

**Cour
Pénale
Internationale**



**International
Criminal
Court**

Original: English

No.: ICC-01/04-02/06
Date: 2 February 2026

TRIAL CHAMBER II

Before: Judge María del Socorro Flores Liera, Presiding Judge
Judge Kimberly Prost
Judge Nicolas Guillou

SITUATION IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO
IN THE CASE OF THE PROSECUTOR v. BOSCO NTAGANDA

Public

Additional Registry Submissions on the Time Extension Request

Source: Registry

Document to be notified in accordance with regulation 31 of the *Regulations of the Court* to:

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ The Office of the Prosecutor | ☐ Counsel for the Defence |
| ☐ Legal Representatives of the Victims | ☐ Legal Representatives of the Applicants |
| ☐ Unrepresented Victims | ☐ Unrepresented Applicants (Participation/Reparation) |
| ☒ The Office of Public Counsel for Victims | ☐ The Office of Public Counsel for the Defence |
| ☐ States' Representatives | ☒ Trust Fund for Victims |

REGISTRY

- | | |
|---|---|
| Registrar
M. Zavala Giler, Osvaldo | ☐ Counsel Support Section |
| ☐ Victims and Witnesses Unit | ☐ Detention Section |
| ☒ Victims Participation and Reparations Section | ☒ Public Information and Outreach Section |

I. Introduction

1. Pursuant to Trial Chamber II (“Chamber”)’s decision issued on 19 December 2025 (“Decision”) in the case *The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda* (“Case”), the Registry hereby provides further observations on “realistic monthly numerical projections on the identification of new beneficiaries for reparations, the assessment of victims eligibility and priority categorization and the communication of assessment results with applicants and the [Trust Fund for Victims (“TFV”)]”, as well as procedural innovations that could further expediate the administrative eligibility process of the Victims Participation and Reparations Section (“VPRS”).¹

II. Procedural History

2. On 14 July 2023, the Chamber issued the “Addendum to the Reparations Order of 8 March 2021” in which it, *inter alia*, (i) concluded that the approximate number of direct and indirect victims in the case is 10,500 individuals; and (ii) detailed the procedure for carrying out the eligibility assessment of victims’ dossiers at the implementation stage.²
3. On 11 August 2023, the Chamber issued its “First Decision on DIP”, in which it entrusted the Registry with the mandate to carry out the administrative eligibility process for reparations in the Case, with the process to conclude on 31 December 2025.³
4. On 3 November 2023, the Registry filed its “Registry Submission pursuant to ICC-01/04-02/06-2860-Red” (“Registry Submission” or “Submission”), in which it *inter*

¹ Trial Chamber II, “Sixth decision on the VPRS determinations of victims’ eligibility for reparations and priority status and order for further information on the VPRS’ request for extension of time and proposal on the reporting of eligibility determinations”, 19 December 2025, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2929](#), para. 14. The Decision also instructed the Registry to include observations on how the modification of the process of reporting eligibility determinations for reparations to the Chamber, proposed by the VPRS in an email to the Chamber dated 9 December 2025, comply with the Chamber’s obligation to provide specific judicial approval of administrative screenings. *Id.*, para. 17 and Annex I.

² Trial Chamber II, “Addendum to the Reparations Order of 8 March 2021, ICC-01/04-02/06-2659”, 14 July 2023, ICC-01/04-02/06-2858-Conf. A public redacted version was issued on the same day, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2858-Red](#) (“Addendum”), paras 25 and following, 320.

³ Trial Chamber II, “First Decision on the Trust Fund for Victims’ Draft Implementation Plan for Reparations”, 11 August 2023, ICC-01/04-02/06-2860-Conf, para. 185(e) and (f). A public redacted version was notified on 30 August 2023 ([ICC-01/04-02/06-2860-Red](#)).

alia provided information on how the VPRS planned to carry out the victim identification, collection of information and eligibility assessment process.⁴

5. Between January 2024 and October 2025, the Registry submitted seven batches of victim eligibility determinations for reparations and/or priority treatment under the TFV's IIP,⁵ which were all endorsed by the Chamber,⁶ bringing the total number of victims eligible for reparations to this date to 2,355.
6. On 28 October 2025, in its Fifth Periodic Report, the Registry requested an extension of time to continue the victims' eligibility determination for reparations.⁷
7. On 9 December 2025, by email correspondence to the Chamber,⁸ the VPRS submitted a proposal to simplify its system of reporting eligibility determinations, suggesting to adopt an approach that mirrors the 'A-B-C system' endorsed in the Chambers Practice Manual for the participation stage.⁹

⁴ Registry, Annex I to "Registry submission pursuant to ICC-01/04-02/06-2860-Red", 3 November 2023, ICC-01/04-02/06-2878-Conf-AnxI. A public redacted version was notified on 22 November 2023, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2878-AnxI-Red](#). The Chamber further clarified the scope of the conviction for the purposes of eligibility for reparations in its "Decision on the Victims Participation and Reparations Section request for guidance" issued on 31 January 2025 ([ICC-01/04-02/06-2912](#)) and "Decision on the VPRS request for guidance on issues regarding the eligibility for reparations", 16 October 2025, ICC-01/04-02/06-2926-Conf. A public redacted version was issued on the same day, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2926-Red](#).

⁵ The Registry transmitted batches on 23 January 2024 (and 2 February 2024), 28 June 2024, 28 October 2024, 5 and 28 February 2025, 27 June 2025 and 28 October 2025. See respectively their public or public redacted versions: [ICC-01/04-02/06-2890 \(First Notification\)](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2891](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2901-Red \(First Periodic Report\)](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2906-Red \(Second Periodic Report\)](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2913](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2916-Red \(Third Periodic Report\)](#), [ICC-01/04-02/06-2922-Red \(Fourth Periodic Report\)](#) and [ICC-01/04-02/06-2928-Red2 \("Fifth Periodic Report"\)](#).

⁶ See "Second Decision on the Trust Fund for Victims' Draft Implementation Plan for Reparations", 27 February 2024, ICC-01/04-02/06-2894. A public redacted version was notified on 25 July 2024, ICC-01/04-02/06-2894-Red; "Decision on the First Registry Periodic Report on Eligibility Determinations for Reparations", 20 August 2024, ICC-01/04-02/06-2904-Conf. A public redacted version was notified on 11 September 2024, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2904-Red](#) ("First Decision on Eligibility"); "Decision on the Second Registry Periodic Report on Eligibility Determinations for Reparations", 3 December 2024, ICC-01/04-02/06-2910-Conf. A public redacted version was notified on 13 January 2025, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2910-Red](#); "Third decision on the VPRS determinations of victims' eligibility for reparations and priority status", 14 February 2025, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2914](#); "Fourth Decision on the VPRS determinations of victims' eligibility for reparations and priority status", 13 March 2025, [ICC-01/04-02/06-2918](#); "Fifth Decision on the VPRS determinations of victims' eligibility for reparations and priority status", 11 July 2025, ICC-01/04-02/06-2924, and Decision.

⁷ Fifth Periodic Report, paras. 52, 53 and 55.

⁸ Email from VPRS to Chamber, dated 9 December 2025 at 15:14. See also Annex I to Decision.

⁹ ICC, Chambers Practice Manual, Eight Edition, 21 October 2024, <https://www.icc-cpi.int/about/judicial-divisions/chambers-practice-manual> ("Chambers Practice Manual"), para. 96.

8. On 19 December 2025, the Chamber issued the Decision, suspending the initial deadline and ordering the Registry to provide additional submissions on the abovementioned topics by 31 January 2026.¹⁰

III. Applicable Law

9. The Registry makes this submission in accordance with the Decision.

IV. Submissions

A. Monthly numerical projections

10. The table below summarizes the VPRS' expected monthly capacity for identification,¹¹ assessment and notification, along with a projected timeline required for each step to reach the estimate of 10,500 eligible beneficiaries.¹² The three steps are consecutive by design but run in parallel. Furthermore, these estimates encompass projected efficiency gains from innovations gradually put in place and explained in the Fifth Periodic Report (e.g., household form, digital platform for form collection),¹³ and to be expected from ongoing initiatives to further optimize the process, as detailed below.

¹⁰ As 31 January 2026 falls on a Saturday, the present filing has been filed on the first working day following this date, as per reg. 33(1)(d) of the Regulations of the Court.

¹¹ Identification encompasses the steps of locating potential beneficiaries, meeting with the relevant victims in person, collecting their application forms and conducting an initial check for completeness. Monthly capacity for identification thus accounts for time needed to assist victims in completing applications (*i.e.*, number of forms collected per month, reported in the Fifth Periodic Report, para. 29) and to perform the initial review.

¹² See Addendum, para. 320. This target number has been used to calculate the number of victims remaining and the projected timeline for completion. However, the total number of potential beneficiaries that the VPRS will ultimately identify, assess, and notify will undoubtedly vary. Notably, the VPRS and the former common legal representatives of victims ("CLR" see *infra* fn. 33) in the proceedings have faced challenges in locating some of the participating victims for the purpose of completing their applications or notify them of their eligibility. It is therefore expected that a subset of applications will likely remain incomplete despite follow up efforts or result in negative eligibility determinations. Moreover, the Registry previously reported the challenging security situation in the field that has impeded its capacity to reach out to victims.

¹³ See Fifth Periodic Report, paras 46 to 49.

(unit: number of victims applying for reparations¹⁴)

	Completed	Remaining	Monthly processing capacity ¹⁵	Projected timeline for completion
Identification	4,300 ¹⁶	6,150	500	2 years
Assessment	2,500 ¹⁷	7,000 ¹⁸	300-400 ¹⁹	2 years ²⁰
Notification	382 ²¹	10,000	480	2 years

11. In comparison, without the recent and ongoing efficiency measures, identification, assessment and notification capacity would remain at 140/month (identification), 200/month (assessment) and 260/month (notification), which would lead to even longer completion timelines.

12. The table above extrapolates in a steady linear line to the future in order to come to relevant completion timelines. It is expected that some procedural routines may over time shorten the discrepancy between assessment and notification—particularly since for newly identified potential beneficiaries, assessment and notification may go hand-in-hand, and IT developments and reallocation of resources will lead to a significant increase in monthly capacity. The projected

¹⁴ As detailed in para. 13, the figures are calculated based on there being an average of three members per household form, which is the average for forms collected in the context of the *Ongwen* case.

¹⁵ Based on the current process in place in the Democratic Republic of Congo (“DRC”) of collecting individual applications on paper forms.

¹⁶ Approximate total number of victims that have applied for reparations in the Case thus far. This includes participating victims and victims newly identified by the VPRS.

¹⁷ Approximate number of victims the VPRS assessed to be eligible for reparations thus far. This includes 2,487 victims files assessed as eligible by the Chamber (*see* Decision, para. 8 and Addendum para.144) and transmitted to the TFV.

¹⁸ This estimate does not take into account approximately 1,000 dossiers that have already been assessed but no decision has been issued yet, including dossiers preliminary assessed as incomplete or outside the scope of the conviction, and for which receipt of supplementary information is pending.

¹⁹ This figure is expressed as a range, derived from estimates in the *Ongwen* case where the electronic household form is already deployed in the field and partial data automation in VAMS is in place, with further enhancements scheduled in the coming months. Although there are expected benefits from these prior developments, the precise efficiency gains of this innovation in the Ntaganda context remain to be fully established.

²⁰ This timeline takes into account that efficiency gains will be gradual.

²¹ Upon agreement with the TFV, the VPRS currently notifies only beneficiaries from the former child soldiers group who were not already found eligible for reparations in the *Lubanga* case. The notification of eligibility to the victims of the attacks will follow in due course.

notification timeline may thus turn out to closely match the assessment timeline, or lag by only a small margin.

13. The above estimates are contingent upon five key conditions: (i) the forms from newly identified victims will predominantly be household forms, consisting of three household members on average;²² (ii) the Section will maintain its current level of resources allocated to the Case;²³ (iii) there will be no major disruptions to the use of the IT tools already in place nor to the new ones that the Section is currently developing;²⁴ (iv) the Section will have continuous access to the victims; and (v) the quality and integrity of the process will not be otherwise compromised.²⁵
14. The Registry emphasizes here that while the use of electronic household forms creates efficiencies, it still remains contingent on the security situation in the field and resulting access to communities - in particular as it seeks to expand its operations to locations that it has so far not been able to reach.
15. Lastly, an increased level of resources dedicated to the Case would also boost the processing capacity and thus reduce the timeline required for completion. Yet, with the *Ongwen* reparation process in parallel and reparation proceedings in *Yekatom/Ngaissona*, *Al Hassan* and *Abd-Al-Rahman* commencing in 2026, an

²² This first assumption is impacted by a number of contextual factors difficult to quantify at this stage. Some eligible victims will likely pass away while their applications are being processed, triggering additional processes for family members to resume action. Not all victims identified are assessed to be eligible for reparations, increasing the total number of individuals that must be identified, assessed and notified to reach the target estimate. The current average of three persons per household form may also increase overtime. Finally, the level of IT awareness of VPRS intermediaries will decide over the success of a purely electronic victim data collection system; specific training will be administered on a periodic basis to ensure completeness of forms. At this stage, it is difficult to anticipate the magnitude of any of the aforementioned contingencies.

²³ The current resources devoted to the case are divided as follows: (i) two Full Time Equivalent ("FTE") (Field Assistant and Field Officer), assisted by 12 field clerks tasked with identification and notification; (ii) 3 FTE (Data Processing Assistant) for data registration; and (iii) 1.5 FTE (Assistant/Associate Legal Officer) for assessment. Resource allocation may be impacted by competing deadlines in other cases which may divert resources.

²⁴ This third assumption requires continuous access to the VPRS' core IT tools currently in use, as already outlined in the Submission.

²⁵ Difficulties to access victims arise, *inter alia*, from the security conditions prevailing in the field (item (iv)), weather conditions—particularly during the rainy season, when travel becomes more difficult—as well as from differing levels of sickness of the population which makes individuals more or less available to meet with representatives of the VPRS (item (v)).

increased capacity level does not appear realistic given the anticipated competing needs in these cases.²⁶

B. Innovations and proposed procedural amendments

a. Innovations

16. As mentioned, the VPRS has already started to implement a number of innovations and continues to monitor and refine its processes to ensure that any new efficiency continues to improve with time. Since October 2025, for instance, process optimization has boosted the Section's assessment capacity. Further automation steps to improve data processing capacities are being incorporated in phases, with the next major update planned in mid-February 2026 and expected to take full effect in March 2026. Similarly, the process for form collection will continue to be optimized, and internal feedback and targeted trainings for field intake will improve the quality of applications received, thereby gradually reducing the level of review and follow up required at the identification stage.
17. While efficiency gains from such routine updates will likely be smaller further along in the process, the VPRS is committed to a continued review of its procedures to identify additional areas where processing could be optimized and accelerated, and exploration of additional IT tools to further accelerate the pace and optimize data transfers from the field to HQ and from VPRS to the TFV. Whenever necessary, the VPRS will also review its strategies for reaching out to victims to ensure maximum efficiency.
18. In this regard, the Registry continues to explore manners by which victims who are located outside its reach can safely and securely apply for reparations in due time. The VPRS will ensure that any potential new outreach to victims upholds good practices in interacting with victims and the 'do no harm' principle, and keeps the risk of fraud at a minimum. Related to the above, and more generally in terms of

²⁶ *The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda, The Prosecutor v. Alfred Yekatom and Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona, The Prosecutor v. Al Hassan Ag Abdoul Aziz Ag Mohamed Ag Mahmoud and The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb")*.

innovation, the VPRS continues to coordinate closely with the TFV. The VPRS and the TFV have, for instance, agreed to set up a joint mechanism for ensuring integrity in the process throughout both the administrative eligibility process and the implementation of reparations, and have been exploring ways to further streamline joint processes such as the adoption of shared IT tools and databases. The Registry also notes that the PIOS' outreach team continues to conduct outreach activities in support of the administrative eligibility process in close coordination and collaboration with VPRS as well as TFV and other relevant actors.

b. Proposed procedural amendments

19. The Registry proposes the following procedural amendments to the current process that will create further efficiencies. As these amendments would depart from the current process ordered by the Chamber, they require the Chamber's approval.²⁷

▪ *'A-B-C' approach adapted to reparations*

20. The first proposed procedural amendment is the adoption of a modified version of the 'A-B-C' approach²⁸ adapted to the *Ntaganda* reparations process.²⁹

21. The A-B-C approach was endorsed in the Chamber's Practice Manual as the standard "generally [...] applicable at all stages of proceedings".³⁰ Its adoption at the participation stage in various cases at the Court, including in the *Ntaganda* case,³¹ has resulted in significant time and resource savings, notably by allowing the VPRS to process a higher number of victim applications in all cases in which it was adopted. Similarly, adopting the A-B-C approach at the reparations stage, as described *infra*, would release the VPRS resources devoted to producing the

²⁷ See Decision, para. 17, where the Chamber requests additional explanations for this proposal.

²⁸ See *supra*, footnote 9.

²⁹ The Registry notes that the A-B-C approach, as outlined in the Chambers Practice Manual, requires amendments to be implemented at the reparations stage of proceedings. For example, since the parties in the proceedings (the Office of the Prosecutor and the Defence) are no longer involved at this stage of the proceedings, they would not be invited to make observations on group C applications.

³⁰ Chambers Practice Manual, para. 96.

³¹ Trial Chamber VI, "Decision on victims' participation in trial proceedings", 6 February 2015, ICC-01/04-02/06-449, para. 24.

detailed tables currently filed to the Chamber, enabling their redeployment toward increasing the output of legal assessment of applications.

22. Moreover, with the A-B-C approach the Chamber would retain the oversight over the administrative screening of reparations applications,³² by maintaining its full authority to determine eligibility following the Registry's initial categorization based on clearly established requirements. This approach further preserves the Registry's ability to seize the Chamber in case of complex reparation applications, notably through the presentation of group C applications.
23. The following outlines the proposed A-B-C approach adapted to the context of the Ntaganda reparations process:

- the Registry classifies the applicants into three categories:
 - Group A : applicants who are clearly eligible for reparations,
 - Group B : applicants who are clearly not eligible for reparations, and
 - Group C : applicants for whom the Registry could not make a clear determination for any reason.
- The VPRS transmits all complete applications to the Chamber, and, for Group B applications, the relevant CLR,³³ in accordance with the abovementioned grouping, on a rolling basis.
- With each transmission, the VPRS files reports to the Chamber and, for Group B applicants, the relevant CLR, and lists the victim applications falling into the aforementioned three groups.
- The report related to Group A does not include application-by-application reasoning or analysis. Barring a clear, material error in the VPRS' assessment, the Chamber would ratify the assessments regarding these applicants through a decision.

³² This is consistent with the First Decision on DIP, para. 185. f.

³³ As per paras 182 and 185 of the First Decision on DIP, as counsel of the Office of Public Counsel for Victims, Ms Sarah Pellet who represented the group of Victims of Crimes Against Child Soldiers in the proceedings and M. Dmytro Suprun, who represented the group of Victims of the Attacks in the proceedings, provide general support and assistance to any potential beneficiary during the administrative eligibility assessment, particularly regarding those assessed as non-eligible.

- For Group B, the VPRS report identifies the grounds on which the VPRS has assessed the victim not eligible for reparations.
 - For Group C, the VPRS report clearly highlights the issue(s) arising from the transmitted application forms, requesting clear guidance from the Chamber on whether the applicants are eligible for reparations or not.³⁴
- Following the Chamber's determination, the VPRS would proceed with a decision categorizing the concerned applications- i.e. transmit them as Group A or Group B.

▪ *Separate deadlines for identification and eligibility assessment*

24. For the Chamber's suggestion to introduce "separate deadlines for identifying new potential beneficiaries of reparations and for completing the eligibility assessment process",³⁵ the VPRS first observes that the different steps required for its administrative eligibility process naturally entail divergent timelines. Identification of potential beneficiaries necessarily precede the processing and assessment of their forms and the subsequent notification of eligibility status. The amendment suggested by the Chamber may thus help maximize the number of forms collected that can be fully processed and acted upon, allowing more victims to take part in reparations. In the *Abd-Al Rahman* process, Trial Chamber I agreed for the Registry to collect victim applications up to a certain procedural juncture, and to continue to file the assessments of these forms in the succeeding procedural phase,³⁶ effectively extending the Registry's time for submission of victims applications by more than a year while at the same time providing clear timelines for the overall process. A similar logic could be contemplated by the Chamber in setting deadlines in the current process, thus enabling the Registry to continue the

³⁴ As with participation, the VPRS will submit to the Chamber a sample of applications illustrating the legal issues requiring determination. The Chamber's rulings on these sample applications will then guide the assessment of other applications raising similar issues.

³⁵ Decision, para. 14.

³⁶ *The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman*, Trial Chamber I, "Decision on the Second Registry's Request to Extend the Time Limit to Submit Victim Applications for Participation", 16 May 2023, ICC-02/05-01/20-943, para. 12 (a), (c).

assessment/notification process after the identification deadline has passed. If separate deadlines are adopted, the VPRS would recommend first setting the deadline for identification - to be followed by a second deadline for the remaining steps. Ideally, the latter deadline could be determined closer to the first one, based on the total number of forms collected by then and the Section's capacity to process these.³⁷

- Additional recommendations

25. In addition to the innovations in place and the continued fine-tuning, which mainly target procedural blockages and delays identified by the VPRS, procedural amendments could be envisaged to alter or simplify the overall design of the process. The Registry is cognisant that its projections as per the table above exceed substantially the timeline originally set in the Reparations Order. It is therefore eager to continually assess with its partners how the current identification-assessment-notification process could be further streamlined. Yet, certain minimum standards are presently part and parcel of the process, such as the individualized components required even for group-based intake; the need to carry out a legal determination (per individual) that the crimes reported fits the confines of the conviction in the Case (which leads to a level of complexity in the intake form) as well as a priority assessment reflecting the current needs of each individual; and a vehicle to transfer the vetted dossiers to the TFV for implementation, alongside notifying the victims that have applied for reparations.

V. Conclusion

26. The Registry reiterates its request for an extension of time that allows a meaningful number of victims to benefit from reparations in the Case, as deemed appropriate by the Chamber.

³⁷ The delayed setting of the second deadline would have the benefit of ensuring that all forms collected can be processed within the margin of the second timeline.

27. As detailed in paragraphs 20 to 24, the Chamber may wish to consider (i) the adoption of the A-B-C approach ; and (ii) the adoption of separate deadlines—a first one by which the VPRS would strive to finish its identification of potential beneficiaries as close as possible to the estimate of 10,500, followed by a second one to be determined at a later stage for the remainder of the administrative eligibility process. The Registry will continue to engage in strategic discussions with the TFV and other relevant actors to deliberate on concrete options for further process acceleration and innovation, and proposes to report thereon in the coming months.



Marc Dubuisson, Director Division of Judicial Services
on behalf of
Osvaldo Zavala Giler, Registrar

Dated this 2 February 2026

At The Hague, the Netherlands