

ANNEX

Explanatory Annex to Corrigendum* to the “Public Redacted Version of ‘Defence response to CLR1 and CLR2 Observations on Defence Appeal Brief – Part II’, 22 June 2020, ICC-01/04-02/06-2537”, 22 June 2020, ICC-01/04-02/06-2537-Red

1. On 22 June 2020, the Defence filed its Public Redacted Version of “Defence response to CLR1 and CLR2 Observations on Defence Appeal Brief – Part II”.¹
2. When proceeding to file the public redacted version of the aforementioned filing on 22 June 2020, four related mistakes were identified in footnotes 164, 165, 193 and 196, the correction of which will assist the Appeals Chamber and the Parties.
3. The mistake identified in footnotes 193 and 196 also appeared in paragraph 261 of the Defence Appeal Brief –Part II, for which a *corrigendum* was also submitted.
4. Accordingly, the three errors identified in paragraph 2 above have been corrected:
 - (i) **Footnote 164:**
 - Defence Appeal Brief – Part II, para.183 (responding to the argument that corroboration could have been sought from numerous witness during trial with the argument that “Ntaganda identifies no legal basis requiring the Prosecutor to put specific questions to witnesses”).

The corrected footnote reads as follows:

- Defence Appeal Brief – Part II, para.247 (responding to the argument that corroboration could have been sought from numerous witness during trial with the argument that “Ntaganda identifies no legal basis requiring the Prosecutor to put specific questions to witnesses”).

(ii) **Footnote 165:**

- Defence Appeal Brief – Part II, para.183.

The corrected footnote reads as follows:

- Defence Appeal Brief – Part II, para.247.

¹ Public Redacted Version of “Defence response to CLR1 and CLR2 Observations on Defence Appeal Brief – Part II”, 22 June 2020, ICC-01/04-02/06-2537.

(iii) **Footnote 193:**

- **P-0907:**T-29,57:5-6.

The corrected footnote reads as follows:

- **P-0901:**T-29,57:5-6.