

Explanatory note

1. Paragraph 87 of the Prosecution's response was originally filed as reading in relevant part (with emphasis added):

[...] Yet the second part of the second sentence of article 127(2) would then address this situation, by providing that the absence of cooperation obligations **does imply** that the Court is prevented from continuing to consider such matters. [...]

2. As clear from the broader context of the paragraph, this is a typographical error, where the word "not" was inadvertently omitted in the final version of the text as filed.
3. Accordingly, the corrected version of paragraph 87 of the Prosecution's response now reads in relevant part (with emphasis added):

[...] Yet the second part of the second sentence of article 127(2) would then address this situation, by providing that the absence of cooperation obligations **does not imply** that the Court is prevented from continuing to consider such matters. [...]