

From: Massidda, Paolina
Sent: 24 May 2017 12:40
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Bemba Case - Reparations - Experts
Attachments: BEMBA REP EXPERTS CV [REDACTED] No. 3487-Conf-Anx9.pdf; BEMBA REP EXPERTS CV [REDACTED] No. 3487-Conf-Anx23.pdf; BEMBA REP EXPERTS CV [REDACTED] No. 3487-Conf-Anx3.pdf; BEMBA REP EXPERTS CV [REDACTED] No. 1248-Conf-AnxA.PDF
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear [REDACTED],

In light of the information provided below, and as instructed, the Legal Representatives conferred in order to submit common observations on the proposed experts.

The Legal Representatives respectfully submit the following:

- **Ms [REDACTED]** : Her expertise appears to be extremely streamlined and thus, in their submission, it does not correspond enough to the nature of the case;
- **Ms [REDACTED]** : He has already worked extensively with the Registry and namely with [REDACTED]. Taking into consideration their respective expertise, the Legal Representatives observe that [REDACTED], who is a social psychologist, appears to have a very specialized and relevant expertise in light of the specificities of the case, which adequately complete Mr [REDACTED]'s approach. In this regard, the Legal Representatives would like to suggest that Ms [REDACTED] be chosen as expert in combination with [REDACTED];
- **Ms [REDACTED]** : Notwithstanding the fact that Ms [REDACTED] submitted several observations as an expert and *amicus curiae* in the [REDACTED] case, her wide expertise in the field of academic researches does appear too theoretical at this stage of the procedure.

Taking into consideration the expertise deemed relevant by the Chamber through the two experts who are finally unavailable, Ms [REDACTED] and Ms [REDACTED], the Legal Representatives respectfully indicate the following four other experts as possible alternatives, three of them drawn from the Registrar's initial List of Experts (#3487 and confidential annexes).

- 1) Ms [REDACTED], as developed above, in combination with [REDACTED].
- 2) Ms [REDACTED] : Her name was proposed by the UN Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner for the purpose of this procedure. A Barrister ([REDACTED]), Ms [REDACTED] appears to have developed a wide expertise as adviser in relation to mass crimes and gender crimes. Her expertise seems notably relevant with regard to the issue of prioritization and differentiation of categories of victims, including victims of sexual violence and child victims. Moreover, the latter appears to be perfectly bilingual, which represents an advantage in this procedure. Her expertise appears to be the most relevant to replace the one initially sought through [REDACTED].
- 3) Mr [REDACTED] : As a clinician psychologist, his extensive practical expertise in contact with individuals affected by a diversity of traumas, notably victims of mass crimes, appears to be of high

relevance for this case; notably with regard to the psychological and psychosocial services that could be offered to victims. Furthermore, the [REDACTED] he directs ([REDACTED]) appears to have broad relevant expertise that could be beneficial in the context of his possible Report to the Chamber. Mr [REDACTED] seems to have the most relevant expertise to replace the one initially envisaged through Ms [REDACTED].

4) Mr [REDACTED]: Although not in the Registrar's initial List, [REDACTED] already intervened as [REDACTED] on sexual violence as tool of war [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and his expertise as [REDACTED] psychiatrist who has been working with many victims in CAR and especially victims of sexual violence committed at a large scale could adequately be harnessed at this new stage of the proceedings. Ms [REDACTED] has recently been in contact with him and he confirmed his availability should the Chamber decide to appoint him.

The CVs of the above-mentioned four experts are attached to the present e-mail for the convenience of the Chamber and of the other participants. Said CVs are annexed to the Registrar's List filed on 22 December 2016 (#3487) and, for [REDACTED], was submitted earlier in the case (#1248-Conf).

In light of the information already available to the Chamber and the needs of the procedure at this stage, the Legal Representatives respectfully submit that the four above experts would bring the relevant expertise required by the Chamber and in the best interests of the future beneficiary victims.

Respectfully submitted,
Paolina Massidda and Marie-Edith Douzima-Lawson

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2017 14:23
To: Douzima Lawson, Marie-Edith; Haynes, Peter; Massidda, Paolina
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Bemba Case - Reparations - Experts
Importance: High

Dear Counsel,

The Chamber sought the views of the parties and OPCV on possible experts in its Order issued on 21 February 2017. The Registry has informed the Chamber that two of the experts listed in the 21 February Rrder are no longer available to assist [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]).

The Chamber is considering replacing them with the following experts to assist it in its determinations. They were all included in the Registry's list of experts filed on 22 December 2016 (#3487 and confidential annexes). Their CVs are attached.

- 1) [REDACTED]
- 2) [REDACTED]
- 3) [REDACTED] (subject to confirmation of her availability)

The defence for Mr Bemba, the legal representative of victims and the OPCV may provide their views on these experts by Wednesday 24 March 2017 COB.

Best regards, [REDACTED]