

1 International Criminal Court
2 Trial Chamber I
3 Situation: Republic of Côte d'Ivoire
4 In the case of The Prosecutor v. Laurent Gbagbo and Charles Blé
5 Goudé - ICC-02/11-01/15
6 Presiding Judge Cuno Tarfusser, Judge Olga Herrera Carbuccion and
7 Judge Geoffrey Henderson
8 Trial Hearing - Courtroom 1
9 Monday, 29 May 2017
10 (The hearing starts in open session at 9.24 a.m.)
11 THE COURT USHER: [9:24:40] All rise.
12 The International Criminal Court is now in session.
13 Please be seated.
14 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:25:02] Good morning.
15 Before calling the witness on the stand, I think we need to know how we go forward,
16 because next week is basically nothing because we have problems with 607 and with
17 156. And so one solution which is very much suggested by the Chamber, well, it's
18 not a solution, but it's at least to have somebody on the stand next week, is the
19 following, that expert witness 626, which should have been, meant to be here today
20 and, therefore, was for sure prepared, and following the email of Mr MacDonald of
21 22 May, was somehow suggested to be postponed to put him close to 583, just to
22 anticipate 583 for next week together with 626, which should not be a big problem, I
23 would say, if he's a forensic expert in the research unit of the OTP. So it should not
24 be a big problem.
25 Therefore in any case, in order to have somebody next week, I would very much

1 suggest - when I say "very much suggest," I hope this rings a bell, like the interpreters
2 always say - to have as soon as possible also this week here 583 and 626. And then
3 we'll see, because I've asked also the VWU to try to find out how the next witnesses
4 after 607, 156, how is the stand of those witnesses.

5 Mr MacDonald.

6 MR MACDONALD: [9:27:36] Good morning, your Honour. Indeed, I think 516 is
7 the more uncertain of the two between 607 and 156, so therefore we're still working
8 on having the Witness 607 appear. Now, the only solution would be by video link
9 on the week of the 5th.

10 What I can inform the Chamber is yes, 583 being an expert of the OTP, we can always
11 call him to be present and testify on Monday. It will not be possible, I think, for 626
12 to follow immediately after 583 because of his schedule so I think that would be
13 impossible.

14 Now, just to inform --

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:28:32] That would be to be explored, I would
16 say. Not impossible, it's to be explored, because we have a week. I think if we start
17 today suggesting this, I would say that it could be possible.

18 MR MACDONALD: [9:28:51] We, of course, will verify with him, your Honour, but
19 I know that all three experts had prior engagements in the next three weeks which
20 made the scheduling also more complicated than usual.

21 What I can tell your Honour is that for the week of the 5th also, is that Witness 164 is
22 available but would have to be done by video link. And also under the control of
23 my colleagues of the legal representatives if they're dual status crime-base witnesses
24 P-237 and P-172 could also be possible. So one option, your Honour, to
25 contemplate --

1 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: 237?

2 MR MACDONALD: 172. So I'll repeat that just to get the numbers straight.

3 Insider witness 164, who was already planned after 156 and before the summer recess,
4 and then two crime-base witnesses of the 3 March incident, Witnesses 237 and 172,
5 but that were scheduled later, I understand.

6 Now, today this scenario of certainly 164 in the week of the 5 June by video link could
7 be also an opportunity to slot him in there. I will come back to the Chamber the
8 second session today. We're still liaising, of course, ourselves with VWU, your
9 Honour, that's what we're doing. Also, we will immediately verify with 583 if ever
10 he was to go on any missions or not. Thank you.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:31:29] Thank you.

12 Maître Altit.

13 MR ALTIT: [9:31:36] (Interpretation) Thank you, Mr President. Mr President,
14 ladies and gentlemen of the Court, it's a little bit difficult for the Defence to adapt
15 permanently, and of course we need a minimum amount of time in order to prepare
16 ourselves. With your leave, I would like to check that we are at least in agreement
17 for some of the witnesses under the reservation of the information to be provided by
18 Mr MacDonald at a later stage.

19 Can we say that P-626 and P-583, as you just suggested a moment ago, Mr President,
20 are to testify next week and, if so, this does solve partially the issue of next week,
21 because the only alternative solution that we would suggest or that Mr MacDonald
22 suggests in fact is video links and you know how problematic video links are for us,
23 because they are not entirely testimony in due form because we like the physical and
24 interactive aspect of a testimony, which we believe is fundamental.

25 So, Mr President, may we ask or may we hope, rather, that we have a decision from

1 the Chamber during the day so that we are in a position to prepare ourselves? These
2 are important witnesses that we are talking about here.

3 Now, P-626 and P-583, if that is the decision of the Chamber, we will prepare
4 ourselves to question them next week. P-516 and P-6164 will not be able to come,
5 and we are opposed to that. And as for P-103, I'm not sure that I understood what
6 was being said. And once again we might have some further information, but I note,
7 for things to be clear, is that P-607 is not coming. We need to know that because this
8 is a big witness, and if that witness does not come, then we can prepare the others.

9 But if we remain in uncertainty, we can't prepare things at the very last moment
10 because we have meagre means. We need to know things, at least as far as I'm
11 concerned, Mr President.

12 We are available to you to discuss the matter. If anything is to be discussed as for
13 the obligations that the Prosecution has, of course we understand that, and things that
14 might have been unplanned, we also understand that.

15 MR MACDONALD: [9:34:38] Additional information, your Honour -- sorry to cut in,
16 it's in relation to 626, so the sound expert. He is on vacation abroad from 2 to 12
17 June, just to inform you. Now, in relation to 607, the only way it would be possible
18 again is by video link. So the only witness that could be here, and we're trying to
19 reach him as we speak in person, would indeed be OTP expert 583.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:35:20] Well, which I suppose could be here
21 also this week to fill up this week.

22 MR MACDONALD: [9:35:25] Yes, this week, your Honour, of course.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:35:27] Yes.

24 MR MACDONALD: [9:35:28] After the current two experts.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:35:30] Yes, yes.

1 Mr Knoops.

2 MR KNOOPS: [9:35:34] Good morning, Mr President. We would appreciate to be
3 informed today by the definite schedule in order to prepare our team. We are
4 flexible but I think it's fair that ultimately, at the end of the day, it is clear for our team
5 what witness is to be expected next week. For the rest, I refer to my comments of
6 last week. Thank you.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:36:04] Well, what we have to do this week for
8 sure is to find out what is possible before the week of break, which is the week from
9 the 12th to the 16th. This has to be obviously done today and we will for sure come
10 out with a decision today what relates to the witnesses in the next week. But the
11 Chamber wants also to come up with a more structured decision which goes
12 following the list filed by the Prosecutor, the last list filed by the Prosecutor of
13 witnesses, which will go to the end of the Prosecutor's case, so that we know at least
14 we have a deadline, an end deadline. But this will be done not before Wednesday,
15 because it has also implication with the Rule 68 decisions and has some other
16 implications and, of course, all this without prejudice to what can't be foreseen.
17 But I think that as of today we should know more or less where we end from a timely
18 point of view the case of the Prosecution, and this will be done by Friday. And I can
19 also say that we will re-start after the summer recess on 28 August, Monday, 28
20 August.

21 MR MACDONALD: [9:37:52] Thank you very much. That's what I was going to
22 ask.

23 Your Honour, just one last thing since we're on the schedule. The Prosecution has a
24 number of witnesses left, some of which, some of whom we will not be calling, and
25 that's why some witnesses had been pushed back. So our list of witnesses will again

1 be reduced.

2 Now, just to make it clear, the case evolves. Evidence, witnesses testify, and then
3 some witnesses are not necessary to call anymore when they're testifying on similar or
4 same topics. So this is why some witnesses will not be called.

5 Now, again, I'm sorry for my colleagues for what happened recently. It is certainly
6 out of our control, your Honour. Some witnesses have certain needs, certain
7 requests, certain positions, and also we've been struggling, and I'm saying this openly,
8 with our point persons in country, which impacts then on VWU, who work with the
9 same point persons. And we're trying to address this issue so that the response time
10 is much faster, because the requests for legal assistance in the matter of these
11 witnesses was sent weeks ago, if not four weeks ago. It was usually -- it's much
12 faster, but for some reason, it's been stalling a little bit, as we can see. Thank you.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:39:58] Thank you.

14 Legal representative.

15 MS MASSIDDA: [9:40:04] Thank you. Good morning, your Honour. We are
16 quite flexible on the schedule. As already told to the Chamber last week, our only
17 problem is for 5 June. It's the only day in which I will be unable to sit in the
18 courtroom, and this, of course, refers only to dual status individuals 172 and 237.
19 Thank you very much.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:40:27] Thank you. I said what I had to say,
21 and I think it's time now to call the witness. And I'm referring to Witness 601, which
22 was authorised to have his expertise with him in order to be able to consult his own
23 expertise.

24 (The witness enters the courtroom)

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:42:13] Good morning. Good morning,

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Mr Kloosterman. You have to switch.

2 WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

3 THE WITNESS: [9:42:21] Good morning.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:42:24] Thank you. Before starting the
5 examination by the parties, I have to give you some information and do some things
6 we're obliged to, like identifying you completely with name, date of birth and
7 occupation and things like that.

8 Can you please tell us this, give us this information. Thank you.

9 THE WITNESS: [9:42:57] My name is Ate D. Kloosterman. I was born 25
10 September 1951 in Surhuisterveen in The Netherlands. My occupation since 1979 is
11 a forensic DNA scientist at the Netherlands Forensic Institute in The Hague.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:43:23] And you're a Dutch citizen.

13 THE WITNESS: [9:43:25] And I'm a Dutch citizen, yes.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:43:28] Now, since you will be speaking English,
15 like I do, and these proceedings are conducted both in French and in English
16 simultaneously, it is important for us to speak slowly in order to allow a sound
17 interpretation and recording of what we say. This is quite easy if we speak two
18 different languages, but which will then be with the Defence teams who will speak
19 French, but as long as we speak English, it's a bit difficult to comply with it. But in
20 case you go too fast, I will give you a sign just for the benefit of our people in the
21 booth. Thank you.

22 This Chamber has been established to try the case of the Prosecutor against
23 Mr Gbagbo and Mr Blé Goudé. And you as an expert are called to do your part for
24 the search of the truth. And this obviously within the area of your expertise and
25 within the area you were asked to give your expertise. Obviously, you will be asked

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 questions by the lawyers in here, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Defence teams,
2 and maybe also by the Judges, if something is not clear or for us not clear. And your
3 only duty, what I am sure you know, is you have to tell the truth. And to this effect,
4 I would ask you to read the formula you have in front of you. Thank you.

5 THE WITNESS: [9:45:30] I solemnly declare that I will speak the truth, the whole
6 truth, and nothing but the truth.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:45:39] Thank you very much.

8 Now I think we are ready for the questions by the Office of the Prosecutor, Mr
9 Demirdjian.

10 If you at any point in time you have some concerns to raise, raise them with me.

11 Okay.

12 Mr Demirdjian.

13 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:45:59] Thank you, Mr President. Good morning, your

14 Honours. Good morning to everyone in and around the courtroom.

15 QUESTIONED BY MR DEMIRDJIAN:

16 Q. [9:46:08] And to you, Mr Kloosterman, good morning.

17 You've already explained to the Court that you were working at the NFI since 1979,
18 therefore, I would like to begin with your educational background. We also have
19 your resume, which we will look at in a moment. Is it correct to say that in 1976 you
20 obtained a university degree in biochemistry, clinical chemistry, and clinical
21 immunology at Utrecht University?

22 A. [9:46:45] That is correct.

23 Q. [9:46:46] Very well. Following this, is it correct to say that you were a research
24 fellow?

25 A. [9:46:57] Yes. After my study, I went to the central blood -- Blood Transfusion

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Centre in Amsterdam, where I was for more than three years a research fellow.

2 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:47:07] Excuse me. Could we not just, if there
3 would be an agreement, just take the curriculum vitae and put it in the record of the
4 case?

5 MR O'SHEA: [9:47:29] We have no objection to that, your Honour.

6 MR KNOOPS: [9:47:32] We have no objection.

7 MS MASSIDDA: [9:47:34] We have no objection.

8 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:47:37] Very well, your Honours. The curriculum vitae before
9 us will be CIV-OTP-0098-0608. Now we see it on our screen.

10 Do you see it before you, Mr Kloosterman?

11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:47:54] Yes. We have it. We know it. It's
12 submitted.

13 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:47:57]

14 Q. [9:47:58] And is the curriculum vitae you provided to us, Mr Kloosterman; is
15 that right?

16 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:48:14] Well, it is submitted.

17 THE WITNESS: [9:48:17] This was my version of the CV that was sent by email to
18 ICC.

19 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:48:23]

20 Q. [9:48:23] Very well.

21 Your Honours, I was going to go through the witness's expertise and professional
22 background. I understand we want to fast track the proceedings a bit. However,
23 you do have to accept the witness as an expert before we launch into his report.

24 Therefore, do you wish for me to go through his experience before we hear about the
25 report?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:48:50] Well, it's in here.

2 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:48:52] Yes.

3 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:48:52] Yes, that's it. I would go to the report.

4 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:49:05] Very well. So before I launch into the report, Mr
5 President, I would move to have the Trial Chamber recognise Dr Kloosterman as an
6 expert, and I will use the terms in his report as an expert in forensic investigation of
7 biological traces and DNA and DNA kinship analysis.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:49:25] Okay. Please go ahead.

9 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:49:28] Thank you, Mr President.

10 Q. [9:49:34] Mr Kloosterman, could you tell us a little bit about your workplace, the
11 Netherlands Forensic Institute. I will refer to it as NFI.

12 A. [9:49:45] My workplace is both at the NFI, Netherlands Forensic Institute, and
13 the University of Amsterdam, the UVA, the Universiteit van Amsterdam, where I
14 lecture forensic science, and my specialty there is DNA science, of course. A little bit
15 on the department of DNA at the NFI. I started my career in 1989. Looking back,
16 we were with five, six employees then. At the moment, we are with over 120 people
17 at the department of biology and DNA analysis at the NFI.

18 We have a team of reporting scientists, and we have a team, different team, of people
19 who take care of the evidence, who search the evidence, who extract the evidence for
20 DNA, who analyse the DNA, and who are responsible for getting the profiles. At
21 the end of the process is the DNA scientist, the reporting officer, and I'm one example
22 of them.

23 Q. [9:51:14] Thank you for that clarification, Dr Kloosterman. Before we look at
24 your report, there are some terminologies I would like to establish so that we get an
25 understanding of some of the field-specific terms that are used in it.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 First of all, we will see the term ISO 17025 standards, and that the NFI follows those
2 standards. Could you tell us a little bit about these standards.

3 A. [9:51:55] Yeah, the ISO 17025 standard is a standard for laboratories, not only
4 forensic laboratories, but all kinds of laboratories can have this standard. Especially
5 in the forensic world it's important, especially for DNA scientists, that the analysis is
6 undertaken by an accredited laboratory, that you know the procedures of that
7 laboratory, and that you know those procedures are checked, and that the laboratory
8 which has the accreditation is tested every 12 months by an independent party, as in
9 The Netherlands, the counsel for accreditation.

10 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [9:52:39] May I say that also the ISO certificate is
11 something which is known, what is an ISO, the quality, the quality certification. I
12 think we should go to the report.

13 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [9:52:58] very well, your Honours.

14 Q. [9:53:16] Now, Mr Kloosterman, could you explain to us when the NFI receives
15 a request for DNA identification, what is the process within the NFI?

16 A. [9:53:30] Are you referring to report number, because here we have quite a few
17 reports here.

18 Q. [9:53:39] I'm talking about the general process before looking at the specific,
19 when you receive a request --

20 A. [9:53:45] Yes.

21 Q. [9:53:45] -- from an external agency or like ourselves, the Court, when a request
22 for DNA identification is received, what is the process within the NFI?

23 A. [9:53:56] Yes.

24 Q. [9:53:56] From the moment you receive the request until you produce the report.

25 A. [9:54:00] Yeah, in this case we had I think telephonic conversation that this case

1 will be brought to the NFI for DNA research and DNA identification work. So we
2 make an appointment with the people who bring in the case that we sit ready to hear
3 their stories and to take receipt of the items they have with them.

4 So we got some explanation about the case and about the materials which are brought
5 to the NFI for DNA analysis. All the items have a unique identity seal both from the
6 ICC as well as from the NFI. Those unique NFI seals were given when the case was
7 brought in at the NFI and were immediately given these unique identity seals.

8 This seal is a crucial element in our DNA analysis because every step in the analysis is
9 done under this specific number. So that's the first step, provide everything with
10 unique identity seals.

11 The next step is, in this case we got both reference samples and items, reference
12 samples from the bodies, get those separated, do them in separate analysis, important
13 for our quality assured laboratories to have the possibility for contamination as low as
14 possible, and we take care of that process.

15 So the next step actually is get the DNA out of the items and the reference samples.

16 And for a reference sample, that's quite an easy process. In this case, we had to do
17 with bone and teeth, which is a much more tedious process because you have to grind
18 the bones and the teeth before you can get -- before you can extract the DNA from the
19 bone or the teeth.

20 Can I continue?

21 Q. [9:56:40] Please do so, yes.

22 A. [9:56:44] Then we have the DNA in an extract in a watery solution. An
23 important next step is that you know how much DNA is in that extract, so we
24 quantify the amount of DNA in the extract. If the DNA concentration is extremely
25 low, we report this with a few items. Then the possibility that you get a DNA

1 problem with that sample is extremely low. When the DNA concentration is high,
2 we expect to get a DNA profile from that extract.
3 So, after knowing all the DNA concentrations, the next step in the process is the DNA
4 amplification. Before we can analyse the DNA, it's so little amount of DNA, we have
5 to amplify the DNA first, which is a routine process in every forensic laboratory, but
6 not only in forensic laboratories but also in laboratory that deal with clinical genetics.
7 After we amplify the DNA, we analyse the DNA. We have enough DNA then to get
8 the specific information on the areas of DNA where we are interested in. In the
9 forensic world, interested in areas of the DNA that are definitely called those areas
10 loci that are different between different individuals. They have a high probability to
11 be different. Because that's our work, at the end of the process, we would like to say,
12 okay, this item belongs to that individual. You can only achieve that by looking to
13 stretches of DNA that differ among different people.
14 We did it also in this case by using a routine method, our routine system looking at 15
15 DNA loci at the same time, those loci that are variable, variable between humans.
16 One important locus is a so-called sex locus, which look to a marker, sex
17 chromosomes. Women have two X chromosomes, males have an X and a Y
18 chromosome. So this is extremely helpful in these identification cases that you know
19 that the individual, looking at the unknown, is a male or a female, an important first
20 step in the identification process.

21 Q. [9:59:45] Before you continue, Mr Kloosterman, can I ask you very briefly, for
22 the Chamber's understanding, when you mention "loci."

23 A. [9:59:51] Yes.

24 Q. [9:59:51] Yes, what are we talking about exactly?

25 A. [9:59:55] We are talking about specific spot on the DNA, a spot that we know,

1 that we have identified, we know exactly where it is and we know exactly how it
2 behaves. The DNA, the human DNA has millions of different loci, and I told you we
3 are interested in those loci that are variable between different people. We have
4 hundreds of thousands, so like millions of those area, as in the forensic world we
5 selected between 15 and 25 of those specific loci, that we compare DNA profiles over
6 borders, between different countries, and even between different continents. So we
7 harmonise on that.

8 Q. [10:00:45] Now, you spoke about, in this specific case, having to grind a tooth.
9 Just one question on this issue, is DNA found in particular parts of the body or can
10 you find it in any parts of the body?

11 A. [10:01:05] You can find in every part of the body. Every part of the body that
12 carries cells has DNA in the nucleus. So every part of the body contains DNA, but
13 some parts have a much higher concentration than other parts. And the bones and
14 the teeth are known for they have a very low DNA concentration, but the good news
15 about these bones and teeth is that the DNA is well conserved there, that we can also
16 get a DNA profile from those bones and teeth even after many, many years.

17 Q. [10:01:41] Now, you mentioned to us the terms "cells" and "nucleus." I'd like to
18 focus on nucleus for a moment.

19 A. [10:01:59] Yes.

20 Q. [10:01:59] First of all, are there different *types of DNA?

21 A. [10:02:04] There are different types of DNA. In this aspect in respect to this
22 case only, the autosomal DNA is relevant. But apart from the DNA in the cells, we
23 also have DNA -- separate from the DNA in a cell nucleus, we also have DNA
24 mitochondrial DNA outside a nucleus which can also be important in identification
25 cases, but not in this case.

1 Q. [10:02:34] So for the purposes of this case, it was the autosomal DNA?

2 A. [10:02:44] Yeah, it was the DNA from the nucleus which was relevant.

3 Q. [10:02:52] Now, can you explain to us how DNA was extracted? You were
4 talking about grinding the samples that you had. How was the sample then
5 analysed to obtain a DNA profile?

6 A. [10:03:07] What I tried to explain, the first step is the amplification process so
7 you know how much DNA you've got in your extract. You know the optimal
8 amount of DNA that you need for amplification. And those steps are done in little
9 closed laboratory tubes. The extract is in a tube.

10 Summary agents are added. The tube goes into a thermocycle and that thermocycle
11 does the work. And after an hour or so, the DNA is amplified millions of times so
12 we can analyse it easier. Is all the DNA amplified? No, only the parts of the DNA
13 we're interested in, the loci we're interested in are amplified and analysed.

14 Q. [10:04:00] Now, we will look at the report in a moment, but just before that point
15 I would like to ask you, with respect to DNA of a specific individual, how does that,
16 the DNA of that person, relate to relatives or parents?

17 A. [10:04:21] Yeah. Important about DNA is that you inherit it: Half of the DNA
18 you get from your mother and the other half of the DNA you get from your father.
19 So that makes DNA also an extremely useful instrument in identification cases,
20 because when you have a father or a mother, or a son or a daughter available, you can
21 identify such a person because you can recognise the pieces of the DNA that were
22 inherited from the parents from that certain individual. So that makes DNA such a
23 powerful means for identifying individuals, and that's also what we used in our
24 laboratory.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:05:14] Can we, excuse me, can we go to the

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 specific points, because there are lots of things known. I would go to the samples
2 and the results and the --

3 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [10:05:31] Very well, your Honour.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:05:32] Yes.

5 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [10:05:33] Yes, your Honours. I just wanted to make sure that
6 DNA terminology has been established before we launch into the report. I have one
7 last term and I will get to the report.

8 Q. [10:05:42] Mr Kloosterman, we also see the term "allele" in the report.

9 A. [10:05:47] Yes.

10 Q. [10:05:48] So could you explain to us what that is?

11 A. [10:05:50] Yeah, so I explained about loci, that in the loci of the forensic
12 community, they have variable. So that means you have different alternative,
13 alternatives like a blood group. Some people have blood group A; other have blood
14 group B; other have blood group O. Those A, B and O are what we call alleles. The
15 same is true on the stretches of DNA that we investigate, when you look in the
16 population, you see for every loci between 8 and 20 different alleles. 8, and people
17 can be different at that specific locus, and we have to have a name for it, and those
18 names are the alleles.

19 Q. [10:06:56] I think there is also "allele frequency" is a term?

20 A. [10:06:59] Yes.

21 Q. [10:06:59] Can you specify what that is?

22 A. [10:07:03] Yes. After we have made the comparisons between the different
23 profiles, for example, between a putative father and his son and we see those profiles
24 give a familial match, the next question is of course, yes, what does it say, this match?
25 How strong is the scientific evidence in this case? Before we can say something

1 about that, we have to see to the allele that transferred from that person to the child
2 and we must have information, yeah, how rare is that allele that was transferred from
3 parent to offspring.
4 So we take a population sample and we measure the alleles in that population sample.
5 Those population samples can be hundreds of different individuals, non-related
6 individuals. We analyse those individuals and we see how frequent is the allele then.
7 You can compare it to how frequently is the blood group A. How frequent is the
8 blood group B? How frequent is the blood group O in that specific population?
9 You can only do that by testing a lot of different individuals. So we need that
10 information to be able to say something about the evidential strengths of the familial
11 match.

12 Q. [10:08:39] The report that I would like us to look at is the one dated 13 May.
13 For the record, it is CIV-OTP-0084-3930. For your purposes, Professor Kloosterman,
14 the NFI case number is 2014-0523159.

15 A. [10:09:11] It has request number?

16 Q. [10:09:14] Three.

17 A. [10:09:15] Request number 3. I've got it in front of me.

18 Q. [10:09:25] Okay. It's the one that says amended report, is that right?

19 A. [10:09:29] Yes.

20 Q. [10:09:32] I do not see it on the screen yet. Yes. If we can go to the cover page,
21 please. Thank you.

22 The report is confidential, as it contains the names of protected witnesses.

23 Very well. Now, before we go into the substance, Professor Kloosterman, can you
24 tell us, at the bottom of the page we see the term "amended report." Could you just
25 explain why the term "amended" is added here?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 A. [10:10:15] Yeah, because we had another report in this case a month earlier or so,
2 which was from 27 March 2015. And we saw after this was sent that -- we saw that
3 we made some typographical errors in this report. So we brought out a new report,
4 which we called "amended report," and that is from 13 May 2015.

5 Q. [10:10:51] Okay.

6 A. [10:10:51] And what has been corrected is in the report from May 2015.

7 Q. [10:10:59] Very well. So if I could ask you to turn the page to the page which is
8 entitled "case information," so it's the next page. Thank you very much. We can
9 zoom it a little bit for everyone in the courtroom. Now, it indicates here in the upper
10 part of the report where you see the word "samples" that "reference samples from 16
11 victims, unidentified persons," and then we see "reference samples from 12 relatives
12 of six missing persons."

13 And just before that it is written "the remaining DNA extracts of human remains and
14 the reference samples will be retained by The Netherlands Forensic Institute." Can I
15 just ask you if this is still the case? Are they still maintained at the NFI?

16 A. [10:12:02] They're still maintained at the NFI, yes, yes, and will stay there until
17 notice from the requesting authority.

18 Q. [10:12:10] Very well. Now, below that we see additional information where, as
19 you just said a moment ago, you explain which typographical errors were corrected.
20 Now, I have no questions about that, and I would like to turn to the next page, which
21 has "title 1 samples received." Very well.

22 So in a nutshell, Dr Kloosterman, could you explain to us what we have in this table?

23 A. [10:12:51] Yeah. For the chain of evidence, it's important to see when we
24 received it in January 2015. These items were received by the NFI from the
25 International Court through Mr Baccard. And these are the items that we received at

1 the NFI from Mr Baccard. And the first column, column to the left, is what we call
2 the DNA identity seal which is given by the NFI. So I told you the whole process at
3 the NFI is dependent on this crucial number. When I want a reanalysis of a sample, I
4 have to give this number. When I want a quantification, I have to give this number.
5 So this is extremely important for the process at the NFI. But it also carries an
6 original ICC number. This item is known through this number by the end ICC. So
7 this gives a little translation between the numbers of the ICC and the numbers that
8 were given by the NFI.

9 And then we have the description. It was a container with four teeth from victim 1,
10 which is also ICC information. And that goes, the same story is true for all these
11 different items numbers given by the ICC and the respective numbers given by the
12 NFI.

13 Q. [10:14:44] Very well. You explained to us earlier the importance of the NFI ID
14 number. Just below that, we see a section entitled "information and instructions
15 received." Here you explain what instructions you received from the ICC. Now,
16 there is a term here which says "previously established DNA profiles from reference
17 samples." So do we understand from this that the DNA profiles of the relatives had
18 already been established at that moment?

19 A. [10:15:23] Yeah. We had -- you're asking at the moment questions from request
20 number 3. But there is also request number 1, in this case. This is not a report from
21 my hand but from a colleague of mine, and in relation to request number 1, we
22 received the items which are also mentioned in this table.

23 And that request number 1 is from 24 May 2014. That report is from 8 July 2014 that
24 has been signed by a colleague of mine. So that's also the moment we received the
25 reference sample from the family members.

1 Q. [10:16:19] So in January 2015 with respect to this report, you received new
2 samples from victims?

3 A. [10:16:29] From other victims, yes.

4 Q. [10:16:30] Yes?

5 A. [10:16:31] Yeah.

6 Q. [10:16:31] And at that stage what you were requested was to compare their
7 DNA profile to previously already established profiles from relatives?

8 A. [10:16:40] Yeah.

9 Q. [10:16:40] Do we understand that?

10 A. [10:16:41] Yeah. So we had the profiles of the relatives available. We had to
11 analyse the new samples, get DNA profiles from those new samples, and make the
12 comparison between the existing profiles from the reference samples.

13 Q. [10:16:58] And if we turn the page, please, to the next page, we see table number
14 2 -- in a moment. Very well. So is it right that this is the table where we find the
15 previously-established DNA profiles from the relatives?

16 A. [10:17:27] Yes.

17 Q. [10:17:28] This was the list?

18 A. [10:17:30] This was copied from that other report, yes.

19 Q. [10:17:32] Okay. So below this table you explain the methods used to extract
20 the DNA profile. And on the next page at 3.1, we see "DNA extraction and
21 quantification." Now, here you explain that from the 16 victims, the following
22 bodily material was used -- sorry, and pulverised, and the table lists for each victim
23 what material was used.

24 A. [10:18:17] Yes.

25 Q. [10:18:18] Can you clarify to us one aspect of this. Below the table, there is a

1 sentence which reads "The concentration of total human and male DNA in the
2 extracts were quantified using a duplex realtime PCR assay."

3 Now, my first question is, well, out of curiosity, why does it say only male DNA?

4 A. [10:18:49] Thank you for this question. I told you before that females have two
5 X chromosomes and males have an X and a Y chromosome. This quantification
6 method looks to whole amount of DNA but also to a certain -- to a certain locus of the
7 Y chromosome. From the Y chromosome, we get the amount of male DNA. This is
8 important when you are dealing with mixes, and because we have reference samples
9 here, we do not expect to get mixes here. But in mixed analysis -- which is irrelevant
10 in kinship analysis -- we perform, this information is important, that you know in a
11 mixture I have so much male DNA and so much female DNA. So this is more or less
12 a standard way of describing the quantification method at the NFI.

13 So from this information also you can get immediately if it's a male or a female
14 individual, which you also get from the DNA profile which is done in a later stage
15 after the quantification.

16 Q. [10:20:21] Very well. For a layman like myself, what does a duplex realtime
17 PCR assay do at this stage of the process?

18 A. [10:20:32] Also, it also contains a very, very small amount of DNA. You can't
19 analyse it directly for the concentration of DNA, also in this case. You have to
20 amplify the DNA first before you can quantify the DNA.

21 And yeah, this is the name of the technology, it's realtime PCR, that you measure the
22 concentration of the DNA during the amplification process. This is what is called
23 realtime PCR.

24 So you follow the process through all these amplification cycles to get your
25 information you're interested in, the concentration of the DNA. It's a process well

1 known to the scientists at the laboratories. I understand that laymen have
2 difficulties in understanding this, yes.

3 Q. [10:21:41] It's all part of our everyday business. But thank you for that
4 explanation.

5 A. [10:21:44] Yes.

6 Q. [10:21:45] So at the end of that process, what do you obtain?

7 A. [10:21:48] What we obtain is, we obtain only the information how much DNA is
8 in your extract and how much male DNA is in your extract. That's the information
9 we get, very important information for the next step in the process, that we know
10 how much DNA we have to take for a successful amplification process. And we also
11 know, okay, this sample has extremely low possibility of getting a DNA profile from
12 because the amount of DNA is too small. And that sample has too much DNA for
13 amplification, so we have to dilute that sample before we can amplify it. We didn't
14 have that problem with these samples. They all contained a low amount of DNA,
15 but in most cases, enough to get a DNA information from.

16 Q. [10:22:48] Very well. Then let's look at the DNA information on the next page
17 at item 3.2, DNA profiling. Here, you explain the process in the first paragraph and
18 the systems and the kits that were used.

19 A. [10:23:09] Yes.

20 Q. [10:23:09] And under 3.3 you explain how you compared the DNA profiles of
21 victims and those of relatives of missing persons. Now, I'd like to look at this, under
22 3.3. The second paragraph begins with: "The Bonaparte Disaster Victim DNA
23 identification software tool was used to compare the ante-mortem DNA profiling data
24 from missing persons with the DNA profiles from the post-mortem reference samples
25 from unidentified persons -- victims," sorry.

1 So just to understand this sentence, this is where you compare ante-mortem DNA.

2 That's the one of relatives?

3 A. [10:24:04] Yes.

4 Q. [10:24:04] Okay. The next sentence begins with "The Dutch allele *frequency
5 data was used." *Now, you explained to us what an allele frequency was a moment
6 ago. Can you explain to us why was the Dutch allele frequency used in this case?

7 A. [10:24:25] Yes. So we have the profiles from the victims, from the bone and the
8 teeth samples, and we have the profiles from the living family members who
9 provided their DNA, and they have to be compared, because there could be familial
10 relationship between a victim and a family member.

11 You can do that by hand, but a much better idea is to do it electronically, which is
12 done by this Bonaparte software. The profiles are transferred electronically to this
13 software, and the software compares the profiles between victims and living family
14 members, to call a relationship yes or no between a certain victim and a family
15 member.

16 In case of a non-match, it's a non-match. There can't be any familial relationship,
17 there can't be a familial relationship. As said, on the information from the ICC, a
18 mother-child relationship, a father-child relationship, a kinship relationship, we have
19 a non-match. End of story. We can't call a familial relationship.

20 But in case of familial match, what I said is, what you want to know, what is the
21 strength of the evidence. Is it strong or is it weak evidence? We want to know that.

22 The DNA also gives the possibilities that you can answer these questions.

23 And I told you also that for estimating the frequency of a certain allele that you find
24 in a case, that you have to measure that allele within the population. In the ideal
25 case, within the relevant population, but sometimes you don't have that relevant

1 population available.

2 We had a big database from The Netherlands available, a population genetic database.

3 All people in that database volunteered to have their DNA sample analysed for this
4 purpose. So that was the related database that we had available. And that was
5 used in this case.

6 That is what we tried to explain here.

7 Q. [10:27:09] And just for everyone's understanding here, is there any impact in
8 using the Dutch allele frequency data to a non-Dutch population such as the one in
9 Côte d'Ivoire?

10 A. [10:27:21] We haven't done this because also we lack a population genetic
11 database from the country that you mentioned. That can have an effect. But in this
12 case the likely ratio, which was mentioned, was extremely high. There was
13 extremely strong evidence using the Dutch database. We expect that the evidential
14 value, the likelihood ratio will be also high, extremely high, when you use a different
15 DNA database; for example, the DNA database from this particular country, Côte
16 d'Ivoire. But it has effect.

17 Q. [10:28:23] So could you explain to us a little bit how the likelihood ratio is
18 calculated?

19 A. [10:28:31] Yeah. We have mathematical formulas, quite simple mathematical
20 formulas for every possible familial relationship, a child and a parent, two brothers,
21 two sisters, also half siblings. We can make calculations, and these calculations are
22 made electronically. So we use a computer programme to make these calculations,
23 and Bonaparte can make these calculations for us. So it can not only call the familial
24 matches, but it also comes with a likelihood ratio. It's the likelihood ratio that we
25 report, and we also reported in this case. But you must feed Bonaparte with

1 appropriate population genetic sample. In this case, we use Dutch allele frequency
2 data which is used in all our standard identification cases.

3 Q. [10:29:33] Very well. So you're saying that in your experience, this has been
4 used in other cases in Holland?

5 A. [10:29:48] Yes, yes.

6 Q. [10:29:49] Actually, since we're on this point, this is something that we hadn't
7 covered in your CV because I don't think it is there, how frequently have you testified
8 on DNA evidence in the past?

9 A. [10:30:00] Around 250 times in The Netherlands in the Dutch situation, yeah.
10 This is my first international appearance.

11 Q. [10:30:15] And just the last question on this, and what type of cases did you give
12 evidence?

13 A. [10:30:24] Most of the cases were criminal cases from The Netherlands where we
14 had to compare a stain with a reference sample from a suspect with a DNA profile
15 that matched, gotten from the DNA database, that kind of cases. And maybe in 10 of
16 those 250, a kinship analysis played a role.

17 Q. [10:30:49] Very well. Now, you explained to us that when there was no match,
18 that was the end of the story?

19 A. [10:30:58] Yeah.

20 Q. [10:30:58] And then when there's a match, you establish this likelihood ratio?

21 A. [10:31:02] Yes, you make your calculations, yes.

22 Q. [10:31:04] So at this stage, do I understand that the match is more of the result of
23 the scientific analysis, and then you have a more statistical aspect to your conclusions?
24 Do we have to understand it in that way?

25 A. [10:31:19] Yeah, but those always go together. Also, when you are dealing with

1 a straightforward DNA case, the DNA profile from a cigarette end, we have a suspect
2 and we see that their profiles match, they always, they always want to know how
3 strong is the evidence that you got in this particular case. We can make these
4 calculations with the DNA profiles you get from the evidence.

5 Q. [10:31:50] So if we can look now at the results --

6 A. [10:31:55] Yes.

7 Q. [10:31:55] -- which is section 4 of your report. So you begin with, here, victim
8 number 13, no DNA profile was obtained, but you're able to obtain profiles for the
9 remaining 15 victims. And you established that 14 of them had a female genotype.

10 Now, I have no questions about this segment of your result.

11 I would like you to go to the next page, section 5, "DNA identification results." Okay.

12 Now, here you explain that the DNA profiles from the unidentified victims were
13 compared with the DNA profiles from the relatives mentioned in table 2 and
14 likelihood ratios were calculated.

15 Under item number 1, we see here that the DNA profiling results of remains -- there is
16 a number here.

17 A. [10:33:05] Yes.

18 Q. [10:33:05] AAHJ2574NL of victim 3 show a familial match with the relatives of
19 Gnon Rokia Ouattara. Then, here you express a number "Given the family tree, the
20 DNA typing results are more than one thousand million times more likely if the tooth
21 originated from Gnon Rokia Ouattara than if this tooth originated from an unrelated
22 random female."

23 Now, this ratio of one thousand million times more, can you explain to us how we're
24 supposed to understand it?

25 A. [10:33:57] What is exactly your question?

1 Q. [10:34:14] Perhaps to be more specific --

2 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:34:18] Can you explain to us number 1, the
3 result which you indicate in number 1.

4 THE WITNESS: [10:34:24] Yes. So in this case we had a match. Having reviewed
5 familial relationship number 3 and family members, we had here an unidentified
6 person which fitted in that picture. So it could be a possible positive identification.

7 Next question is how strong is the evidence? How we can answer that question.

8 And we do this through our likelihood ratio calculation. In the old days, it was also
9 called a paternity index, when we looked at paternal investigation to say somebody
10 was the father, yes or no.

11 And the outcome, before you do a likelihood ratio calculation, you must have two
12 scenarios and see which scenario fits your analysis results best. So we have here a
13 scenario number 1, they are related; number 2, they are not related. It's an unrelated
14 individual.

15 So under both scenarios, we calculated the strength of the evidence. What is the
16 probability of getting these DNA typing results under this scenario and under that
17 scenario? And we divide the two.

18 In this case, we came out to a factor of a billion, which is called a thousand million,
19 which is extremely strong evidence. This is also our threshold value. We don't
20 report values above a thousand million. I can't tell you the exact figure now, but
21 significantly higher than that thousand million.

22 So this is our scale for calculating the strength of the evidence in familial relationships
23 in kinship testing.

24 Q. [10:36:43] So you answered my next question, which is that this is indeed the
25 highest level you ever report even if the strength is higher?

1 A. [10:37:01] Yes, yes.

2 Q. [10:37:02] So from this conclusion, Professor Kloosterman, would it be fair to say
3 that it would be very unlikely for anyone else with a similar DNA profile to have a
4 familial match with the relatives who provided a DNA sample?

5 A. [10:37:25] Yeah, the only thing I can say is that the probability that an unrelated
6 person would fit this is extremely low. That's all in this figure of a thousand million.
7 So when I would, for example, take my own profile and see if I could fit this picture,
8 the possibility that it would fit is extremely low.

9 Q. [10:37:57] And the same conclusion we see under number items 2 and 3 --

10 A. [10:38:04] Yes.

11 Q. [10:38:05] -- with respect to the familial match to the relatives of Malem Sylla
12 and under number 3 with the relatives of the missing Moyamau Koné?

13 A. [10:38:19]. So in all these cases we got this factor of more than a thousand
14 million, which is our threshold value.

15 Q. [10:38:29] Okay. And the numbers we see here, the remains which starts with
16 AHJ, these are the numbers given to the samples received like the tooth; is that what
17 this number refers to?

18 A. [10:38:44] Yeah. These are the NFI numbers, unique seal numbers that were
19 given by the NFI in the identification process in the analysis process.
20 So you need the other table again on page under 3.1.

21 Q. [10:39:15] Yes.

22 A. [10:39:17] To get all the information about that specific NFI number.

23 Q. [10:39:21] Right. So reference, it is page 0084-3934 where your Honours can
24 find the table containing these NFI reference numbers.

25 This is table you are referring to, Professor; is that right?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 A. [10:39:44] Yes, yes.

2 Q. [10:39:45] Very well. And the last page of your report under item number 6,
3 Additional DNA Analysis, you mention here that on request of Dr Baccard, the femur
4 from victim 8 will also be analysed. The reason for this request is the possibility of
5 commingling of remains, teeth and femur in this case.

6 So I understand that the outcome of this was reported in a separate report.

7 A. [10:40:24] Yes.

8 Q. [10:40:24] Okay. Now, at the bottom of the page we see your name, and is that
9 your signature?

10 A. [10:40:30] That's my signature, yes.

11 Q. [10:40:31] Very well.

12 Your Honours, I would move for the report to be considered submitted at this stage.

13 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:40:38] Yes.

14 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [10:40:40] Your Honours, I see we have five minutes left. I do
15 have to go through the second report. Would this be an appropriate time to pause?

16 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:41:02] Okay. Let's pause half an hour and
17 then we'll be back at 11.15. That's okay with you?

18 THE WITNESS: [10:41:08] That's okay with me. Thank you.

19 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [10:41:10] Thank you very much.

20 So the hearing is adjourned to 11.15. Thank you.

21 THE COURT USHER: [10:41:16] All rise.

22 (Recess taken at 10.41 a.m.)

23 (Upon resuming in open session at 11.19 a.m.)

24 THE COURT USHER: [11:19:04] All rise.

25 Please be seated.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

- 1 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:19:29] Good morning again.
2 Good morning, Mr Kloosterman.
3 The floor is immediately to the Office of the Prosecutor for its questioning.
4 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [11:19:36] Thank you, Mr President.
5 Q. [11:19:38] Professor Kloosterman, I only have a few questions on the second
6 report, which we will show on the screen. Could I pull up CIV-OTP-0083-1482?
7 It's, for your reference, it is 23 June 2015, request number 4.
8 So, Professor, let me know when you have it in your hands.
9 Very well.
10 So we see the cover page, similar to the previous one. If we could go to the next
11 page, Case Information, I see again the same information that we've seen in the first
12 report. So no questions on this one.
13 Let's go to the next page, please. So for you it would be the third page, with item
14 number 1, Samples Received.
15 Now, Professor, from a glance at this page, I understand from section 2, Information
16 and Instruction, that there was a request for an additional DNA analysis on the femur
17 from victim 8.
18 Now, victim 8 from the first report was one of the three victims for which there was a
19 match; is that correct?
20 A. [11:21:34] Yes.
21 Q. [11:21:34] Please turn on your microphone so we can hear your answer.
22 A. [11:21:38] That is correct.
23 Q. [11:21:38] Thank you. And the reason for this additional request is a possibility
24 of commingling of remains. Now, I mean, "commingling," is this a scientific term or
25 is there anything special about this term?

1 A. [11:21:56] Yes, we use it in identification cases especially when people come
2 from mass graves, that you do not know if all the bones that you see are from the
3 same body or from more bodies. So then we talk about commingling, something
4 always -- should always keep in mind when you are dealing in case scenarios like this
5 where you have more victims which can be from more individuals in a mass grave,
6 like we possibly had here.

7 Q. [11:22:26] Very well. So I see under item 3, Methods, again, it's the same as in
8 the first report. So I have no questions about that.

9 I would ask you to turn to page 2, item 3.1. Here again we see that what was
10 pulverised is a femur sample which was given a specific NFI item ID number; is that
11 right?

12 A. [11:22:57] Yes, that's right.

13 Q. [11:22:58] So the question that I have for you is under number 4. You explain
14 that from the femur, and you have the ID number here, a partial DNA profile from a
15 woman has been obtained and the partial DNA profile of the femur was compared to
16 a DNA profile from the tooth.

17 First of all, what is a partial DNA profile, Professor?

18 A. [11:23:29] What I tried to explain you before is, using the MGM kit, the MGM
19 analysis kit, commercially available kit, we can get typing results of 16 different loci
20 and the sex locus. Sometimes when your amount of DNA is limited, all your DNA is
21 degraded, you can't get a full DNA profile. You don't see all the results that you
22 expect to get.

23 Then we're talking about the partial DNA profile does not contain all the information
24 but can contain still very valuable information. That was in this case that you only
25 had a partial DNA profile from this femur extract.

1 Q. [11:24:21] And do I understand that a partial DNA profile does not prevent you
2 from doing a comparison between two profiles?

3 A. [11:24:28] No. Only when the DNA profile is too partial that you get too little
4 information from it. You can also expect that the scientific evidence that you get
5 from it will be extremely low. So you expect to get a lower scientific evidence value,
6 a lower likely ratio. So we want always as much information as possible. It's not
7 always possible.

8 Q. [11:24:58] Very well. And if we look at the identification results on the next
9 page, section 5, here you explain that the partial profile of the femur matches the
10 DNA profile from the tooth. So this still relates to the same victim number 8?

11 A. [11:25:20] This relates to the same victim, yes.

12 Q. [11:25:22] And you expressed the results in the same formulation as we saw in
13 the same -- in the earlier report, which is that the results are a billion times more likely
14 if the femur and the tooth are from the same person than if these remains are from
15 two different non-related females. So is it again the same type of likelihood ratio
16 we're talking about here?

17 A. [11:25:47] This is a little different. What we have here is a partial DNA profile
18 from the femur and we have a DNA profile from the tooth.

19 The question they had: Are these two items from the same individual? That was
20 the first question that was asked. Or did commingling take place? What we see
21 here is the partial DNA profile from the femur matches all the information from the
22 DNA profile from the tooth.

23 So that's important information if you want to conclude are these two items from the
24 same individual, yes or no. We've got extremely strong evidence here that they are
25 from the same victim.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Q. [11:26:29] Very well. And again, at the bottom, we see your name and your
2 signature?

3 A. [11:26:39] Yes.

4 Q. [11:26:39] Is that right?

5 A. [11:26:40] Yes.

6 Q. [11:26:40] Very well.

7 MR DEMIRDJIAN: Your Honours, just as the first one, I would submit this to be
8 considered as submitted.

9 That would conclude my questions for this witness, your Honours.

10 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:26:54] Thank you very much. Before, just
11 before reverting to the Defence, I would like just for my clarification to pose you a
12 question. So did you receive -- I put them in not leading but in direct. From whom
13 did you receive all the samples you analysed?

14 THE WITNESS: [11:27:24] Yeah, I didn't receive them myself.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:27:27] Well, you or the NFI, yes.

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: Well, the institute.

18 THE WITNESS: [11:27:31] Yes. And the information I got is in my report.

19 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:27:37] Yes.

20 THE WITNESS: Brought by the ICC.

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: Okay. So did the NFI do any further
22 autonomous investigation on this, on the origin of these samples?

23 THE WITNESS: [11:27:44] No, no. We only provided the samples with the unique
24 identification number and that was it, and then it went straight through DNA testing.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:27:58] So you were never confronted with the

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 facts which originated these samples themselves?

2 THE WITNESS: [11:28:05] No.

3 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:28:05] No.

4 THE WITNESS: [11:28:07] Only that they were from teeth or from femur. That was
5 the only information that we got.

6 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:28:11] So no further question.

7 Maître Altit, but I don't see him.

8 MR O'SHEA: [11:28:22] The team for Blé Goudé is beginning, yes.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:28:25] Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

10 Mr Knoops, and please don't speak Dutch. Please don't speak Dutch with the
11 witness.

12 QUESTIONED BY MR KNOOPS:

13 Q. [11:29:18] Good morning, Professor Kloosterman. My name is Geert-Jan
14 Alexander Knoops. I'm a lawyer practicing in The Netherlands, and I'm one of the
15 counsel of Mr Blé Goudé. Thank you for joining us this morning.

16 I have some additional questions on two reports. The first one is the amended
17 report and the second one is the report on the investigation or examination on the
18 T-shirt.

19 First report we would like to discuss with you is the report or amended report of 13
20 May, and that's request number 003.

21 The Prosecution already delved into this report to some extent, and I have some
22 remaining questions.

23 My first question relates to the first page where you find the case information. That's,
24 for the Court, CIV-OTP-0084-3931.

25 On this page, Professor, you find under the caveat Additional Information under

1 paragraph 2 - you have the report, I guess, before you - an adjustment which doesn't
2 relate to the typographical errors initially reported on page 7. But we're dealing here
3 with an error made in the ICC numbering of the samples of table 1, and the report
4 mentions these errors have been adjusted.

5 Now, my first question to you is what type of errors in the numbering of the
6 examples we are dealing with here?

7 A. [11:31:54] Then I should make an in-depth comparison between the two reports.
8 I can't tell you now from which errors were -- which were the errors that were
9 corrected.

10 Q. [11:32:22] I understand that these errors are different from the one mentioned
11 under sub 1, the typographical errors. These were errors made in the numbering --

12 A. [11:32:32] Yes.

13 Q. [11:32:32] -- weren't they?

14 A. [11:32:33] Yes, yeah.

15 Q. [11:32:35] Who discovered these errors in the numbering? Can you remember
16 who alluded to these errors?

17 A. [11:32:45] I think they came from ICC. When I have the whole case
18 information with me, I can tell you, I can tell you more specific, but not from the
19 information I have in front of me, for me now.

20 Q. [11:33:01] You don't have information before you to inform the Court what type
21 of numbering these errors related to?

22 A. [11:33:10] No.

23 Q. [11:33:11] No, all right. Can you remember by whom these errors were
24 adjusted, apart from discovering these errors? The report mentions under 2 these
25 errors have been adjusted. By whom were these errors adjusted?

1 A. [11:33:32] By the NFI.

2 Q. [11:33:34] And can you recall which person in specific? Was it you or a
3 colleague who --

4 A. [11:33:44] No, it was definitely not me, but I can't tell you who discovered it.

5 Q. [11:33:51] And can you enlighten us on the time frame when these errors were
6 discovered?

7 A. [11:33:57] Not without the information I have available, but not here.

8 Q. [11:34:04] Were you yourself being put in a position to check whether the
9 previous errors were indeed corrected with the correct numbering, or was this
10 information being brought to you by a colleague and you implemented them in
11 table 1?

12 A. [11:34:32] That's exactly what happened, yes, sir.

13 Q. [11:34:34] So you received information from a colleague from the NFI --

14 A. [11:34:37] Yes.

15 Q. [11:34:37] -- saying there were errors?

16 A. [11:34:40] Yes.

17 Q. [11:34:41] And you implemented?

18 A. [11:34:42] Yeah.

19 Q. [11:34:43] So you are not in a position to verify whether indeed the numbers in
20 table 1, you have the left column, NFI ID number and the right column ICC number,
21 you were not able to verify these numbers yourself, were you?

22 A. [11:35:00] No. We have an electronic system at the NFI containing the case
23 number but also the items and the numbers that were given to the respective items.

24 So I check that, if that information was corrected, electronic information, and that was
25 also the information that was in my report; I checked that.

1 Q. [11:35:21] In relation to the question of the Presiding Judge, can you remember
2 how the samples were delivered at the NFI, the samples we're speaking of in table 1?
3 You mentioned, for instance, one container. Were you yourself able to verify how
4 these samples were delivered? Or you relied on information of a colleague?

5 A. [11:35:52] I relied on the information of the front office at the NFI and I also
6 relied on the information that was taken from photographs. Every item that we
7 received is photographed.

8 Q. [11:36:04] Yes.

9 A. [11:36:04] So I looked to that information.

10 Q. [11:36:05] Yes. Can you remember, Professor, whether the sending party, i.e.
11 the ICC, provided to you a written chain of custody form which related to these
12 samples?

13 A. [11:36:27] Yes. From the moment it was brought by the ICC and then a transfer
14 moment to the NFI, that was documented very well.

15 Q. [11:36:35] Were the specific chain of custody documents available for every item?
16 Can you recall that?

17 A. [11:36:43] Yeah. What I recall is also a table with signatures of the transfer
18 moment of the specific items to the NFI.

19 Q. [11:36:54] Could it be the formula which is titled
20 transfer -- Transmission/Reception Form?

21 A. [11:37:04] *(Indecipherable).

22 MR KNOOPS: [11:37:05] Can we perhaps call up document, sorry, that's attached to
23 the mission report of Dr Baccard, CIV-OTP-0084-3939, and then page number 3945.

24 Q. If you look at the screen, Professor, you see a document on letterhead of NFI
25 called Transmission/Reception Form. You see on the left column a list of items

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 transferred?

2 A. [11:38:02] Yes.

3 Q. [11:38:02] With numbers, description in the middle and at the right-column
4 remarks.

5 Is this the chain of custody form you referred to?

6 A. [11:38:12] This is an example of a chain of custody form, yeah, refers to another
7 item than the item we just discussed. This refers to a T-shirt.

8 Q. [11:38:19] Yes.

9 A. [11:38:20] Yes.

10 Q. [11:38:20] I will return to the T-shirt in a minute. This is a chain of custody
11 form drafted by the NFI. What I meant was whether these type of forms were also
12 transmitted by the investigators of the ICC to NFI?

13 A. [11:38:43] I have to go to the case file to look for the information.

14 Q. [11:38:48] Looking at this document, Professor, it mentions at the top in writing,
15 "incident women demonstration 3rd March 2011."

16 A. [11:39:03] Yeah.

17 Q. [11:39:04] Who wrote this qualification? Can you remember that? Was it NFI
18 itself or was it somebody who presented this information to NFI?

19 A. [11:39:24] Perhaps this information was presented to the NFI but I don't know
20 by whom and who wrote it down.

21 Q. [11:39:29] It's not your handwriting?

22 A. [11:39:30] It's definitely not my handwriting, no.

23 Q. [11:39:33] And with respect to the right column of the first part of the table, you
24 see on the right side "DNA tears/bullet hole; composition, black material."

25 Was this the information which was given to NFI by the ICC investigators? Can you

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 remember that?

2 A. [11:40:01] Yeah, but I don't know who wrote it down.

3 Q. [11:40:03] Okay.

4 A. [11:40:03] Of course it's related to the investigation needs from the ICC, but I
5 don't know who wrote this down.

6 Q. [11:40:09] Yes. You -- and that's transcript page 14, line 21 of this morning's
7 hearing, you said to the Chamber that you received some explanation about the case
8 and about the materials.

9 Can you remember, Professor, what information you were given by the ICC prior to
10 your investigation, to your examination about the case itself, the facts of the case?
11 How was the case presented to you by the ICC investigators?

12 A. [11:40:52] I never spoke to the people from the ICC. But the people who spoke
13 to the ICC were the people from our front office, Mrs Eerhart and Mrs O'Sullivan.
14 They are the contacts between the ICC and the NFI.

15 Q. [11:41:10] What was the information you had prior to your DNA examination?
16 What, if any, was the information you had on the facts of the case? How was the
17 case being presented to you by those intermediaries?

18 A. [11:41:28] That the most important thing was that they had a number of bones
19 and teeth from a mass grave. They had to be compared with reference sample and
20 to look for any matches. That, I didn't have a name of suspects also, and I had no
21 detailed information on the case. I know it was from the Ivory Coast, but that was
22 more or less it.

23 Q. [11:41:53] Was it prior to your examination, Professor, known to you that the
24 samples which were presented to NFI allegedly related to an incident in Côte d'Ivoire
25 which had to do with a demonstration by women on the 3rd of March? Was this

1 known to you before your DNA examination start?

2 A. [11:42:20] On the T-shirt, you mean?

3 Q. [11:42:22] Yes.

4 A. [11:42:24] I think, yeah. I know, I knew that information, yes, yeah.

5 Q. [11:42:28] And was the information also presented to you that this T-shirt
6 allegedly had a bullet hole, such as demonstrated by the transmission reception form
7 I just showed you?

8 A. [11:42:47] I know that the T-shirt was the topic for multidisciplinary
9 investigation, so that more people had to look at the T-shirt, not only from the DNA,
10 but also other forensic disciplines. So that was the important part of the information,
11 that we had to be careful with the T-shirt and that it required a special approach.

12 Q. [11:43:11] Right. Professor, without going into much detail of the ISO 17025
13 standard norms, requirements for the competence and testing of testing and
14 calibration laboratories, in footnote 6 of your amended report, you refer to an article
15 of Dr Gjerston, but you didn't refer in footnote 6 of your amended report to the article,
16 and that's where my question comes in, of Professor Niels Morling. He was a
17 member of the paternity testing commission, as you know, Dr Niels Morling,
18 Department of Forensic Genetics, Institute of Forensic Medicine in Copenhagen,
19 Denmark, who issued an article in Forensic Sciences International in 2002, together
20 with Professor Robert Allen, et al. So all the members of the Paternity Testing
21 Commission wrote this article.

22 And I've uploaded this article, it's CIV-D25-0039-0017. Maybe you can look at the
23 screen. Whether you recognise the article, that's my first question, whether you are
24 familiar with the findings of Dr Morling, et al., in Forensic Sciences International of
25 2002, published 15 July 2002 to be more specific. That will be my first question. If

1 correct, you have the article in front of you.

2 A. [11:45:20] I have the article in front of me now, yeah.

3 Q. [11:45:23] Yeah. You are familiar with this publication, Professor?

4 A. [11:45:28] Yes, yeah.

5 Q. [11:45:29] In short, the Paternity Testing Commission in which Professor
6 Morling was participating recommends that genetic testing, including sampling, be
7 performed according to the already-mentioned ISO standards. And interesting part
8 of this article is that this commission, part of the International Society for Forensic
9 Sciences: Genetics, offers several explanations to the -- or recommendations to these
10 ISO paragraphs.

11 In this article, which was as mentioned not included by you in your footnote 6, it's
12 being said in paragraph 5.7, and I kindly ask you to look at this paragraph, that's
13 CIV-D25-0039-0023. You see the ISFG recommendation drafted by the PTS, the
14 Paternity Testing Commission, the additional recommendation, and that's also in
15 relation to maybe the question of the Presiding Judge, procedures guaranteeing the
16 identity of the individual from which the sample was taken and the traceability of the
17 sample shall be covered by the contracts with the clients.

18 Now, my question is I assume that the ICC was in a way your client, a client of the
19 NFI to use the words of the PTS. How was, if any, a procedure being put in place to
20 guarantee that the samples which you received from ICC indeed reflected the real
21 identities of the alleged family members in accordance with paragraph 5.7, the ISFG
22 recommendation?

23 A. [11:48:04] I think the answer to this question is with the ICC and not with the
24 NFI, because we were not involved in the sampling of the reference material for living
25 members or with the sampling of the bone and the teeth from the deceased ones.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Q. [11:48:27] To be clear to you, Professor, that also counts for the report 001,
2 because you yourself mentioned the report drafted by your colleague, Professor or
3 Dr van Dongen of 24 May 2014 and the paragraph 1, "samples received," but also here,
4 isn't it, it holds true that your colleague van Dongen didn't verify the veracity,
5 authenticity of the samples received from ICC; is that a true reflection of the --

6 A. [11:49:09] Yes.

7 Q. [11:49:10] -- *reality? Thank you.

8 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [11:49:10] Your Honour.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:49:11] Mr Prosecutor.

10 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [11:49:11] Your Honours, Mr Knoops has just made reference to
11 a report without giving us the reference; number one. Number two, the expert
12 cannot give any explanations about the substance of another person's report. So I
13 think this question is irrelevant.

14 MR KNOOPS: [11:49:28] Well, it was the expert who raised this report himself to,
15 what I understand, to substantiate his answer as to the origin of the samples.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:49:42] I just realised that you made a very
17 long question obtaining the same result as I did with a short question.

18 MR KNOOPS: [11:49:49] That's true, Mr President. As Defence, we don't have the
19 luxury that we can say things without foundation. I'm sorry.

20 It's tab 21 of our Defence materials, Mr Prosecutor. That's the report I mentioned,
21 the report 001, tab 21 of our list of materials.

22 Q. [11:50:11] On this very topic, Professor, could you please look at the next page of
23 the article we just delved into by Dr Morling, et al. That's paragraph 5.10.3.2,
24 CIV-D25-0039-0024. You find, Professor, at the bottom of that page of this article,
25 5.10.3.2, "the test reports containing results of sampling shall include the following

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 were necessary for the obtaining of test results." And then you see an enumeration
2 of in total six points, "date sampling, unambiguous identity of substance, location
3 sampling," et cetera.

4 I take it that also here you relied on the information of the ICC in order to verify
5 whether this recommendation was met, isn't it?

6 A. [11:51:29] Yeah, but we did not refer to this recommendation. We referred to
7 the recommendation of Gjerston.

8 Q. [11:51:37] Yes?

9 A. [11:51:38] This is the Morling article.

10 Q. [11:51:39] Yes, correct.

11 A. [11:51:40] Yeah, yeah.

12 Q. [11:51:41] I understand. I understand you referred to the article of Gjerston.
13 But the recommendations made by the PTC, you mentioned in your amended report
14 that you followed those recommendations. I take it that you refer to these
15 recommendations?

16 A. [11:52:03] Yeah. In the way, how we call, how we calculate likelihood ratio and
17 what to do with the conclusions.

18 Q. [11:52:10] Right.

19 A. [11:52:11] Because this is specific for paternity testing. Here we have *a living
20 -- a putative father and living family members. This is a completely different situation
21 than digging up the items from the ground, get the teeth and the bones, and bring
22 them to a laboratory. You can't compare that situation with the situation given here.

23 Q. [11:52:33] So are you saying that, in this specific case, NFI could not apply these
24 recommendations? That's your statement?

25 A. [11:52:42] Not with respect to the identity of the sampling.

1 Q. [11:52:46] Okay. Right.

2 A. [11:52:53] But we have no doubt on this.

3 Q. [11:52:54] Right. What about paragraph 5.10.6, "When the test report contains
4 results of tests performed by subcontractors, these results shall be clearly identified."
5 Is it your testimony that this paragraph 5.10.6 or this recommendation doesn't apply
6 to the instant case?

7 A. [11:53:26] No, not with respect to the DNA analysis. All the *analyses were
8 done at the NFI and there was no --

9 Q. [11:53:34] Okay.

10 A. [11:53:35] -- matter of subcontraction of DNA tied to the results also.

11 Q. [11:53:39] Right. My last question on this report, Professor, relates to your
12 statement this morning, that's transcript page, English transcript page 28, line 5, you
13 said, "All samples contained a low amount of DNA."
14 Was it --

15 A. [11:54:01] Meaning the samples from the femur and the tooth.

16 Q. [11:54:04] Yes, exactly, exactly, yes.

17 A. [11:54:06] Yes.

18 Q. [11:54:06] Was ever considered to, because you used the traditional PCR
19 technique, was ever considered in this regard to use the technique known by Low
20 Copy Number method, LCN, which has been applied by NFI before, which is
21 adjusted for low amounts of DNA?

22 A. [11:54:35] Yeah, I think also without the LCN -- LCN, we use *more from the
23 tissues, when we can't get any typing results from a certain sample and we're
24 extremely interested to get a typing sample from that. In this case from most of the
25 samples we had informative DNA profiles. So LCN analysis was not necessary here.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Q. [11:55:03] Right. Thank you.

2 Those were my questions, Professor, for the first report, the amended report. The
3 second report which was not touched upon by the Prosecution is the report drafted
4 by you, that's request number 005.

5 MR KNOOPS: [11:55:46] Mr President, the report has not been released but we have
6 hard copies, and I'm sure that Professor Kloosterman has himself the report.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:55:54] Yes, because he was authorised to have
8 it.

9 MR KNOOPS: Okay.

10 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: So I have it as well. 12 August 2015, right?

11 THE WITNESS: [11:56:00] 2005?

12 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: Yes.

13 MR KNOOPS: [11:56:03]

14 Q. [11:56:03] Yes, it's from 3 August 2015, multidisciplinary forensic examination in
15 the ICC, et cetera.

16 A. [11:56:10] I've got it in front of me, yes.

17 Q. [11:56:13] ICC-OTP-0086-0568. That's the report you just mentioned?

18 A. [11:56:21] But this is not the report on the screen.

19 Q. [11:56:24] No, not yet. It's the report on the T-shirt?

20 A. [11:56:41] Yes. It's not on the screen yet. I've got a T-shirt in front of me.

21 Q. [11:56:50] Yes.

22 A. [11:56:52] Yes.

23 MR KNOOPS: [11:56:52] It's not on the screen but I can proceed, Mr President?

24 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:56:55] Yes.

25 MR KNOOPS: [11:56:56] Thank you.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Q. [11:56:57] Professor, with respect to this report, you find under paragraph 2,
2 actually also in paragraph 1, under the title Exhibits: Description according to
3 request form, T-shirt victim. That's the first table. And then you see in the second
4 paragraph, Background Information. Second paragraph, Evidence Description:
5 T-shirt worn by the victim.

6 My question was who gave you this information that this T-shirt related to a victim
7 and that it was actually worn by a victim related to the incident of the women's
8 demonstration on 3 March? That's the first paragraph of the background
9 information at paragraph 2.

10 A. I don't know who wrote it on the evidence bag, if that was the NFI or the ICC.

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. It was definitely not me.

13 Q. [11:58:14] So you took actually from the evidence bag this information and put it
14 in your report?

15 A. [11:58:17] This report is signed by more people?

16 Q. [11:58:24] Yes, of course.

17 A. Yeah.

18 Q. I'm sorry. Of course.

19 A. So I don't know who took that information.

20 Q. [11:58:28] One of the three of you?

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [11:58:30] Please do not overlap.

22 MR KNOOPS: Sorry.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: Please don't overlap.

24 THE WITNESS: [11:58:36] So this report is written by three people. I didn't put this
25 information in.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 MR KNOOPS: [11:58:50]

2 Q. [11:58:50] Were you yourself able to inspect the evidence bag you referred to?

3 A. [11:58:57] I have not inspected the evidence bag.

4 Q. [11:59:02] Okay. Since this is a multiple -- multidisciplinary forensic
5 examination drafted by three experts, one of them being you, did you discuss with
6 your two colleagues, Dr van der Weerd and Dr Knijndenberg, the results of their
7 examination on their respective disciplines, Mr van der Weerd, fibres and textile, and
8 Dr Knijndenberg, gunshot residue, was it discussed after the three of you completed
9 your respective analysis?

10 A. [12:00:02] Yeah, of course, at a certain moment you get a report.

11 Q. [12:00:07] Yes.

12 A. [12:00:07] And there you have the whole report in front of you. So yeah, I
13 knew of their findings, yes.

14 Q. [12:00:14] Can you perhaps enlighten us on the conclusion by Mr van der Weerd
15 on the fibres and textiles, where he mentions in the report, and that's page 5 of the
16 report, under paragraph 5, Results: "The T-shirt is in a remarkably good condition
17 given the information received, i.e., that it had been buried for a number of years"?
18 In connection with his finding in paragraph 6.2, that's page 6 of the report at the very
19 end, you see, "The overall good condition of the T-shirt excludes wear and tear."
20 So on two occasions your colleague van der Weerd referred to the remarkably good
21 condition of the T-shirt given the fact that it had to be buried allegedly for a number
22 of years.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:01:27] Well, how can he answer the question
24 which is not -- things not written by the witness himself?

25 MR KNOOPS: [12:01:33] That's true, Mr President, but he, the professor just

1 informed us that at the end of the examination they spoke. That's my
2 understanding.

3 Q. [12:01:44] My question is, did you speak with Mr van der Weerd about this
4 finding?

5 A. [12:01:49] No, I did not speak with him about this finding.

6 Q. [12:01:52] All right. In the part of the report which was drafted by you, that's
7 paragraph 6.1, that's on page 6, Professor, of this report, Biological Traces and DNA
8 Analysis, you first of all examined this T-shirt for the presence of blood, and you say,
9 "This investigation gave no indication for the presence of blood."
10 That's the first line of paragraph 6.1 of the report.

11 A. [12:02:36] Yes.

12 Q. [12:02:36] Now, my question is what is the forensic qualification we should give
13 to this term "no indication"? Is this within your discipline a high evidentiary
14 qualification? Is it of a moderate degree, or low degree?

15 A. [12:03:00] I'll explain it a little bit further. We tested stains that we saw on the
16 T-shirt, suspicious stains. We used an extremely sensitive test for the presence of
17 blood. All the spots that we tested on the T-shirt, we tested negative. So the test
18 was negative.

19 Q. [12:03:29] All right.

20 A. [12:03:29] So this is important information.

21 Q. [12:03:30] My second question relating to this paragraph, Professor, is the
22 investigation, examination of the potential hairs, the presence of possible hairs were
23 observed. You say these possible hairs were not yet examined but are stored
24 together with the T-shirt.

25 What was the reason not to test those potential hairs?

1 A. [12:03:54] We could only test *them for mitochondrial DNA analysis and
2 compare to something. There are no databases for mitochondrial DNA. So you
3 must have a suspect or a victim or a witness to compare the mitochondrial DNA
4 profiles with. So we choose here to save the hair for future, possible future analysis.

5 Q. [12:04:17] So you were not able to retrieve an autosomal DNA sample?

6 A. [12:04:22] No. By looking at the hair, you could predict already.

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. And that investigation is -- will damage the hair. It will consume the material
9 of the hair so we could see this is of extremely low probability that we get an
10 autosomal DNA profile from this hair.

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. So we didn't do that.

13 Q. [12:04:42] And your reason not to conduct a mitochondrial examination was?

14 A. [12:04:49] Mostly that nobody to compare it with.

15 Q. [12:04:52] Okay. Thank you.

16 A. [12:04:54] And no order from the ICC also yet.

17 Q. [12:04:56] Exactly.

18 A. [12:04:57] Yeah.

19 Q. [12:04:58] Yeah. Thank you, Professor. Last remark relating to this paragraph
20 6.1 is that no conclusion can be drawn on the question regarding the putative persons
21 that have been -- or have worn the T-shirt.

22 That's indeed the conclusion you can confirm?

23 A. [12:05:22] Yes. It needs maybe a little explanation when you state it like this.

24 So we looked for blood stains on the T-shirt, but we also took a few samples from
25 inside the T-shirt. People who wear a T-shirt, you can expect that they lose some

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 DNA on their own T-shirt.

2 We secure those areas, but *there was not enough DNA from those areas to analyse
3 the DNA. So we can't draw any conclusion on who wear the T-shirt.

4 Q. [12:05:55] All right. Thank you.

5 MR KNOOPS: We submit, we ask the Court to submit this report, Mr President.

6 THE WITNESS: [12:06:04] But the hair still could do, of course.

7 MR KNOOPS: [12:06:07]

8 Q. [12:06:07] Of course.

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. That's clear. Thank you. But that would then relate to potentially a
11 mitochondrial?

12 A. [12:06:13] That would, yes.

13 Q. Yes.

14 A. And somebody to compare it with.

15 Q. [12:06:15] Exactly. Thank you, Professor.

16 My last question, and for this I have to go back to the amended report, actually at the
17 very end. It's the report of 13 May 2015, where we started with.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Paragraph 5, that's CIV-OTP-0084-3930, page 3936. The Prosecution
20 confronted you with the results relating to victims 3, 8, and I believe also 15, but
21 didn't mention your overall conclusion, which is at the very end of this paragraph,
22 namely, that if I have calculated correctly, 12 out of the 15 alleged victims could not
23 be matched to any of the biological relatives of the missing persons?

24 A. [12:07:35] That's correct, yes.

25 Q. [12:07:36] And now my question to you is "could not be matched," is this to be

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 transformed into a more forensic, forensic empirical conclusion such as "This is for me,
2 as an expert, the highest degree of qualification I can give to certain examination"?

3 A. [12:08:00] This is an exclusion.

4 Q. [12:08:02] Exclusion.

5 A. [12:08:03] Yeah.

6 Q. [12:08:03] Thank you.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:08:04] Mr MacDonald.

8 MR MACDONALD: [12:08:07] The answer, your Honour, on record is fine. I just
9 want to qualify the use of the word "victim" here.

10 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:08:13] Well --

11 MR MACDONALD: [12:08:13] It's bodies found in a mass grave. I mean, that's
12 what I wanted to remind the Chamber, because we're not alleging that 12 victims died
13 on 3rd of March.

14 MR KNOOPS: [12:08:32] Mr President, this concludes my examination. Thank you
15 very much.

16 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:08:36] Thank you.

17 Now I revert to the Defence for Mr Gbagbo and to Mr O'Shea. Well, this concludes
18 the Blé Goudé Defence as a whole?

19 MR KNOOPS: [12:08:57] Yes, Mr President. Thank you very much.
20 Thank you, Professor, for your time.

21 THE WITNESS: [12:09:02] Thank you.

22 MR O'SHEA: [12:09:03] It would be surprising if it concluded their Defence as a
23 whole. Sorry.

24 QUESTIONED BY MR O'SHEA

25 Q. [12:09:16] Professor Kloosterman, is the correct pronunciation?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

- 1 A. [12:09:20] Yes.
- 2 Q. [12:09:21] Really?
- 3 A. [12:09:21] Yes.
- 4 Q. [12:09:22] Okay. Now, just while we are on the subject of titles, when you were
5 giving evidence, you referred to Mr Baccard, which is referred to as Dr Baccard in the
6 report. Is he a doctor, Baccard?
- 7 A. [12:09:44] I haven't checked it, no.
- 8 Q. [12:09:46] Okay.
- 9 A. [12:09:46] So I take that information from other sources.
- 10 Q. [12:09:48] I see, okay.
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:09:49] But we know him.
- 12 MR O'SHEA: [12:09:51] Thank you, your Honour.
- 13 Q. [12:09:53] Now, obviously, you have a lot of experience with regard to the
14 general subject of DNA and you're a university professor, so you've published a
15 number of articles, which we have listed in your CV. I note that many of these
16 articles are co-authored. Are any of these articles written by you alone?
- 17 A. [12:10:36] I don't think so. Most of them are co-authored, yes, if not all.
- 18 Q. [12:10:47] Yes. And which proportion of these articles are in accredited
19 journals?
- 20 A. [12:10:59] These are all peer-reviewed journals.
- 21 Q. [12:11:02] Very well. And do any of these articles deal with the problem that
22 you are dealing with in this case, which is the problem of comparing the DNA from
23 alleged victims with the DNA from family members?
- 24 A. [12:11:29] Yeah, that's for example the article on the MH17 disaster.
- 25 Q. [12:11:38] These are the plane crashes?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 A. [12:11:42] Yes.

2 Q. [12:11:42] Yes.

3 A. [12:11:43] But we also wrote a peer-reviewed article on that in a Dutch journal.

4 Q. [12:11:47] Yes.

5 A. [12:11:50] But it was peer reviewed.

6 Q. [12:11:52] You mentioned that you had 10 cases in the Dutch courts which you
7 said were --

8 A. [12:12:07] Kinship analysis played a role.

9 Q. [12:12:08] Were those air crash cases?

10 A. [12:12:12] No.

11 Q. [12:12:12] What were those cases about? Were any of those similar to this case?

12 A. [12:12:16] No, I can't say that. Mainly, question on, okay, we got a suspect who
13 matches the evidence, and then the question could a brother of him, of the suspect,
14 who we couldn't sample also be the source of the DNA, questions like that.

15 Q. [12:12:38] Now, while we're on your publications, there is one at number 10, that
16 you wrote together with Mapes and Poot, The Criminal Justice System: The DNA
17 Success Story in Perspective. Now, this article you wrote, The DNA Success Story in
18 Perspective, what was your hypothesis and your conclusion in that article?

19 A. [12:13:11] This article was on the success story of DNA matches. We looked in
20 how many cases did the DNA match really come as a surprise for the Prosecution,
21 and we report in 50 per cent of the unsolved cases, we reported DNA matches in our
22 laboratory, which looks quite spectacular. And then we really looked into those
23 cases, wasn't there any other evidence, and we tried to put that in perspective. So in
24 how many cases did the DNA really help, and there was no other clue with the police
25 or the Prosecution.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Q. [12:13:55] I see, I see.

2 A. [12:13:55] That was the main message of this article.

3 Q. [12:13:58] Yes, I see.

4 A. [12:14:02] So not in every case a DNA match came as a big surprise. We
5 suspected him already or he was already a suspect or we knew the guy. But only in
6 a few cases did a DNA match really came as a surprise.

7 Q. [12:14:19] And in those, in those cases that you've been dealing with in Holland,
8 have you been receiving information about the suspects before you conduct these
9 DNA analysis?

10 A. [12:14:41] That sometimes happens, yes.

11 Q. [12:14:45] Yes?

12 A. [12:14:46] Yes. Could also be from the newspapers or the media.

13 Q. [12:14:53] You explained, when you were explaining the process, that there
14 would be a telephone conversation and then an appointment would be made, and
15 then there would be a meeting, so in this case with the ICC -- representatives from the
16 ICC. Do you know who would have been present at that meeting with the ICC?

17 A. [12:15:23] There are the two persons I mentioned before, Mrs Eerhart and
18 Mrs O'Sullivan. They were definitely there. And I think they were the main ones
19 there in most of the meetings. So they took care of the material that was brought in
20 by the ICC.

21 Q. [12:15:40] And they're not involved in the actual scientific process?

22 A. [12:15:48] No, they're not NFI scientists, no.

23 Q. [12:15:51] Now, did they produce an internal report of what the ICC told them?

24 A. [12:15:54] No, not an official internal report. They leave some information.

25 Q. [12:16:03] And do they convey that information to those who are involved in the

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

- 1 actual scientific process?
- 2 A. [12:16:08] Yes, yeah.
- 3 Q. [12:16:09] Okay.
- 4 A. [12:16:16] Most of the time by an email to the respective scientists.
- 5 Q. [12:16:20] And are you aware of the concept of cognitive bias?
- 6 A. [12:16:26] Yes, yeah.
- 7 Q. [12:16:30] Can you explain to the Chamber --
- 8 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:16:32] No, please. We know what that is. If
- 9 he explains it to you, I'm fine.
- 10 MR O'SHEA: [12:16:45] As your Honour pleases.
- 11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:16:50] I just repeat that we are not a jury.
- 12 MR O'SHEA: [12:16:55] Yes, your Honours are not a jury.
- 13 Q. [12:17:08] Now, in terms of the actual process of analysing the DNA, were you
- 14 personally involved in that process?
- 15 A. [12:17:32] No, I was not personally involved in that process, no.
- 16 Q. [12:17:35] So what is your role?
- 17 A. [12:17:38] My role is to report writing process.
- 18 Q. [12:17:43] All right.
- 19 A. [12:17:47] These reports are mainly drafted by two scientists, me and another
- 20 scientist. The other scientist drafts the report, I check the results, and signed it.
- 21 Q. [12:18:03] Now, you've explained how the DNA is extracted and then amplified
- 22 and then analysed.
- 23 A. [12:18:22] Yeah, yeah.
- 24 Q. [12:18:23] Now, when you get to the stage of analysis, what part of that is
- 25 human and what part of that is done by computer?

1 A. [12:18:40] 99 per cent of that work is done by computer. Those people have no
2 information on the case whatsoever who do the analysis. So that they get the profile
3 from the computers, they have no link to from which case these profiles are. They
4 *don't even know it's from an ICC case. They don't know if it's from a murder case
5 or a burglary. They only check the *profiles, and sometimes they make adjustments
6 to the electronic allele calling.

7 Q. [12:19:14] The technology that you used in this particular case, is it an old form
8 of technology or new form?

9 A. [12:19:30] No. Old, old, existing technology.

10 Q. [12:19:35] So does the computer produce electropherograms?

11 A. [12:19:41] Yeah, the computer produced electropherograms, yes. And a
12 scientist checks the EPGs, the electropherograms.

13 Q. [12:19:52] Now, these electropherograms are graphs?

14 A. [12:19:58] Yes.

15 Q. [12:19:59] And you --

16 A. [12:20:00] Big profiles, we call them. So you see the peaks which represent the
17 alleles in front of you.

18 Q. [12:20:09] And does it sometimes occur that there are peaks which appear which
19 are difficult to explain?

20 A. [12:20:23] That can occur, yes, yeah.

21 Q. [12:20:25] And since you yourself were not involved in the scientific process, I
22 suppose you can't confirm whether any such instances happened in this case?

23 A. [12:20:41] No. Everything which was treated manually, I see that in the profile.
24 So when somebody puts some extra information in the profile or takes some
25 information out, I see that in the profile.

1 Q. [12:21:05] Did you examine the electropherograms yourself?

2 A. [12:21:10] I checked them, yes, yes.

3 Q. [12:21:12] When you say you checked them, is this just a sort of supervisory
4 checking or do you look at it in detail?

5 A. [12:21:23] No, it was a supervisory checking, yes. If any typographical errors
6 were made or so, that's what I check.

7 Q. [12:21:32] So if there were any unusual peaks in the electropherograms, you
8 could have missed them?

9 A. [12:21:38] I don't exclude that, yes, yeah.

10 Q. [12:21:49] Is there any reason why the electropherograms were not included in
11 the report?

12 A. [12:21:58] Yeah, it's typically the Dutch situation. The Dutch legislation
13 prohibits us to add profiles to our reports, but we always will hand over those
14 profiles when we get a court order for this.

15 Q. [12:22:16] Did the Office of the Prosecutor request you for these
16 electropherograms?

17 A. [12:22:27] No. To my memory, not, not yet.

18 Q. [12:22:36] Could you assist the Chamber to understand what kind of errors can
19 occur in DNA analysis in this type of case?

20 A. [12:22:58] Yes, I did quite a lot of research in errors, which you also can see from
21 my CV, which is number 9, error raised in forensic DNA analysis. How often does a
22 certain error occur. So I did quite a lot of research in that, and areas of
23 contamination, what can happen, and mixing up samples.

24 Q. [12:23:32] So far as contamination is concerned, that error can obviously occur
25 before you even receive the samples?

1 A. [12:23:58] Yeah.

2 Q. [12:23:58] So and you've told us that you were not involved in any way in the
3 retrieving of the samples, only the receiving of them?

4 A. [12:24:10] Yes, yeah.

5 Q. [12:24:14] So you don't have an independent basis of being sure that there was
6 no contamination; would that be right?

7 A. [12:24:24] Yeah, but I see contamination of course because I get a mixed DNA
8 profile when I have contamination. From a tooth, from a dead body, you expect to
9 get a one-person DNA profile, not a mixture. When I get a mixture, then I think,
10 whoa. Can contamination explain the result I got?

11 Q. [12:24:57] You've explained that the DNA that one obtains from a tooth or a
12 bone is good quality but low?

13 A. [12:25:08] It's a low concentration of DNA, yes.

14 Q. [12:25:12] Who makes the judgment as to how low is too low?

15 A. [12:25:18] It's from data from the past. So we know from many different DNA
16 concentrations, samples with many different DNA concentrations, what the entries
17 how it was. We did some scientific work in this also. So that's, for us, we can give
18 a better explanation or a better expectations if the sample will work, yes or no, in the
19 laboratory.

20 Q. [12:25:51] Now, you've explained of one instance of a suspicion of commingling,
21 which then resulted in the process of looking into things a bit further and producing
22 another report. How was that co-mingling noticed?

23 A. [12:26:21] This was information from the ICC.

24 Q. [12:26:24] Information from the ICC. So if information did not come from the
25 ICC, it's possible for co-mingling to take place and not to discover it from your side?

1 A. [12:26:36] It depends a little bit on the scenario. If it is the case of a mass grave,
2 you must also take that into account, that co-mingling could have taken place. Also
3 in mass disaster co-mingling can take place, so we are aware of it.

4 Q. [12:27:05] Yes. Now, with regard to determining the sex of a person, you have
5 the XX chromosomes, which is female, right?

6 A. [12:27:19] Yes.

7 Q. [12:27:19] And XY is male?

8 A. [12:27:21] Yes.

9 Q. [12:27:23] When you take a sample of DNA, do you have instances where it's
10 difficult to find the Y or the Y may simply not be found?

11 A. [12:27:38] Yes, that can happen. In the quantification process, some males
12 produce a female type. We are aware of it. It is rare but it happens. So that is
13 why we are quite conservative in our reporting on result only from a DNA
14 quantification.

15 Q. [12:28:08] Can errors in relation to the sex happen in other ways?

16 A. [12:28:19] Yeah, yes. People with two X chromosomes and one Y chromosome,
17 or one X chromosome and two Y chromosomes, which makes it hard to draw
18 conclusions. We don't see that in our DNA profiling work, but they are there.

19 Q. [12:28:38] Could it also result from computer error?

20 A. [12:28:47] No. This happens during the amplification process.

21 Q. [12:28:51] Could it also happen from human error?

22 A. [12:28:56] Mixing up samples is a human error, yes. Contamination is a human
23 error, yes.

24 Q. [12:29:13] Can I just ask you to explain one possible discrepancy in the reports in
25 relation to sex. I refer first of all to CIV-OTP-0084-3930 at page CIV-OTP-0084-3935,

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 under section 4 where it says, "Results." Four lines down, it states the following,
2 "From the DNA typing results, it was determined that one of the victims, victim 1,
3 AAHJ2572NL was male, XY." So victim 1, AAHJ2572NL was male XY.
4 Then in the document CIV-OTP-0086-1261, page CIV-OTP-0086-1268, there is
5 reference four paragraphs down to a tooth. And it says, "DNA typing of the tooth
6 AAHJ2618NL yielded a female DNA profile. The DNA profile matches the
7 previously generated DNA profile of victim 1, AAHJ2572NL."

8 So is what's being said here that this tooth probably belongs to victim 1?

9 A. [12:32:27] Yes.

10 Q. [12:32:30] So is there a way of explaining why it states here that the tooth
11 yielded a female DNA profile and in the previous report -- sentence I read out,
12 explained that victim 1, AAHJ2572NL, was a male XY?

13 A. [12:32:57] No, these two reports don't match. So I must go into the original
14 results to see what, what's the case here. But something doesn't seem to be correct.
15 I agree with that.

16 Q. [12:33:20] Would this illustrate that there are times that when the reports are
17 produced, there are errors in the reports themselves? That's something that happens
18 from time to time, right?

19 A. [12:33:37] Yes.

20 Q. [12:33:41] And so would you accept that for an independent person, whether it's
21 a scientist or a lawyer or a judge, to analyse these DNA results, it would be useful to
22 have not only the final report but also the electropherograms? Your answer has to
23 go on record. I saw the nod, but --

24 A. [12:34:19] What is exactly your question?

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:34:22] Well, if they can read it.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 MR O'SHEA: [12:34:30]

2 Q. [12:34:30] My question is this, that if we accept that the final reports do
3 sometimes contain errors, here obviously we're in a court of law so we're independent
4 individuals looking at this from the outside. We weren't there when the experiments
5 were conducted, not that we would understand anyway, but we weren't there when
6 the experiments were conducted. So my question is, would you accept that really
7 the electropherograms --

8 A. [12:35:02] Electropherograms, EPGs.

9 Q. [12:35:04] Yeah. Or really be there together with the report in order to conduct
10 an independent analysis?

11 A. [12:35:09] Yeah, I agree with you that the EPGs, the electropherograms contain
12 the key information of these identification cases. But these EPGs, electropherograms,
13 should also be read by the appropriate persons and scientists who knows what he's
14 dealing. And when we get a court order, we are happy to transfer our DNA profiles
15 for second analysis, second independent analysis.

16 Q. [12:35:44] Yes. Well, that was not your fault. There was no request. Yes.
17 Now, in terms of the preparation of the reports in this case, if I understand you
18 correctly, you kind of play a supervisory role. You're not an actual drafter in any
19 sense, are you?

20 A. [12:36:11] No.

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:36:18] But you signing it, you're responsible
22 for --

23 THE WITNESS: [12:36:20] I'm the responsible one, yes, yeah.

24 MR O'SHEA: [12:36:24]

25 Q. [12:36:25] And by signing those reports you are essentially confirming that

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 because you are in a supervisory role, you are taking responsibility for what's said in
2 it?

3 A. [12:36:53] Yes, no doubt about it.

4 Q. [12:36:53] But you are not saying that you are sure there are no errors in the
5 reports?

6 A. [12:36:56] Again, please, the last sentence?

7 Q. [12:37:03] You're not saying by putting your signature that you are sure there
8 are no errors in the reports, are you?

9 A. [12:37:07] No, you can never be sure there are no errors in a report.

10 Q. [12:37:10] Now, you mentioned during the course of your evidence that the
11 population sample that you took was, if I understood you correctly, from the Dutch
12 population?

13 A. [12:37:43] Yes.

14 Q. [12:37:43] Yes. Would you accept that there might be variations in the ratios
15 whether one is -- if one is dealing with one geographical society as opposed to
16 another?

17 A. [12:38:09] That's a fact. Not only accepted, that's a fact, yeah.

18 Q. [12:38:13] Now, have there been any studies on close-knit small societies and the
19 effect of DNA analysis in that context?

20 A. [12:38:43] Yes. Society with a high inbreeding factor produce different results.

21 Q. [12:38:50] Do those studies --

22 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [12:39:00] I apologise. Your Honours, we've moved on to
23 another topic here, but since we are approaching the break, might it be an idea for the
24 expert to look at the discrepancy that was raised just now by my learned friend, to
25 have access to his material if he has them here, to be able to explain this issue of the

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 male versus female.

2 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:39:22] He can always look and request and
3 look at his material. I mean, it's up to the witness or to the expert to answer
4 according to what his best knowledge is.

5 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [12:39:38] Because we've left --

6 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:39:41] I don't think there is a need to tell him
7 what he has to do.

8 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [12:39:44] No, no, of course not, but I think that we've left it at
9 that and we've moved on. So the issue is lingering. And I think that it is fair for
10 him to be able to explain that to your Honour so you have a complete picture. So if
11 he wishes perhaps to consult during the break.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:40:00] Yes. But, Mr Prosecutor, you know
13 that you have later on the possibility to re-question.

14 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [12:40:06] Very well.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:40:07] And there you can re-question on this
16 topic or others. But now I think it's time for the Defence to question, and I think it's
17 also for the Defence to question on what topic they want to question or they deem
18 relevant.

19 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [12:40:27] Very well.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:40:29] Please go ahead. The right thing is
21 that in 5 minutes we break, or even less, for lunch.

22 MR O'SHEA: [12:40:35] Yes, your Honours. But I would really have appreciated
23 that intervention to come not in the middle of my question, because it wasn't an
24 objection to my question.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:40:43] Yes. I already said this so there is no

1 need to say it again. That was also my intervention in that sense. So please.

2 MR O'SHEA: [12:40:54] Yes. I didn't hear your Honour say that, sorry.

3 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:40:57] Well ...

4 MR O'SHEA: [12:40:59]

5 Q. [12:41:00] So we were talking about studies which may have been done on
6 close-knit societies. What I wanted to ask you is, have these studies in any way
7 demonstrated that DNA analysis could come up as positive matches for people who
8 are technically not relatives within those societies?

9 A. [12:41:37] This is only relevant when there's truly a high inbreeding in the
10 relevant population. And I don't have any information on that. Do you have more
11 information on that?

12 Q. [12:42:05] No, no, sir, I don't. I'm relying on your expertise.

13 A. [12:42:09] Yes. But when there is a population with a high inbreeding factor, it
14 changes the results.

15 Q. [12:42:16] Yes.

16 A. [12:42:18] It has a dimming effect on the likelihood ratio. And we can
17 incorporate in our formulas an inbreeding factor, if necessary. But then we must
18 have that information.

19 Q. [12:42:38] If I could focus for an instant on the term "relative." One has the
20 father, the mother and the children, which is the most direct line. Then you have
21 sisters, brothers, uncles, aunties. So if you go to the sisters, brothers, uncles and
22 aunties, would we have DNA matches?

23 A. [12:43:12] With autosomal DNA profiling, those familial relationships, as you
24 point out, uncles are much, much harder. Then autosomal DNA profiling is not the
25 right instrument any more. Now we must go, for example, to Y chromosomal typing

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 or mitochondrial DNA typing.

2 Autosomal DNA profiling is ideal for first degree relationships and siblings. Beyond
3 that, you should look for another typing method to prove kinship between two
4 individuals.

5 Q. [12:43:52] Can you have a DNA match between an uncle and a nephew?

6 A. [12:44:06] When you look at full DNA profiles, no, this is extremely unlikely.

7 Also a DNA match between two brothers is extremely unlikely if they're not identical.

8 MR O'SHEA: [12:44:22] We can break there, your Honour.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [12:44:24] Okay. We break for lunch. We will
10 resume at 14.15, one hour and a half, and most likely finish then within the next hour
11 and a half. Thank you very much.

12 The hearing is adjourned.

13 THE COURT USHER: [12:44:44] All rise.

14 (Recess taken at 12.44 p.m.)

15 (Upon resuming in open session at 2.22 p.m.)

16 THE COURT USHER: [14:22:23] All rise.

17 Please be seated.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:22:45] Good afternoon. Good afternoon,
19 Professor, to you as well.

20 I give the floor again to the Defence for Mr Gbagbo. Can we also have an estimate in
21 terms of time, please?

22 MR O'SHEA: [14:23:34] Some minutes, I think.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:23:38] Thank you.

24 MR O'SHEA: [14:23:59]

25 Q. [14:24:00] So Professor Kloosterman, I hope you had a pleasant lunch?

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 A. [14:24:06] Thank you.

2 Q. [14:24:07] Yes. When you were being questioned by the Prosecutor and you
3 were talking about the fact that you used a Dutch database?

4 A. [14:24:25] Yes.

5 Q. [14:24:26] Dutch population database, you didn't have a population database for
6 the Ivory Coast?

7 A. [14:24:32] No.

8 Q. [14:24:33] And you said that it does have an effect. Can you explain what kind
9 of effect?

10 A. [14:24:46] It will provide you with an unlikely ratio, which I expect is closely to
11 the likely ratio which I reported, because we see differences between, allele
12 frequencies between different populations but those allele frequencies, those
13 differences are not that high that you get enormous differences in the likelihood ratio
14 calculations.

15 But if there is effect, yes.

16 Q. [14:25:17] And the expectation that you would get a similar result if you did
17 have an Ivory Coast database, of course, until you've actually done it, it remains a
18 hypothesis, doesn't it?

19 A. [14:25:39] Yes. But the Ivory Coast population for example is impossible
20 because it's not there. It's not published. But the other population, studies from
21 Africa which you could use in this case.

22 Q. [14:26:06] But you didn't in this case?

23 A. [14:26:08] We didn't do in this case, no. But we made transparent which
24 populations in that example we used.

25 Q. [14:26:14] Now, the final matter is this. The DNA analysis which is conducted,

1 the result which is obtained from the analysis, would it be fair to say that that result is
2 limited to the exclusive question is there a relationship between this sample from the
3 alleged victim and this sample from the alleged family member; it can't actually go
4 beyond that in terms of conclusions, can it?

5 A. [14:27:24] I'm --

6 Q. [14:27:24] It's just a simple comparison of two samples?

7 A. [14:27:27] It's a simple electronic comparison between another two samples,
8 because we had more bodies here. We had more profiles from reference samples.

9 Q. [14:27:39] Yes?

10 A. [14:27:39] So we compared everything with everything electronically.

11 Q. [14:27:42] Yes, yes. I understand about the reference samples?

12 A. [14:27:46] Yes.

13 Q. [14:27:46] I perhaps expressed myself badly in that respect.

14 But then if one goes to your section in your report which your report

15 CIV-OTP-0084-3930, section 5, it's stated here the DNA profiling results of remains

16 AAAH12574NL of victim 3 show a familial match with the relatives of Gnon Rokia

17 Ouattara. Given the family tree the DNA typing results are more than one thousand

18 million, one times ten to the power of nine times more likely if the tooth

19 AAHJ2574NL originated from Gnon Rokia Ouattara than if the tooth related from an

20 unrelated random female.

21 Now, would you agree with me that, strictly speaking, that sentence should not read

22 "originated from Gnon Rokia Ouattara" because there you are identifying a specific

23 individual. Whereas, if I've understood your evidence correctly, all you can say is

24 that there is a familial match between one sample and the other. So it could be Gnon

25 Rokia Ouattara or another person in a relationship, sorry, another relative. So that

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 conclusion, strictly speaking, scientifically is incorrect, isn't it? You can't say from,
2 from Gnon Rokia Ouattara?

3 A. [14:29:48] If the family tree is correct and complete, meaning that she doesn't
4 have more sisters or brothers I'm not aware of, this is scientifically correct. If she has
5 more unknown sisters or brothers --

6 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:30:08] Probably.

7 THE WITNESS: [14:30:09] -- then it's different.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:30:10] No. I think probably, probably,
9 maybe scientifically not correct is giving a name, because the name is not something
10 that you ascertained; is that right?

11 THE WITNESS: [14:30:27] No. We were provided with a family tree --

12 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:30:29] Yes, yes, yes.

13 THE WITNESS: [14:30:31] -- from this particular person who has a name in that
14 family tree.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:30:34] Yes. Assuming that the name is the
16 right one.

17 THE WITNESS: [14:30:37] In the family tree, yes, yes.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:30:38] Okay, okay.

19 MR O'SHEA: [14:30:41]

20 Q. [14:30:41] Now, the difficulty that I have with that is that this family tree that
21 you are referring to is not in this report; is that correct?

22 A. [14:30:56] That's information from the ICC, yes.

23 Q. [14:30:58] Yet we have information that this person has eight brothers and
24 sisters. So on the basis of what we know, if there is a family tree that states that this
25 person does not have brothers and sisters, then it's incorrect. So that's why, since we

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 don't have the family tree in this report, strictly speaking, that conclusion, the way it
2 is expressed, it should not be expressed like that, should it?

3 A. [14:31:34] If this person has more brothers and sisters who are missing, then I
4 cannot discriminate between one daughter or the other. That's correct. Same with
5 a mass disaster, when I have, for example, brothers on the plane, looking at the DNA
6 profile from the parents, I can't say which brother is who only looking at the DNA
7 profiles.

8 Q. [14:32:02] Yes. Professor, thank you very much for your cooperation. You've
9 been most helpful.

10 A. [14:32:11] Yes.

11 MR O'SHEA: [14:32:12] Your Honours, those are my questions.

12 THE WITNESS: [14:32:15] We had one unfinished business before lunch about male
13 and female DNA profiles.

14 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:32:20] Yes. I know you have now some
15 more documents.

16 THE WITNESS: [14:32:24] Yes.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:32:24] Yes. So please, if you want to explain,
18 I can't remember exactly the issue, but I think you wanted to explain something
19 further on the questioning by the Defence, by the way.

20 MR O'SHEA: [14:32:39] I'll remain standing for now while you explain it.

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:32:43] Please, yes.

22 THE WITNESS: [14:32:47] Yes, I need some help with --

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:33:35] It's on evidence channel 2.

24 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:33:55] Make sure it is not being broadcast. Thank you.

25 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:33:58] Also if it was, I must say not very

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 many people would know what we are talking about.

2 THE WITNESS: [14:34:10] So this question from the Defence was a report, 0086, and
3 on page 1268, where we reported on a tooth. And on that page we report that DNA
4 typing of the tooth AAHJ2618 yielded the female DNA profile. This DNA profile
5 matches the previously generated DNA profile of victim 1, AAHJ2572.

6 This is the profile of that last item and it shows you also the sex of that body, of that
7 unidentified body, which has an X and a Y.

8 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:35:26] Professor, you can also move a little bit
9 there and move the microphone, so maybe you are more comfortable, yes.

10 THE WITNESS: [14:35:34] Okay. Thank you. We see that this item is from a male.
11 It is XY. And we reported in that report on page number 8 that it is a female DNA
12 profile, which is incorrectly stated in this report. And I'm sorry about that.

13 MR O'SHEA: [14:36:18]

14 Q. [14:36:19] Thank you, Professor. Are you finished with that point?

15 A. [14:36:21] Yes. Then I can show you the other profile which also makes clear
16 that this is a male DNA profile.

17 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:36:33] Your Honours, should that be captured, a snapshot?
18 Is that possible?

19 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:36:38] Well, I think, I would assume it is.

20 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:36:42] If we could do it for the first page before we move to
21 the second one.

22 THE COURT OFFICER: [14:36:48] It is possible. We are just encountering some
23 technical problem. An assistant is coming soon.

24 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:36:55] But in any case, we will do it, of course.

25 THE WITNESS: [14:36:58] But we are talking about two male matching DNA

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 profiles.

2 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:37:02] Yes.

3 THE WITNESS: [14:37:07] Just a little further clarification, the D8 is a locus on
4 chromosome 8. And it has alleles 12, 14. The next locus on chromosome 21, alleles
5 29, 30. Those data are electronically transferred, so we don't make clerical errors
6 there, and fed to the Monopoly software to make the comparisons.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:37:41] Okay. Thank you.

8 THE WITNESS: [14:37:42] Thank you.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:37:43] Is this the clarification you wanted to
10 give us?

11 THE WITNESS: [14:37:45] Yes.

12 MR O'SHEA: [14:37:46]

13 Q. [14:37:46] Those are the electropherograms that we were talking about earlier,
14 aren't they?

15 A. [14:37:52] Yes, these are the electropherograms yes.

16 Q. [14:37:55] Can I just ask you, when it says 44.2 on the second section there, is
17 that an allele?

18 A. [14:38:01] Yes, yeah. It's a variant allele, but it's an allele.

19 Q. [14:38:05] On the second bar, the second chart, the last reference.

20 A. [14:38:19] There is referred to this allele.

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:38:22] Okay, okay, okay.

22 MR O'SHEA: [14:38:25]

23 Q. [14:38:26] Just one last point, it may seem obvious. I don't know if it is obvious,
24 but when a tooth has been provided by someone who is dead as opposed to someone
25 who is alive, I suppose it's exactly the same thing, isn't it? The DNA doesn't change

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 when a person dies?

2 A. [14:38:47] No, no. It can degrade, so you can't analyse it any more.

3 MR O'SHEA: [14:38:52] Yes. Thank you very much.

4 A. [14:38:57] Thank you.

5 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:38:57] Can you please display both again just
6 so that we can take screenshots.

7 MR MACDONALD: [14:39:08] Actually, with your permission, your Honour, why
8 don't we just make photocopies. I think it would be better qualities because the
9 prompter is not --

10 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:39:16] We can do both.

11 MR MACDONALD: [14:39:18] -- capturing everything it seems.

12 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:39:20] We can do both. But it depends on
13 how it is.

14 Can you just zoom out a little bit so it captures the whole. Yes. That's it. A little
15 bit. Yes. And then we can make also photocopies.

16 (Discussion off the record)

17 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:41:05] Does it not work?

18 So, Professor, we take two photocopies.

19 THE WITNESS: [14:41:30] Yes.

20 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:41:30] Because I think we have technical
21 issues, but this is nothing new, at least once a day, technical issues. And then we'll
22 give you back the documents.

23 So the questioning by the Defence for Mr Gbagbo is terminated?

24 MR ALTIT: [14:41:48] (Interpretation) Yes, your Honour. The cross-examination
25 on behalf of Mr Gbagbo is completed.

- 1 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:41:58] Thank you very much.
- 2 Now I revert to the Office of the Prosecutor, asking if they want to re-question.
- 3 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:42:06] Yes, Mr President, just a couple of questions.
- 4 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:42:08] Okay. The floor is yours.
- 5 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:42:10] Thank you.
- 6 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:42:11] Now, Professor, there is the request of
- 7 re-questioning by the Office of the Prosecutor for some further clarifications.
- 8 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:42:24] Thank you, Mr President.
- 9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:42:25] Mr Demirdjian.
- 10 MR DEMIRDJIAN: [14:42:28] Thank you, Mr President.
- 11 Q. [14:42:29] Dr Kloosterman, just a couple of clarifications. So on this last point,
- 12 the issue of the reporting of victim 1 as female in this other report, is it correct to say
- 13 that the error does not lie in the DNA results but, rather, it lies in the reporting?
- 14 A. [14:42:47] Yes, yeah.
- 15 Q. [14:42:51] Now, this is --
- 16 A. [14:42:52] And not in the matching. It's in the reporting. So the match is still
- 17 there.
- 18 Q. [14:43:02] And this is victim number 1. It does not relate to the three victims
- 19 for whom you had a DNA match with relatives; is that correct?
- 20 A. [14:43:11] That's correct, yes.
- 21 Q. [14:43:13] Okay. So with respect to this identification of victim 1 as a female,
- 22 does that in any way alter your conclusions relating to the DNA match for victims 3, 8
- 23 and 15?
- 24 A. [14:43:30] No.
- 25 Q. [14:43:34] Thank you, Professor. One last question on the issue of the Dutch

1 allele frequency database. The fact that you did not have access to the allele
2 frequency of Côte d'Ivoire, does that change anything to the three victims for whom
3 you had a DNA match of over one thousand million as reported in your report?
4 Does that change anything?

5 A. [14:44:06] I don't expect that will change, but I haven't done it yet because the
6 populations in that data to my knowledge are not available. But I expect, and I'm
7 sure, that the evidence in this case, DNA evidence for the identification is strong and
8 will stay strong.

9 Q. [14:44:34] Thank you for your answer, Professor.
10 Your Honours, that completes our further questioning.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:44:39] Thank you, Mr Demirdjian.
12 Again I revert now to the Defence, recalling to the rule the last possibility to question.
13 Mr Knoops.

14 MR KNOOPS: [14:44:52] Mr President, one question.

15 QUESTIONED BY MR KNOOPS:

16 Q. [14:44:55] Professor, going back to the question of the Prosecution regarding the
17 database which you didn't consult, the allele database of Côte d'Ivoire, you did say in
18 your report, in the amended report --

19 A. [14:45:19] Yeah.

20 Q. [14:45:21] -- on page 3925 -- 35, paragraph 4, the last sentence, "The
21 misidentification rate may vary among populations but in general appears to be low."
22 And my question is have you any foundation for this observation, in specific with
23 respect to whether certain types of populations are more vulnerable for
24 misidentification, the misidentification rate when it concerns the general type
25 identification?

1 A. [14:46:17] Yeah, that concerns the gender of an individual.

2 Q. [14:46:20] Yes, yes.

3 A. [14:46:21] Yes. There are populations in the Far East who have a high, who
4 give a high misidentification than populations, Caucasian populations, for example.

5 Q. [14:46:34] Can you be more specific when you speak about "appears to be low."
6 It's quite a general remark. Do you have percentages or --

7 A. [14:46:43] It appears to be low. That's from our own data. We investigate
8 many, many DNA samples of reference samples who we know the sex from.

9 Q. [14:46:55] But you couldn't --

10 A. [14:46:56] We occasionally see a mistyping.

11 Q. [14:47:00] But you're not in a position to extrapolate this to, for instance, West
12 Africa?

13 A. [14:47:06] No. If there are no scientific results available on that area, I can't
14 extrapolate it, no.

15 Q. [14:47:18] Thank you.

16 Thank you, Mr President.

17 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:47:21] Thank you, Mr Knoops.

18 Mr O'Shea.

19 MR O'SHEA: [14:47:22] Just one matter arising out of re-examination.

20 QUESTIONED BY MR O'SHEA:

21 Q. [14:47:25] Professor, it's just a question of the terminology you used when you
22 answered the Prosecution a moment ago. Now, you as a scientist, you work on facts
23 and data. So when you say "I don't expect that will change, but I haven't done it yet
24 because the population is in that data to my knowledge not available, but I expect and
25 I'm sure that the evidence in this case, DNA evidence for the identification is strong

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 and will stay strong."

2 Now, as a scientist, it's right, isn't it, that you can say "The evidence based on the
3 Dutch database is strong and I will expect that it will stay strong," but you cannot as a
4 scientist, can you, say "I am sure it will stay strong" when on your own admission you
5 haven't done it?

6 A. [14:48:38] Yeah, but I have not seen any population in the world yet where those
7 markers we're referring to, those 15 loci I've shown you results are not variable. And
8 as long as they're variable and within the population, you will end up with a high
9 likelihood ratio, especially when you have close family members and you have DNA
10 typing data of 15 different loci.

11 Q. [14:49:14] Thank you.

12 A. [14:49:14] It will only have effect when every individual in that population has
13 exactly the same typing result, which we have never seen before.

14 Q. [14:49:27] Yes. Like Newton never saw the theory of general relativity.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:49:34] Of course, of course, of course. This
16 is -- okay.

17 MR MACDONALD: [14:49:39] Getting argumentative.

18 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:49:41] Yes. We could have lived without it.
19 But it's okay.

20 Thank you very much. This concludes your expertise as a witness, as an expert here
21 before this Chamber. Thank you very much, Professor, for having been here.

22 THE WITNESS: [14:49:59] Thank you.

23 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:50:00] Well, have a nice trip home. It's not
24 so far.

25 THE WITNESS: [14:50:03] Okay.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:50:04] Normally witnesses I wish a nice trip
2 home, they have a longer distance to go home.

3 THE WITNESS: Yes.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: Thank you very much for being here.

5 THE WITNESS: [14:50:13] Thank you. Yeah.

6 (The witness is excused)

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:50:44] Now we have finished this witness.

8 We cannot start with the next witness because of familiarisation things, issues. We
9 can start only tomorrow with the next witness at 9.15.

10 But before adjourning to tomorrow 9.15, I want to communicate how we proceed for
11 the following weeks, and I am speaking until we break for the summer recess.

12 From tomorrow, on the 31st and 1st of June, we will have Witness 606 and Witness
13 583.

14 You might remember that we have no hearing on 2nd of June and we will continue on
15 19th of June, because we ran out of witnesses, with Witness 626, who should by then
16 have come back from the holidays, and Witness 164. And these two witnesses in the
17 day from 19, 20 and 21st of June, remembering that the 21st is a shorter day, meaning
18 only two sessions instead of three.

19 In the week from 27 to 30 of June we will go with Witnesses 226, 239 and 411. And
20 I'm always following as much as possible the list the Prosecutors submitted a few
21 weeks ago.

22 And then in the weeks from the 3rd to the 7th and from the 10th to the 14th of July we
23 will have the following witnesses: 607 and 156. We try together with VWU as
24 much as possible to have them here viva voce, but if not, we will make a video link,
25 but we will for sure try to have them here.

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 Then witnesses 87, 88, 172 and 237. And this is the programme from now to the
2 summer recess.

3 As soon as possible I would like also to have from the Office of the Prosecutor the
4 numbers related to the witness the office wants to withdraw or is intending to
5 withdraw, because obviously it has an impact on the organisation of the programme.
6 And finally, on Wednesday, we will, I hope we really will, but I'm sure we do, on
7 Wednesday we will come out with a few decisions, one is also the programme related
8 to the further steps after the summer recess, which will start, as I said before, on the
9 28th of August.

10 This concludes the hearing today. The hearing is adjourned to tomorrow morning
11 9.15 with Witness 606.

12 I was trying to go fast so nobody wants to stand up, but obviously somebody stands
13 up. Maître Altit.

14 MR ALTIT: [14:54:53] (Interpretation) Yes, thank you, Mr President. And sorry to
15 get to my feet.

16 We're talking about 583, Witness 583 that you said would come just after 606, whom
17 we will be hearing tomorrow, and maybe he will have finished tomorrow and maybe
18 not. This will leave us so 583 will be, if I understand, will be on Wednesday, will be
19 after, if I understood correctly from what you've said. That will give us one day to
20 play with, one day to prepare it, because 583 was scheduled, if I'm not mistaken, it
21 was scheduled for September, if I'm not mistaken, Mr President, that is to say after the
22 judicial recess. So I do apologise, Mr President.

23 You might like to say something?

24 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:55:48] No. I just wanted to say that I
25 expected this. But Witness 583 is an expert which worked together with 626, which

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 has been scheduled for today, so you should be prepared.

2 MR MACDONALD: [14:56:11] I just want to be very honest, your Honour, and
3 frank, no, because he is not limited it that, your Honour.

4 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:56:20] Well, he might not be limited to that.

5 MR MACDONALD: [14:56:22] He also did a crime scene at the Lem mosque. He
6 also did a crime scene at certain locations 16th December and 3rd of March.

7 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:56:33] Yes.

8 MR MACDONALD: [14:56:33] I think that maybe we can start on Thursday.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:56:37] We start on Thursday.

10 MR MACDONALD: [14:56:38] Not Wednesday.

11 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:56:40] No, no, no. We start on -- well, it
12 depends on how long we have with the witness for tomorrow.

13 MR MACDONALD: [14:56:45] Tomorrow the witness should take the same length
14 that this witness today.

15 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:56:49] Then we see. We'll see. We go step
16 by step. In any case we will bring 583, because 583 is the twin witness to 626, which
17 should have been prepared for today at least for that portion because, as you cannot
18 see, but I can tell you, that here it is written that if we do not finish with 583 by this
19 week on 1 June we can, because he is here and there is no expenses for having
20 postponing him, we could continue in the morning of the 19th. So I think that is -- I
21 don't know why you always jump up.

22 MR MACDONALD: [14:57:35] We're trying to work together, I think, making
23 proposal to the Chamber, which you are the obviously final arbitrator.

24 Your Honours, we're working on sending our list of documents that we will send as
25 soon as we can today. What could be a proposal, because I will be taking that

Trial Hearing
WITNESS: CIV-OTP-P-0601

(Open Session)

ICC-02/11-01/15

1 witness, and I also need some time to prepare him while he was not -- because he's
2 not only covering, your Honour, I know he's a twin of 626, but not solely on that.
3 In order not to miss anything, the Prosecution would certainly appreciate if we could
4 start his testimony on Thursday. And I'll guarantee you that the Prosecution's
5 presentation will be done on Thursday for sure. And then Monday, since he's here,
6 the Defence could start his cross-examination, and then I think it provides enough
7 time for everyone and it would be fair and reasonable. That's my honest opinion
8 and submission.

9 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:58:46] Maître Altit.

10 MR ALTIT: [14:58:48] (Interpretation) Yes, thank you, Mr President. Just a word.
11 Personally I would like to thank Mr MacDonald for his suggestion. Of course we are
12 in your hands, the hands of the Chamber.

13 Just a word about 583. Of course, Mr President, you are right in saying that there is
14 an expert side that might be processed rather rapidly. But as Mr MacDonald just
15 said, Witness 583 is not only coming to just testify from that angle. He has many
16 things to say on a multitude of matters, and it demands true preparation and for the
17 calling party and yet more so, but of course as much so for the non-calling party.
18 And I humbly request that your Chamber take into account this aspect so that the
19 questioning be prepared as best as possible. I think the Defence needs to be allowed
20 some time. There we are, Mr President. That was why I rose to my feet.

21 PRESIDING JUDGE TARFUSSER: [14:59:51] Well, tomorrow we start with 606.

22 The hearing is adjourned to tomorrow at 9.15.

23 THE COURT USHER: [15:00:05] All rise.

24 (The hearing ends in open session at 3 p.m.)

25 CORRECTIONS REPORT

- 1 The Court Management Section has made the following corrections in the transcript:
- 2 *Page 14, line 20: "times" is corrected to "types".
- 3 *Page 23, lines 4-5: "frequency" is corrected to "frequency data".
- 4 *Page 23, line 5:
- 5 "You can explained to us what a allele frequency was" is corrected to "Now, you
- 6 explained to us what an allele frequency was".
- 7 *Page 37, line 21: "Not here." is corrected to "(Indecipherable)".
- 8 *Page 42, line 7: "variety" is corrected to "reality".
- 9 *Page 43, lines 19-20:
- 10 "a living putative father" is corrected to "a living -- a putative father".
- 11 *Page 44, line 7: "analysis" is corrected to "analyses".
- 12 *Page 44, line 22: "none" is corrected to "more".
- 13 *Page 49, lines 1: "info" is corrected to "them for".
- 14 *Page 50, line 2: "it was" is corrected to "there was".
- 15 *Page 56, line 4: "didn't" is corrected to "don't".
- 16 *Page 56, line 5: "profiles. Sometimes" is corrected to "profiles, and sometimes".