and the competent national authorities ultimately in charge of executing them with a view to finding solutions together; suggesting potential alternative ways to assist or transmit the information sought; or organising bilateral meetings to follow up on the execution of such requests.
- Recommendation 3: The availability of channels of communication and simplified domestic procedures for handling ICC cooperation requests, as well as coordination and information sharing between national authorities dealing with Court cooperation requests, all contribute to a smoother, more efficient cooperation.
- Recommendation 4: States should consider implementing necessary measures at the national level in order to support the conduct of voluntary witness interviews by OTP on their territory, including enacting domestic legislation where necessary in order to enable such activities without significant international cooperation requirements such as formal requests for assistance.
- Recommendation 5: States should consider informing the Registry on whether they would prefer to receive requests for cooperation from the Defence teams through the Registry or directly from the teams.
- Recommendation 6: States could consider specific discussion among States and the ICC on the challenges and impediments (whether legal, technical, logistical or financial) faced by States to answer Defence requests for cooperation.
- Recommendation 7: States should proactively consider the extent to which the work of their domestic authorities may benefit from the provision of support by the ICC, in particular through the provision of information and support by the OTP and through participation in the OTP Complementarity and Cooperation Forum.
- Recommendation 8: States should consider making voluntary donations to the existing Trust Funds relevant to cooperation with the Court, including those pertaining to family visits for detained persons, the relocation of witnesses, and, for OTP, the Trust Fund for Complementarity.
- Recommendation 9: Ensure the necessary resources and the security parameters for the national focal points liaising with and supporting the work of the Court.

78. Based on its experience, the Court believes that in order to galvanize arrest efforts, different types of actions are needed for each warrant at different stages, all of relevance to States. These notably include:

- Tracking efforts (whereabouts, movements, activities):
 - Recommendation 10: Make available judicial measures and tools to facilitate access to information on the whereabouts of suspects, including access to special investigative techniques and tools in the hands of national law enforcement and intelligence services as needed (including solely for the purpose of validating or invalidating information collected by the Court).
 - Recommendation 11: Ensure effective resourcing of the tracking function of OTP and the Registry based on a strategic assessment of its needs in this area.
 - Recommendation 12: Transmission of information and alerts on suspects.
 - Recommendation 13: Enhance support to the Suspects at Large Working Group, including through financial support through the ICC annual budget.
 - Recommendation 14: Reactivity when information sent on suspects' movements.
- Increased engagement with States Parties on the implementation of outstanding ICC arrest warrants:
 - Recommendation 15: States Parties are encouraged to continuously emphasize the importance of executing ICC arrest warrants as an element for continued international support and situation engagement, including through leading demarches, bilateral or multilateral discussions.
 - Recommendation 16: Focus on compliance with ICC decisions, including as part of larger diplomatic discussions and fora.
 - Recommendation 17: Link arrests to the importance of the Court's mandate. Campaigns and reminders on the alleged crimes and the charges, especially in the situation where the investigations take place.
 - Recommendation 18: States Parties could support the Court's efforts in encouraging entities such as INTERPOL, Europol, or any other relevant entity to provide support to the ICC on suspects at large.
 - Recommendation 19: States Parties could envisage publicizing domestically and internationally public ICC arrest warrants to help garner support from the international community, including States and CSOs.
 - Recommendation 20: States Parties could envisage, supporting the Court's efforts on suspects at large through short-term secondment of officials from States, who could provide regional or country specific expertise, and/or who could assist in developing specific arrest strategies. Also, expertise on rule of law enforcement related to suspects at large tracking would help the Court further improve the institutional setup on this important topic.
 - Recommendation 21: States Parties could further consider, with the support of the Court, forming a working group of relevant States who would engage and put efforts on specific ICC arrest warrants.
- Operational support:
 - Recommendation 22: Surrender procedures and availability of legal and technical processes (i.e. developed SOPs, including established procedures for different arrest/surrender/transfer scenarios, considering key elements that can influence legally and operationally the operations).
 - Recommendation 23: The integration of exceptions to UN travel bans for the fulfilment of a judicial process are also a useful tool for the ICC for the purposes of bringing arrested individuals to the Court, and these mechanisms need to be triggered on an urgent and simplified basis.

- Recommendation 24: Consider signing an agreement for air transport in order to make the service available to the ICC when persons arrested are transferred to the seat of the Court. Only one State entered into this agreement to date.

- Recommendation 25: Once information is obtained of the high likelihood of the arrest of a suspect at large and bearing in mind the high degree of confidentiality required in such operations, the Registry could, in consultation with the OTP and with the guidance and authorization of the relevant Chamber, establish a very small grouping of States for a specific ICC situation at hand that could assist with the collection and dissemination of information and provide direct or indirect operational support necessary in relation to the arrest of the suspect in question.

79. Based on its experience and assessment, the Court suggests the following recommendations in order to set up effective procedures and structures regarding cooperation and judicial assistance:

- Recommendation 26: The Court encourages States that have not yet ratified the Rome Statute to join the Court as to ensure the responsibility to support the ICC's judicial and prosecutorial functions.

- Recommendation 27: Clear procedures and distribution of roles and responsibilities at the domestic level in the national implementing legislation will help ensure the expeditious response to requests for assistance coming from the Court without any undue delay and, where incorporating the Rome Statute crimes in domestic legislation is concerned, that they can also investigate and prosecute such crimes before their national jurisdictions as relevant.

- Recommendation 28: To adopt the necessary national legislation regarding cooperation with the Court guarantees that the actors involved (governmental agencies, but also witnesses, victims and suspects) have legal certainty on the way the different requests for assistance from the Court will be treated.

- Recommendation 29: It has been the Court's experience that the availability of channels of communication and simplified domestic procedures for dealing with ICC cooperation requests, as well as coordination and information sharing between national authorities dealing with Court cooperation requests, is a best practice that should be fostered.

- Recommendation 30: All States Parties are strongly urged to ratify or accede to the APIC. States are also encouraged to implement the provisions relating to the Court's privileges and immunities in their national legislation, and to take active steps to ensure that the relevant national authorities are aware of the Court's privileges and immunities and their practical implications.

- Recommendation 31: As less than half of the 125 States Parties have adopted legislation in order to implement the cooperation obligations provided for in Part 9 to this date, the Registry of the ICC has availed itself in several instances during the reporting period to provide support and technical advice to interested States engaged in a domestic process to adopt cooperation implementing legislation. While the Registry will not provide substantive advice on matters of national concern, it is ready to participate in discussions and provide written submissions to national stakeholders at the request of the State on the key elements of Part 9 and share what has been its experience and lessons learned in the last twenty-three years of implementing the cooperation provisions with States Parties.

80. A number of important steps could indeed be taken by States to support the work of the Court in relation to the identification and freezing of assets:

- Recommendation 32: The adoption of the necessary legislation or procedures in line with Rome Statute obligations to be in a position to reply timely and effectively to relevant requests from the Court.

- Recommendation 33: Streamlining ICC specific needs domestically so that the prosecution of Rome Statute crimes triggers the same reflexes in terms of financial intelligence and investigations as the prosecution of financial crimes or transnational organised crimes.

- Recommendation 34: The secondment of national experts with specialisation in financial investigations and other areas of advanced technical expertise in order to strengthen the capacity of relevant organs of the Court in this area.
- Recommendation 35: The opening of domestic investigations into possible financial crimes on the basis of information received by the Court so that States can use the full arsenal offered by their national law.
- Recommendation 36: The appointment of focal points on financial investigations and freezing of assets, without prejudice to the formal channels of communication identified by each State, to follow up on exchanges with the ICC as appropriate.
- Recommendation 37: Complete the questionnaire distributed to States on the financial investigations.
- Recommendation 38: Within the judicial context, by replying to the requests of Chambers and asking for clarification where required, States can contribute to shaping the Court's case-law on this complex matter.

81. Based on the efforts of the last seven years to prioritize the signature of voluntary cooperation agreements, the Court has identified some recommendations for the consideration of States:

- Recommendation 39: States should consider concluding framework agreements on interim release, release, relocation of witnesses, transport of detained persons and witnesses and enforcement of sentences and accept cases on an *ad hoc* basis or within the framework of the said agreements.
- Recommendation 40: The inclusion of elements of the cooperation agreements in the provisions of national implementing legislation of the Rome Statute, which will facilitate the negotiation, if needed, with the Court, for the later operationalization of this cooperation; the Registry is available to advise States in this regard, if relevant.
- Recommendation 41: The possibility to engage in synergies between the cooperation and the complementarity facilitations, especially when considering the identified needs of certain States and available organizations or States that can share their expertise or provide capacity-building activities, including in areas covered by the cooperation agreements (such as witness protection, monitoring systems, reintegration programs or the national penitentiary systems).
- Recommendation 42: The possibility for States that have signed cooperation agreements with the Court to act as "goodwill Ambassadors" in their region and in their contacts with other States, in order to explain how they are working with the Court and to clarify implications and opportunities.
- Recommendation 43: The availability of the Court to take part in videoconferences or technical engagements with the relevant national stakeholders of interest countries, to discuss in detail the agreements and how they can function within the national legal framework of each State.
- Recommendation 44: The possibility of including the signature of cooperation agreements as an item in the agenda of meetings of regional groups.
- Recommendation 45: Encourages States to commit to accepting at least one protected witness or victim per year for relocation into their territory together with their dependants, in line with their commitment to supporting the effective functioning of international criminal justice by providing protection to individuals who have agreed to cooperate with the Court thereby placing themselves at risk. To support this effort, States may benefit from the Special Fund for Relocations, which enables the Court to contribute to the funding of relocation and helps reduce the financial burden on national authorities.