

2024



OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON  
SEXUAL VIOLENCE IN CONFLICT

# INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PROSECUTORS ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CONFLICT-RELATED SEXUAL VIOLENCE



26-28 MARCH  
THE HAGUE

## END OF CONFERENCE REPORT

# Content

- 03.** Overview
- 03.** Acknowledgements
- 03.** Conference sponsors
- 03.** Conference Advisory Committee
- 04.** Conference — Summary of Programme
- 04.** High-Level Segment
- 03.** Expert discussions
- 03.** Conference Closing
- 05.** Expert Discussions
- 06.** Films & Interviews
- 06.** Kavumu, DRC: Lessons learned in adopting a victim-centred and trauma-informed approach to prosecute local militia
- 07.** Al Khatib, Germany: Lessons learned from prosecuting CRSV crimes in the domestic courts of a third-party state
- 08.** Sepur Zarco, Guatemala: Lesson learned in prosecuting historic and widespread sexual violence and sexual slavery against indigenous women
- 09.** Titus Yoma, Kenya: Lessons learned from building a case to prosecute authorities for post-electoral violence under command responsibility
- 10.** Roundtable sessions
- 10.** Prosecution Policy and Case Prioritisation
- 11.** Developing Crime-base Evidence
- 12.** Modes of liability: the challenge of promoting accountability for those responsible for systematic CRSV
- 13.** Victim-centred proceedings: the importance and impact of victim participation and representation in judicial proceedings
- 14.** Securing Protection for Victims and Witnesses
- 15.** The Use of Sexual Violence in Conflict by Terrorist Groups
- 16.** Slavery, Trafficking in Persons and CRSV
- 17.** Recommendations to further prosecutions of CRSV
- 19.** ANNEX A — Advisory Committee Members
- 20.** ANNEX B — High-Level Opening Participation
- 21.** ANNEX C — Closing Session
- 22.** ANNEX D — Outcomes from the Conference

# Overview

**From 26 to 28 March 2024 the first International Conference of Prosecutors on Accountability for Conflict-Related Sexual Violence (the Conference) was held at the Peace Palace in The Hague.**



The Conference was led by the UN Team of Experts on the Rule of Law and Sexual Violence in Conflict (Team of Experts), under the leadership of the Special Representative of the Secretary General on Sexual Violence in Conflict (SRSG-SVC), together with the Government of the Netherlands and with the support of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France. The first of its kind, the Conference marked a significant milestone in increasing efforts to combat impunity and uphold justice for conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV).

The purpose of the Conference was two-fold: (1) to capture and share best practices and challenges of the past decades; and (2) to initiate a community of practice across expert practitioners worldwide to foster future practice and learn from one another, with a view to improve the rate of investigation, prosecutions and adjudication of CRSV cases. Through thematic sessions and case studies, the Conference aimed to cultivate and equip a network of expert practitioners committed to advancing justice and combating impunity for CRSV crimes on a global scale.

This report details the preparation, format and participants of the Conference, the research material and practical tools created for the occasion including four documentaries, and the key themes emerging from the discussions at the Conference. Its final section outlines recommendations to deliver greater justice for CRSV that emerged during the Conference.

This report is supplemented by and should be read in conjunction with six Working Papers and four Case Briefs produced as supporting materials for the conference, which were revised on the basis of technical discussions at the conference, and which present an up-to-date horizon scan of prosecution practices.

## Acknowledgements

### Conference sponsors

The Conference was co-hosted by the United Nations Team of Experts and the Government of the Netherlands. Significant financial, logistical and substantive support for the Conference was provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Additional financial support was provided by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France.

The Conference would not have been possible without the strong engagement of the co-lead entities of the Team of Experts: the Office of the SRSG-SVC, the Department of Peace Operations (DPO), the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

### Conference Advisory Committee

The Conference greatly benefitted from the active involvement of an Advisory Committee, comprised of renowned academics and practitioners, who are each specialists in the investigation and prosecution of CRSV. This Committee engaged in the conceptualisation of the Conference and preparation of substantive material (including reviewing case briefs and scripts for the short films, reviewing briefing papers for each roundtable session of the Conference, and preparing guiding questions for the roundtable sessions and interviews). During the conference, the Advisory Committee members chaired and led roundtable sessions as well as live interviews with practitioners. The full list of Advisory Committee members is detailed in Annex A of this Report.



# Summary of Programme

The Conference took place over two and a half days (26 to 28 March 2024) at the Peace Palace in The Hague. The Conference opened with a High-Level political segment followed by in-depth expert discussions, including four sessions discussing emblematic case studies of successful CRSV prosecutions at the domestic level, and seven thematic roundtable sessions on cross-cutting topics relevant to the prosecution of CRSV crimes. To guarantee the high quality of debates, participants in the technical discussions were limited to national practitioners affiliated with specialised units or prosecutorial services with jurisdiction over international crimes, including CRSV, along with legal practitioners from international tribunals and civil society organisations (CSOs) engaged in the litigation of CRSV cases. The technical level discussions took place under Chatham House rules to allow for candid and meaningful exchanges.

## High-Level Segment

The High-Level Segment, open to a wider audience, served as a forum in which Member States of the United Nations and other dignitaries focused on the continued criticality of accountability for CRSV as the international community prepared to celebrate the 15-year anniversary of United Nations Security Council resolution 1888 (2009), which created the Office of the SRSV-SVC and the UN Team of Experts. Reflecting on the 15-year anniversary of the mandate, SRSV-SVC Ms. Pramila Patten inaugurated the segment by emphasising the enduring commitment of the United Nations to combatting sexual violence in conflict and reiterated its commitment to survivors to hold perpetrators of such crimes accountable. Ms. Patten also delivered a message on behalf of the United Nations Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, who recalled that preventing and ending sexual violence in conflict can only be achieved through accountability and survivor centred justice, and expressed his solidarity with the prosecutors present and his thanks for their important work. Following these addresses, Ms. Hanke Bruins Slot, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, emphasised the gravity of sexual violence being used as a deliberate military tactic in conflict, condemning it unequivocally as a violation of international humanitarian law. She also expressed the significance of the Conference as a unique opportunity for prosecutors worldwide to unite in their shared determination to seek justice for victims.

Remarks were also given by H.E. Mr. Francois Alabrune, Ambassador of France to the Netherlands, Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon, Special Representative on Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict and Minister of State for the Commonwealth and the United Nations (by way of video message), H.E. Joanna Roper, CMG, His Majesty's British Ambassador to the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Ms. Nazhat Shameem Khan, Deputy Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court.



Several Member States of the United Nations also delivered statements<sup>4</sup>. Collectively, they reaffirmed their commitment to accountability for CRSV. Member States unequivocally acknowledged the need for additional resources and efforts to fight impunity for CRSV and denounced sexual violence as a grave violation of international law. Member States also noted the innovative efforts they have each taken to fight impunity for CRSV crimes and the importance of initiatives to exchange and foster communities of practice to pursue justice for a criminality that presents unique challenges for prosecutors, investigators and those providing assistance.

<sup>1</sup> The High-Level Segment involved the participation of 27 Member States represented by ambassadors, ministers, chargé d'affaires or deputy heads of mission; representatives from the International Criminal Court (ICC); United Nations agencies; and four CSOs.

<sup>2</sup> The Conference was attended by 95 participants, including: 55 representatives from prosecution offices or magistratures as well as four additional legal specialists from 32 Member States; nine representatives from six international courts or mechanisms; 15 representatives from 11 CSOs; five representatives from UN agencies; and the 11 members of the Advisory Committee.

<sup>3</sup> While the substantive Conference was closed to the public and operated under Chatham House Rules, the High-Level Opening was an open forum where representatives of Member States could participate.

<sup>4</sup> Including Belgium, Colombia, the United States, Kosovo, Canada, Switzerland, Italy, Australia, Ireland and Denmark. See further Annex B of this Report.

## Expert discussions

During the Conference, participants engaged in a series of thematic roundtable sessions to share their experiences, identify emerging and past best practices, as well as remaining challenges. These sessions covered the 7 following areas:

1. prosecution policy and case prioritization;
2. developing crime-base evidence;
3. modes of liability for prosecuting CRSV;
4. victim-centred proceedings and victim participation;
5. victim and witness protection;
6. the use of sexual violence in conflict by terrorist groups; and
7. slavery and trafficking in persons in relation to CRSV.

Each session was opened by expert panellists, who provided an overview of the topic and core issues to be discussed, before guiding a peer-to-peer exchange of practitioners' experiences with guiding questions.

These sessions were interspersed with in-depth discussions on four emblematic cases where CRSV crimes have been prosecuted in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Germany, Guatemala and Kenya. Each of these discussions extracted best practices, challenges and lessons learned in these cases, supported by short documentaries on each case and interviews with practitioners involved with the cases. These sessions are the focus of the remainder of the report.

Conference Closing



The Closing session of the Conference included remarks by several speakers, all of whom highlighted the important work occurring globally to pursue accountability for CRSV that had been identified throughout the Conference, the connections made amongst practitioners during the Conference itself, and the next steps emerging from the work of the Conference to establish a Community of Practice among like-minded global practitioners to share their best practices and experiences moving forward.

## Conference Closing

The Closing session of the Conference included remarks by several speakers<sup>5</sup>, all of whom highlighted the important work occurring globally to pursue accountability for CRSV that had been identified throughout the Conference, the connections made amongst practitioners during the Conference itself, and the next steps emerging from the work of the Conference to establish a Community of Practice among like-minded global practitioners to share their best practices and experiences moving forward

<sup>5</sup> See further Annex C of this Report.

# Expert Discussions



## Films & Interviews

The Conference featured short documentary films on four emblematic cases where sexual violence crimes have been prosecuted at the domestic level.<sup>6</sup>

1. the Kavumu case in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC);<sup>7</sup>
2. the Al-Khatib case in Germany;<sup>8</sup>
3. the Sepur Zarco case in Guatemala;<sup>9</sup> and
4. the ongoing prosecution of post-electoral violence in Kenya (a short segment of the work in progress film of this case was shown during the Conference, as it was yet to be finished).<sup>10</sup>

Each film detailed the facts, the trial and innovations in the investigation and prosecution of sexual violence in each case.

The film screenings were followed by a live interview with practitioners who had worked on each case to expand on the core lessons learned and spark discussions with practitioners from other fora.

The section below details each case and the key themes raised during those sessions.

## Kavumu, DRC: Lessons learned in adopting a victim-centred and trauma-informed approach to prosecute local militia

### Session overview

The Kavumu case was a landmark trial in the fight against impunity for sexual violence in the DRC. Between 2013 and 2016, in the Kavumu village situated in South Kivu, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), members of the local militia Jeshi la Yesu ("Jesus' Army" in Swahili) kidnapped and raped around 42 girls aged between 18 months and 11 years old. Nineteen defendants, including local parliamentarian Frédéric Batumike, were charged with and sentenced for rape as a crime against humanity amongst other crimes.

The trial exemplifies good practices in several areas: the adoption of a victim-centred and trauma-informed approach, the collection and analysis of a diverse range of evidence, the implementation of support measures to ensure the active participation of victims and witnesses in the proceedings, the fostering of multidisciplinary cooperation and the display of courage by the military jurisdiction in prosecuting an influential actor and a feared militia in a challenging operational and security environment, as well as charging rape as a crime against humanity to demonstrate that CRSV was committed as a common purpose of the group.

### Key takeaways

1. Building trust through a victim-centred approach: Panellists highlighted that progressing the Kavumu case had required awareness-raising and trust-building with the victims and their communities, who had initially refused to come forward or speak about the crimes due to collective trauma, social stigmatization, potential physical and psychological repercussions and security/retaliation concerns. Implementing a victim-centred, trauma-informed approach to the investigation and prosecution was critical for the case to advance through the judicial process. The approach taken can be regarded as a best practice.

<sup>6</sup> The films were produced as a collaboration between the Team of Experts and a group of filmmakers: Jerome Thelia, Gabriel Baron, Michael Solsky, Miriam Velazquez and Xavier Marrades.

<sup>7</sup> Cour Militaire du Sud Kivu, Batumike et al., RP 0105/2017, Judgment, 13 December 2017; Appeal: Haute Cour Militaire, Batumike et al., RP 139/2018, Judgment, 26 July 2018.

<sup>8</sup> Oberlandesgericht Koblenz, 1 StE 3/21, Judgment, 24 February 2021 (Eyad A.); Oberlandesgericht Koblenz, 1 StE 9/19, Judgment, 12 January 2022 (Anwar R.).

<sup>9</sup> Tribunal Primero de Sentencia Penal, Narcoactividad y Delitos Contra el Ambiente, C-01-2012-00021, Judgment, 26 February 2016; Appeals: Tribunal Primero de Sentencia Penal, Narcoactividad y Delitos Contra el Ambiente, C-01076-2012-00021 Of. 2º, Appeal of Heriberto Valdez Asig, 15 March 2016; Appeal of Moises Eduardo Galindo Ruiz, 17 March 2016; Appeal of Esteelmer Francisco Reyes Girón, 30 March 2016; Dismissal of the appeal by the High-Risk Crimes Appellate Tribunal, 28 November 2018.

<sup>10</sup> High Court of Kenya at Nairobi, Criminal Division, Republic vs. Titus Yoma & 11 Others, Criminal Case No. E074 of 2022.

2. Scope of evidence: Panellists also noted that harnessing a diverse range of evidence proved crucial to the success of the prosecution. Indeed, in Kavumu, the prosecution relied on a wide range of evidence that included testimony of local civilians and police; reports from activists, the media and the United Nations; declarations of the accused and soldiers injured during the attack; medical certificates of survivors; and telephone records between the accused commander and subordinates in the militia.
3. Deploying protective measures: To ensure the active participation of victims and witnesses in the proceedings, innovative protection and support measures were put in place which also supported the success of the proceedings. These included the use of pre-recorded testimony, obtaining testimony under secure conditions, the use of a specialized psychologist to collect testimony from direct victims, voice modification, camouflaged clothing and an isolation box for testimony. Panellists noted that throughout this process, collaboration among a network of partners was essential, including CSOs who brought specialised knowledge and expertise as well as members of the Task Force that had been established in South Kivu in 2015.<sup>11</sup> Together, they provided a multi-disciplinary approach to the investigation and prosecution of the case.
4. Cumulative modes of liability: The cumulative use of co-perpetration, indirect participation and group complicity as modes of liability to demonstrate the common purpose of the group, particularly in circumstances where the principal offender's identity was unknown, greatly increased the likelihood of conviction. As with many cases of sexual violence, the panellists acknowledged the difficulty in identifying direct perpetrators. The panellists noted how the lower court applied article 25(3) of the Rome Statute to find that the defendants were part of a group of persons acting with a common purpose. As such, applying art 25(3) meant the defendants could be held responsible for intentionally contributing to the criminal acts of the militia with the knowledge of its intention to systematically rape children. The High Military Court upheld the judgment on this point.

## Al Khatib, Germany: Lessons learned from prosecuting CRSV crimes in the domestic courts of a third-party state

### Session overview

The Al-Khatib case involved the prosecution by the court of a third-party state, Germany, of two defendants for international crimes committed against over 4,000 detainees in Branch 251, a detention centre in Al-Khatib, Damascus. Anwar R., who headed of the Investigation Division at Branch 251, and the prison connected to it, was prosecuted for sexual violence and a range of other violent offences including murder and torture. The sexual violence charges were brought as ordinary offences in the German Criminal Code. During the trial, the joint plaintiffs successfully petitioned the Court to amend the indictment, so that charges of sexual violence were charged as crimes against humanity. Anwar R. was convicted in January 2022 of murder, torture and deprivation of liberty as crimes against humanity; sexual coercion and rape as crimes against humanity; and murder, rape and aggravated sexual assault as ordinary crimes.

The discussion explored several best practices of the German prosecutors in pursuing accountability for state-sponsored and systematic sexual violence in detention centres in Syria, including: the positive role played by structural investigations in Germany; how the CRSV crimes were prosecuted as crimes against humanity; the use of diverse sources of evidence in the case; and the need for translation services to support the participation of victims and affected communities. The panellists also explored challenges and lessons learned from the trial, including: the need for gender competence in prosecuting CRSV crimes; and the need to protect and support victims and witnesses in prosecutions occurring in third-party states.

### Key takeaways

1. The use of "structural" investigations: The panellists observed that, particularly in the German context, structural investigations, through which authorities can collect evidence of systematic patterns of offending when there are no known perpetrators, have provided a useful tool in establishing the context in which the crimes are being committed. This structural examination provides the basis for proving the contextual element necessary to establish a "crime against humanity": that the CRSV crimes were committed "as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population". In Germany, such investigations were reported as putting authorities in a better position to prosecute persons involved in such crimes, as authorities are able to investigate and collect evidence related to a particular set of crimes or victims before known perpetrators are identified.

<sup>11</sup> In 2015, prompted by the need to address the ongoing crimes, a group of civil society organizations and UN entities (later designated as the Task Force) that had followed and documented the crimes from the outset, came together to jointly identify and advocate for an adequate judicial response to the incidents throughout the proceedings. The Task Force included representatives from: MONUSCO; Panzi Foundation; PHR; TRIAL International; UNDP; UNPOL.



2. Proving CRSV as a crime against humanity: The panellists noted that in the Al-Khatib case, prosecuting sexual violence as a crime against humanity did not require it to be widespread or systematic in itself. What mattered was that the sexual violence occurred as part of a widespread or systematic attack against the civilian population. The panellists noted that such approach may be of relevance to other jurisdictions prosecuting forms of CRSV as a crime against humanity.
3. Scope of evidence: The panellists also highlighted how diverse sources of evidence were used to prove both sexual violence as a crime against humanity and the structural nature of the crimes. This included witness testimony from victims (including victims who had suffered CRSV); the use of expert witness testimony to describe the organisational structures of the detention centre and intelligence services and how sexual and gender-based violence was used as a tactic of oppression by the Syrian regime; and the use of documentation from international human rights organisations and commission of inquiry reports.
4. The importance of logistical support to victims: The panellists identified the need for translation, interpretation and additional support for the victims, witnesses and affected communities in CRSV cases prosecuted in a third-party state. Translation and interpretation proved important in the Al-Khatib case for the affected communities and all those parties participating to understand and follow the trial.

In addition to these best practices, panellists also called attention to two lessons that can be learned from the Al-Khatib case:

1. Use of a gender perspective: One of the panellists called attention to how a gender perspective can help to identify gaps in the evidence and support the progress of CRSV investigations. Generally, they also underlined the need for increased gender competence in prosecuting international crimes. In the Al-Khatib case, gender competence was vital in identifying that much of the forensic photographic evidence only related to male victims of torture, and that further investigative strategies were needed to obtain evidence that could support the CRSV conduct committed against women in the detention center.
2. Protecting victims in third party state proceedings: the panellists discussed challenges arising from the proceedings being brought in Germany, while the crimes themselves took place in Syria. Currently, protection for victims and witnesses in Germany is provided by Police and supported by prosecutors. Panellists addressed the need for specific types of protection and support measures for victims of and witnesses to international crimes, as currently German authorities have limited means to protect affected communities and family members still living in Syria and who may be at risk of harm from ongoing criminal proceedings. One of the panellists also discussed how, in Germany, CSOs have proposed to extend the right to legal representation and psychosocial support, among others, specifically to victims of international crimes.

## Sepur Zarco, Guatemala: Lesson learned in prosecuting historic and widespread sexual violence and sexual slavery against indigenous women

### Session overview

The Sepur Zarco case was a historical and emblematic trial that brought to justice two national army commanders for sexual violence under the Guatemalan Penal Code for charges of rape, sexual slavery and domestic servitude as crimes against the duties of humanity; forced disappearances; and murder committed against the Maya Q'eqchi' community in the 1980s. This session explored the factors that enabled the successful pursuit of accountability in the case, including the creative use of the Guatemalan Penal Code by prosecutors, the implementation of protective measures, the innovative collection and use of a range of forms of evidence at trial and the importance of external peer-to-peer engagement to support the prosecutors.

### Key takeaways

1. Creative interpretation of existing legislation: The panellists highlighted how prosecutors creatively applied the provisions of the Guatemalan Penal Code in Sepur Zarco to charge the perpetrators and to fill in gaps in national legislation which did not contain offences that would have adequately captured the criminal conduct at hand. Indeed, at the time of the events, article 378 ("crimes against the duties of humanity") did not explicitly mention crimes of sexual violence but contained a generic reference to violations of international humanitarian law and crimes against the civilian population. Lawyers for the victims and Ministerio Público successfully argued for the integration of international legal standards and regulations (which were binding on Guatemala at the time) to charge sexual violence as a crime against humanity.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, forced disappearances were not codified in the Penal Code until 1996, whereas the disappearances began in 1982. By interpreting "forced disappearance" as a
- continuous crime, noting that the fate of the victims was still unknown in 1996, the presiding judge allowed the crime to be charged.
2. Deploying protective measures for victims: During the interview, the panellists identified several best practices in terms of protection and support measures implemented for victims throughout the proceedings, including: the use of pre-recorded testimonies, in compliance with Guatemalan law; the use of the same interpreters who had gained the trust of the victims throughout the proceedings; the presence of a psychologist; the transfer of the case away from the municipality where the facts took place; the protection of victims' identities including through veiling in court; and the prohibition of photographing the victims' faces.

<sup>12</sup> Reliance on international law was key to establishing the charges. The intermediary judge identified that article 378 of crimes against the duties of humanity was an "open or blank penal law", meaning that although it does not describe in detail the conduct proscribed, it makes reference to other sources of law. The judge's interpretation of art. 378 enabled him to qualify the acts under customary or conventional international law, especially the 1949 Geneva Conventions, which encompassed war crimes and crimes against humanity including sexual violence and sexual and domestic slavery.



3. Scope of evidence: At the trial, evidence was adduced from a variety of sources, including expert testimony from anthropologists, gender experts, military experts and a forensic architect who was able to reconstruct the military outpost where the crimes had occurred some 30 years prior. The panellists described how this diverse body of evidence contributed to the successful prosecutions in Sepur Zarco.
4. Implementing psychosocial and other support for victims: All panellists agreed that CSOs, joint plaintiffs and psychosocial support were critical to working with the victims and ensuring their active participation in the proceedings. The

prosecutors were overwhelmed with cases and victims were hesitant to come forward to speak about sexual violence, a taboo topic in Mayan and indigenous cultures in Guatemala. In this context, CSOs were instrumental in collaborating with the prosecution and building trust with the victims to file complaints. The importance of psychosocial support in empowering the victims to tell their stories was also underlined. Generally, these supports helped prosecutors to gain the trust of the victims and prepare them for court, through close and continued collaboration with victim groups from the outset of proceedings. Finally, technical support from international CSOs was critical to moving the case forward as well as to providing visibility to the proceedings.

## Titus Yoma, Kenya: Lessons learned from building a case to prosecute authorities for post-electoral violence under command responsibility

### Session overview

This session explored the ongoing criminal proceedings in Republic vs. Titus Yoma for sexual violence as crimes against humanity committed by police and security forces in the wake of the 2017 elections in Kenya. The ongoing case is groundbreaking for Kenyan courts in several aspects. It is the first time in Kenyan history that (i) the concept of superior/command responsibility is being utilized as a mode of responsibility in Kenyan national courts; (ii) crimes against humanity are being charged under Kenyan law, using the International Crimes Act; and (iii) a criminal prosecution for election-related sexual violence has been initiated. The case is also a landmark example of the prosecution of state security forces by state judicial authorities, before a national court. Finally, the case also illustrates the unique power of creating strong technical partnership between CSOs, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (ODPP), and police oversight authorities.

This session explored the enabling factors and circumstances that supported this groundbreaking case being brought, the significance of the use of command responsibility as a mode of liability and the technical partnerships driving forward accountability for sexual violence as an international crime.

### Key takeaways

1. The importance of complementarity: The panellists started by highlighting that pressure stemming from the preliminary investigation into Kenya before the International Criminal Court influenced the enactment of a new piece of legislation: the International Crimes Act. As a result, crimes against humanity were codified in the legal framework available to Kenyan prosecutors, enhancing their ability to seek accountability against perpetrators of such crimes.
2. Charging for command responsibility: the panellists discussed how the use of command responsibility is particularly critical where direct perpetrators cannot be identified due to the manner and circumstances in which the crimes occurred. One of the panellists noted that it was important to hold commanders accountable, because, in the past, commanders have had little oversight over their troops' actions. The panellists noted that, in this case, aiding and abetting was charged in the alternative to command responsibility. In terms of command responsibility, the defendants had knowledge, assigned duties to their troops and did nothing to stop or prevent the violations.
1. Constitutional developments: Panellists highlighted that the constitutional framework was significant in enabling these proceedings. In 2010 the Constitution established an independent ODPP and an Independent Police Oversight Authority (IPOA). The IPOA has investigative and enforcement powers, including the ability to subpoena and carry out searches. There is also an internal affairs unit within the national police aimed at police discipline and a witness protection agency. Furthermore, the independence of the ODPP and the creation of the IPOA made it possible for police and security forces to be investigated.
2. Cooperation between government, international and domestic organisations: The panellists discussed how several entities worked together to advance the case, including the Kenyan National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR), OHCHR and international non-governmental organisations. The KNCHR encouraged victims and witnesses to appear before the court for the initial inquest into the death of baby Pendo that led to the indictment, and offered psychosocial support, medical aid and counselling to victims. OHCHR and international CSOs worked with civil society and the ODPP to build capacity, provide tools to assess the facts and evidence, and deepen practitioners' understanding of international criminal law. All of these agencies, together with civil society, have worked to progress this case.

The panellists also discussed several contextual factors and collaborative relationships that have been important to progressing the case:

# Roundtable sessions

## Prosecution Policy and Case Prioritisation

### Session overview

This session explored the development of domestic policies for investigating and prosecuting CRSV and how these policies can enhance accountability efforts. Despite challenges such as misconceptions about sexual violence and limited resources to prosecute, establishing clear expectations and guidelines for addressing CRSV crimes is crucial. The introduction of such policies represents a choice by national authorities to pursue these crimes. It has the potential to improve the success of investigations and prosecutions for sexual violence crimes by providing concrete strategies to prioritise such crimes and mitigating obstacles. Key elements of these policies include the political commitment of senior leadership to prosecuting CRSV, gender-sensitive recruitment of practitioners, and prioritising sexual violence prosecutions as part of a broader gender policy.



### Key takeaways

- Participants discussed the various factors which can lead to the prioritisation of sexual violence cases. These may include, inter alia: strong advocacy by relevant and specialised organisations (e.g. pressure from CSOs, such as women's associations and the LGBTQ+ movement, have led to successful investigations and prosecutions); and the willingness to ensure that the judicial response reflects the scale and gravity of sexual violence during a conflict.
- One participant pointed out that case prioritisation must begin at the investigation planning phase, particularly when sexual violence is widespread in conflict settings and there is the potential for many cases to be brought. CRSV must be front and centre of investigation plans.
- Participants agreed that case prioritisation strategies can assist in understanding where effort and resources should be allocated, particularly in resource-constrained settings. Following the exchanges, it was suggested that case prioritisation strategies should include, inter alia:
  - (i) Prosecution prioritisation criteria: such as the nature of the crimes, the rank of the perpetrator, the number and vulnerability of the victims, location of the crimes, security considerations and the impact of the crimes on the population;
  - (ii) Decision maker: who or which institution will decide which cases meet the prioritisation criteria; and
  - (iii) Operationalisation, CRSV and gender lens: how the agencies and actors responsible will ensure that the policies are inclusive, and non-discriminatory, and how bias within prosecution offices will be addressed and eliminated.
- It was further highlighted both in this session and throughout other sessions that specialised units in prosecution offices and police officers with expertise in handling sexual violence cases can greatly assist in drawing attention to these cases, and influence how national authorities respond to CRSV cases, which may in turn result in greater case prioritisation of CRSV crimes.

# Developing Crime-base Evidence

## Session overview

This session explored case-building methodologies, and the diverse array of evidence used to support CRSV prosecutions, including: testimonial evidence, forensic evidence, documentary evidence, statistical evidence to establish patterns of offending, expert evidence about CRSV crimes, as well as open source evidence. Participants emphasised the need to draw on multiple sources and types of evidence and highlighted the importance of collaboration amongst different professionals (academics, CSOs, law enforcement agencies, and prosecution offices) to enhance the prospects of identifying a wide crime-base and, ultimately, achieving successful outcomes in CRSV cases.



## Key takeaways

- Participants collectively acknowledged the challenges that exist in obtaining evidence in CRSV cases, including due to the passage of time, lack of eyewitnesses, inaccessible crime scenes, and often inadequate evidentiary rules or codes of criminal procedure.
- Several participants noted that almost all CRSV cases rely on victim or witness testimony to establish the crime, highlighting the importance of collecting testimonies in a trauma-informed, victim-centred manner. Participants provided examples of trauma-informed measures, including: the use of safe rooms, pre-recorded evidence, psychological support during and after witness interviews, and the participation of NGOs as intermediaries to build trust with law enforcement. Some participants confirmed that these measures have been successfully integrated into the domestic legislation, procedure, and policy of their jurisdictions.
- Participants highlighted that expert testimony, such as from psychologists or psychiatrists specialising in trauma, can play a crucial role in clarifying how trauma impacts the memory, emotions, and behaviour of victims. They noted that such expertise assists prosecutors and courts, which may not be used to dealing with such crimes, in comprehending why victims may exhibit inconsistencies or gaps in their testimonies. One participant explained that in their jurisdiction, expert witnesses can be called to give evidence in order to provide context about the crime, including details about the criminal organisation, patterns, or tactics used, to further enhance the framing of witness testimony.
- Several participants agreed that close cooperation with CSOs and religious leaders can be essential in accessing victims, encouraging them to come forward and report, and building trust within affected communities. This can improve the overall strength of the testimonial evidence provided by victims.

# Modes of liability: the challenge of promoting accountability for those responsible for systematic CRSV

## Session overview

Determining responsibility for international crimes is one of the most contentious areas of international criminal law. The scope of mass atrocities makes the task of establishing who is accountable for what conduct especially challenging. Additionally, divergent judicial interpretations of various modes of liability have had a significant impact on securing convictions for CRSV charges. This session focused on approaches and challenges to modes of liability for CRSV crimes. In particular, it considered what evidence is required to link CRSV crimes to senior officials/commanders and indirect perpetrators.



## Key takeaways

- One participant highlighted the importance of linkage evidence to demonstrate the culpability of senior officials acting as indirect perpetrators. For this purpose, linkage witnesses, including insiders, can often be essential in connecting the official to the scene of the crime and events. Participants identified additional types of critical linkage evidence, including: previous trials concerning the same crimes; documentary evidence, such as internal reports and memoranda from state or paramilitary entities; and statements or actions of the accused.
- One participant underlined their experience of using the expanded form of joint criminal enterprise liability (JCE III) to charge CRSV. Under this mode of liability, it is not necessary for the crimes to have been part of the original criminal plan; instead, they may be charged when and where the acts were a foreseeable consequence of the broader criminal enterprise. This participant noted that, based on their experience, it can often be established that CRSV was foreseeable based on the circumstances, the modus operandi of the particular group and other circumstantial evidence, when where it cannot be proved that the accused directly intended sexual violence to occur.
- In considering which mode of liability to pursue, several participants noted the utility of relying on multiple modes of liability, where sufficient evidence is available, to broaden the scope of the indictment and improve the prospect of a conviction.
- Several participants noted that proving intent and common purpose is challenging when prosecuting extended and indirect modes of liability, such as joint-criminal enterprise, complicity, joint perpetration, and command or superior responsibility. To overcome these challenges, some participants noted the following useful indicia that may satisfy intent:
  - Knowledge that the perpetrator's conduct would likely result in the commission of a crime;
  - Evidence regarding the specific role of the accused, including coordinating and giving orders to militia and being present at the scene; and
  - Evidence demonstrating that a senior official was on notice that CRSV crimes were being committed or were foreseeable, particularly when pursuing charges under command responsibility provisions (including documentation by reports from the United Nations, public, and media).
- Some participants discussed specific challenges in proving the element of "effective control" in command responsibility cases. To satisfy this element, some prosecutors relied on evidence demonstrating that the accused had the capacity to prevent the conduct, punish the perpetrators or inform the authorities, but had failed to do so. Further, evidence that the accused was responsible for splitting armed groups into factions or other organisational authority may be useful in demonstrating effective control.
- In addressing potential defences in command responsibility cases, one participant noted that, in their experience, it is insufficient for defendants to rely on excuses that they may have been arrested for speaking out or that they had to flee for safety before being able to intervene. These excuses do not negate the responsibility of commanders to inform authorities, prevent CRSV directly, or to punish subordinates when they become aware of CRSV being committed.
- One participant mentioned the need to make strategic choices about whether to charge a crime as an ordinary crime or as an international crime — and which code/legal framework to use, if more than one exists or is applicable in the jurisdiction. This participant noted that the use of different legal frameworks can be important in securing a conviction — for example, demonstrating criminal responsibility for an international crime meant that the prosecutors did not have to prove direct responsibility for CRSV, but could instead rely on superior or command responsibility.



# Victim-centred proceedings: the importance and impact of victim participation and representation in judicial proceedings

## Session overview

This session focused on the importance and impact of victim participation and representation in judicial proceedings, emphasising a survivor-centred approach. Victims' participation is critical in criminal proceedings involving CRSV crimes: it acknowledges the actual suffering endured by victims, enables access to justice and restores agency to people who routinely face shame and stigma. Depending on the fora victims can be granted several statuses (victim, plaintiff, party, witness), each with different procedural rights. Very often, their participation is crucial to the trial, as they may request prosecutors to modify the charges, challenge decisions made by the police and prosecutors, question the accused, and seek reparations. Additionally, victims' participation has been key to providing evidence throughout legal processes. However, given that victims have historically been considered as passive participants in criminal proceedings, the adoption of a survivor-centred approach is essential to ensure their participation and to minimize re-traumatization. The session also focused on the barriers that exist for victims to participate in criminal proceedings and creative ways to overcome them.

## Key takeaways

- Several participants raised common challenges in securing victim participation and ensuring a victim-centred approach during proceedings including:
  - stigma surrounding sexual violence;
  - Difficulty in securing protection for victims;
  - Lack of support services for victims, including psychosocial and financial support;
  - Difficulty in accessing and engaging with victims during proceedings due to their location; and
  - Lack of compensation and/or reparations for victims.
- To overcome these challenges, participants discussed examples of approaches that have proven successful in their respective jurisdictions. For example:
  - Collaboration with CSOs can be a powerful way for prosecution offices to enable victims' participation in proceedings and provide them with necessary support, including psychological and psychosocial assistance.
  - CSOs are essential in assisting with obtaining statements from victims located overseas, arranging remote witness facilities, assisting with explaining to victims what to expect from the proceedings, and overcoming practical barriers such as entry visas, support during proceedings, translation etc.
  - To respond to victim traumatization, one participant suggested that victims' witness statements should be streamlined to ensure that they are obtained properly on the first occasion and to reduce the number of times the victim is required to recount their evidence.
  - Some participants encouraged a creative approach to supporting victims. One participant provided an example used in their jurisdiction, where a "safe space" was created where victims could talk before and after the hearings with CSOs and support services. This can help gather important information for the case and provide needed support, as legal aid alone is not always sufficient.
  - In cases with large numbers of victims or where victims are living abroad, some participants noted that the use of legal representatives from victim associations can make victim participation more manageable.
- Throughout the discussion, it emerged that each jurisdiction had different provisions and practices for involving victims in criminal proceedings. One participant provided an example in which victims participated as a joint plaintiff to the proceedings enabling them to actively engage during the investigation and trial proceedings. This meant that if the victim disagreed with the prosecutor about how to approach the case, they could make a direct request to the judge to resolve it. It was suggested that it may be useful for prosecutors to explore how victims may take advantage of certain provisions which would grant them the most meaningful participation, noting that this will differ from one victim to another and between jurisdictions.
- In the universal jurisdiction context, participants identified that there are several ways that victims can participate in criminal proceedings, each with its own challenges. When victims travel to the foreign prosecuting jurisdiction, arrangements must be made for travel, lodging and compensation for lost income. The victims must also be safe, agree to testify or give evidence and live in a jurisdiction that is willing to cooperate. In other cases, investigators may travel to interview victims, or civil society organisations may obtain written testimony and work directly with victims. Several participants observed that, in such cases, CSOs and victim communities can be important in facilitating travel and lodging arrangements and providing holistic psycho-social care and other support to victims adjusting to a foreign place and interpretation.
- Many participants agreed that reparations funds are needed to compensate victims of sexual violence, though victims may require different types of reparations. However, providing compensation can be a difficult task because defendants may be indigent. One participant noted that given the varying approaches to receiving reparations, and that there is often no central fund for victims, it is important that prosecutors draw on the experience and jurisprudence from other jurisdictions to build strong claims for reparations. Another participant noted that in their jurisdiction, despite the existence of legislation which allows for reparations, there are structural obstacles in accessing the funds. This includes, for example, when the offender is a member of the military, and the state is required to pay but it does not have the funding to do so. Other participants identified that it can be administratively challenging to make overseas payments, and it may be important to support victims in confirming their eligibility as well ensuring they can access a bank account to receive payments.

# Securing Protection for Victims and Witnesses

## Session overview

This session focused on practical approaches to securing protection for victims and witnesses in CRSV criminal proceedings across various jurisdictions. The chairs emphasised that victims and witnesses in CRSV cases face specific protection challenges when engaging with criminal prosecutions, which must be addressed to enable the greatest degree of victim participation possible. The session provided valuable insights into the complexity of securing protection for victims and witnesses in CRSV cases, highlighting the importance of multi-sectoral collaboration, innovative approaches, and ongoing efforts to strengthen legal frameworks and procedures.



## Key takeaways

- Financial constraints, lack of effective enforcement, and barriers to collaboration between agencies and CSOs create challenges in providing effective protection for victims. One participant noted that in circumstances where witness protection agencies are available, they often do not become involved until the matter reaches court — leaving victims and witnesses vulnerable during the investigation stage. As such, collaborative efforts between legal, medical, and CSO sectors beginning at the investigation stage is essential for effective protection.
- The role of judges and prosecutors is essential in navigating risks, supporting witnesses, and ensuring a victim-centred approach to criminal proceedings. Yet some prosecutors and judges themselves face risks and persecution in pursuing cases of CRSV, including threats, intimidation, and professional repercussions. Corruption and political interference undermines efforts to hold perpetrators accountable and can deter prosecutors from pursuing justice effectively. This in turn negatively impacts victim participation.
- Innovative practices to overcome resource-constrained and high-risk settings can be essential. One participant provided an example where the prosecution service set up a focal point for the protection of victims and witnesses to coordinate between different available services and ensure comprehensive protection. Other strategies mentioned by participants included mobile courts, closed court sessions, and awareness campaigns to encourage reporting.

# The Use of Sexual Violence in Conflict by Terrorist Groups

## Session overview

The purpose of this session was to explore the nexus between terrorism and sexual violence. Several Security Council resolutions have recognised that sexual violence can represent part of the strategic objectives and ideology of certain terrorist groups, serving as both a tactic of terror and a means to enhance their finances.<sup>13</sup> The chairs noted that despite the extensive use of sexual violence by terrorist groups, accountability for these crimes remains extremely limited. Indeed, criminal responses to date have often been limited to terrorism related charges, rendering serious international crimes — a trademark of these groups — largely invisible in criminal prosecutions.

Throughout this session, participants focused on the different legal frameworks available, the use of cumulative charges, the disjointed approach to accountability, limited investigative methods, evidentiary challenges, jurisdictional complexities, and the critical need for comprehensive victim-focused frameworks.



## Key takeaways

- Terrorism charges are not the most appropriate vehicle for capturing acts of CRSV, yet they can be useful for several reasons. First, they are easier to prove than international crimes charges. One participant commented that, for example, in the case of ISIL, extensive digital records on membership exist, making it easier to link a suspect with involvement in the terrorist organisation, but difficult to prove what conduct they engaged in while party to that organisation. Second, provisions relating to CRSV in the context of terrorism are fragmented (i.e. found in legal frameworks not traditionally used to prosecute terrorism) and, as such, practitioners often overlook broader international crimes associated with terrorist groups, which may encompass CRSV conduct.
- Current frameworks often fail to recognize the diverse experiences, needs, and vulnerabilities of victims of CRSV linked to terrorism. Instead of treating victims as a monolithic entity, individual-tailored support mechanisms encompassing legal, psychological, and social assistance are needed to ensure meaningful engagement and participation throughout the legal process.
- While CRSV crimes frequently occur in terrorism contexts, there can be challenges in gathering admissible evidence, especially in conflict zones or areas with limited judicial infrastructure, which contribute to the low rates of prosecution. Moreover, the lack of standardized protocols for handling digital evidence and testimonies can cause further complications in obtaining evidence that will be admissible in court.
- Cumulative charging, when dealing with crimes committed in the context of terrorism, can broaden the scope of conduct which can be charged. This would mean that core international crimes of CRSV could be charged alongside membership of a terrorist organisation. A growing number of countries use cumulative charging to capture terrorism and core international crimes committed in these contexts.
- Terrorism-related offences have more lenient evidentiary hurdles, particularly in circumstances where an organisation is designated by a national authority as a 'terrorist organisation' (removing the burden of proving an entity is affiliated with terrorist activities).
- The transnational nature of these crimes can make it difficult to gather robust evidence that will withstand legal scrutiny across jurisdictions.
- The focus on terrorism-related aspects can overshadow the nuanced dynamics of CRSV crimes, hindering comprehensive investigative approaches.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, UN Security Council Resolutions 1373 (2001), 1624 (2005), 2178 (2014), 2242 (2015), 2331 (2016), 2396 (2017) and 2617 (2021).

# Slavery, Trafficking in Persons and CRSV

## Session overview

This roundtable session discussed the complexities of investigating, prosecuting, and charging CRSV, particularly focusing on cases involving indicia of slavery and trafficking. These offences can affect civilians of all genders within conflict and are perpetrated by a range of different actors including armed and violent extremist groups, terrorist organisations, criminal networks, national militaries, and corrupt or complicit government officials. In recent years, sexual slavery, slave trade, sexualised enslavement and/or trafficking for the purpose of sexual exploitation by military and rebel groups have been documented during conflicts in several countries, including Angola, Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Colombia, Myanmar, Afghanistan, Libya and Sudan.

Participants discussed and examined how different jurisdictions have sought to prosecute these different offences, including the nexus between these forms of conflict-related sexual violence and how that may impact criminal charging decisions. Speakers also shared experiences on obstacles that impede attempts to achieve accountability.



## Key themes takeaways

- Participants canvassed the diverse legal frameworks utilised by different jurisdictions to prosecute sexual slavery, trafficking, and related offences. They discussed the application of international law, including customary international law and treaty obligations, in charging decisions. The session explored the nuances of defining and proving these crimes in court, including identifying indicia of sexualised slavery and trafficking.
- Participants discussed extensively the benefits and challenges of cumulatively charging offences such as enslavement, sexual slavery, slave trading, trafficking, and terrorism-related crimes. Many participants agreed that using cumulative charges strategically ensures that survivors have access to redress for all forms of violence they have experienced. This will, however, depend on the content of legislation and criminal codes and whether they support cumulative charging.
- One participant noted that the emergence of sophisticated organised criminal groups involved in trafficking in persons has necessitated a shift towards leveraging advanced technology in the fight against these crimes. Technologies like digital forensics and artificial intelligence, along with tools such as wiretapping and facial recognition, are now crucial in gathering evidence, pinpointing perpetrators, and aiding victims. This underscores the imperative for international cooperation and collaboration to effectively combat the transnational networks orchestrating trafficking operations.



# Recommendations to further prosecutions of CRSV

This section identifies several recommendations which emerged from the Conference and which provide a roadmap to inform future work of domestic practitioners, CSOs and other relevant entities. These recommendations converge under four main themes:

- (a) Case prioritisation;
- (b) Prosecution of CRSV in the context of terrorism, trafficking and slavery;
- (c) Working with victims and vulnerable witnesses; and
- (d) Building a community of practice and information sharing.

## a. Case prioritisation and prosecution of intersecting crimes

- Establish case prioritisation policies which, at minimum, consider the types of cases to be prioritised, the criteria used to inform the selection of cases and the appropriate institutions to apply the criteria and implement the policy.
- Address misconceptions and eliminate biases vis-a-vis gender and sexual violence, including through the adoption and implementation of specific gender-based policies within prosecution offices.

## b. Prosecution of CRSV in the context of terrorism, trafficking and slavery

- Ensure the adequate investigation of terrorism cases, including through an analysis of the group's patterns of conduct, guaranteeing an early assessment and analysis of possible indicators of CRSV crimes.
- Comprehensively review existing legal frameworks and consider options to charge for CRSV crimes in a way which appropriately reflects their gravity, including drawing on provisions relating to slavery, the slave trade, trafficking and terrorism, and drawing on international law, customary practices and treaty obligations where applicable. Where necessary strengthen legal frameworks to allow for such charging practices.
- Conduct research and ensure nuanced consideration regarding female members within terrorist organisations, encompassing a comprehensive understanding of their diverse roles, motivations, and experiences, acknowledging the complexity and varied nature of their involvement in terrorist activities, ensuring that prosecutions accurately reflect their full experiences (including, in some cases, as both victim and perpetrator).

## c. Working with victims and vulnerable witnesses

- Foster closer collaboration between legal practitioners, mental health professionals, and civil society to ensure comprehensive support for survivors throughout the legal process.
- Explore and encourage the use of innovative protection measures, such as leveraging digital technology for remote testimonies, anonymous reporting mechanisms, and secure data management to improve the safety and well-being of victims and witnesses.
- Strengthen legal frameworks and regulatory procedures related to witness protection, including the adoption of specific legislation, guidelines, and protocols tailored to address the specific challenges faced by victims and witnesses in conflict settings, and communities where reporting may place the life of the victim and/or their family at risk.

## **d.** Building a community of practice to support national authorities to prosecute CRSV

- Develop a community of practice and network of prosecutors, to 1) maintain and foster the connections made amongst national and international prosecutors working on accountability for CRSV crimes; 2) leverage existing expertise and best practices, including novel developments in domestic legal frameworks and jurisprudence, through cross-fertilization; 3) foster greater informal and formal judicial cooperation; and 4) create a solidarity and support platform amongst colleagues working on CRSV crimes in challenging contexts.
- Improve best practice sharing across jurisdictions, including by:
  - o Creating a database of jurisprudence that have been used in CRSV prosecutions (relevant themes should include trauma-informed care, forensic evidence, the psychological impact of sexual violence).
  - o Creating a repository of practical tools to enhance successful prosecutions including the finalised Conference working papers, the case briefs and films on the four emblematic case studies, as well as other resources provided by practitioners about domestic prosecutions of CRSV crimes.
- Strengthen judicial cooperation and collaboration among countries affected by CRSV to exchange information, share best practices, and coordinate efforts in combating transnational criminal networks, including at the regional level, ensuring the capture of regional realities. This should include regular in person meetings at the regional and international levels.
- Based on feedback from participants obtained as a result of a post-Conference survey, other opportunities that a community of practice could provide include: capacity-building to train prosecutors on CRSV; directing funding of technical expertise or logistics to support prosecutors to learn from experts or practitioners in other jurisdictions; providing information on fundraising or partnership opportunities; and supporting prosecutors to raise awareness about CRSV and engage with political stakeholders to support policy/legislative change.

# ANNEX A

## Advisory Committee Members

The Team of Experts wishes to extend their deepest gratitude to the members of the Advisory Committee, who were essential to the Conference's success. The committee members were:

1. Ms. Shyamala Alagendra, Gender and Children's Rights Advisor, Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar (IIMM);
2. Ms. Adejoké Babington-Ashaye, Senior Research Fellow, The Soufan Center;
3. Ms. Stephanie Barbour, Investigative Team Leader, Commission for International Justice and Accountability (CIJA);
4. Ms. Michelle Jarvis, Deputy Head, International, Independent and Impartial Mechanism (IIM) – Syria;
5. Ms. Alexandra Lily Kather, Co-Founder, Emergent Justice Collective;
6. Ms. Maxine Marcus, Co-Director, Partners in Justice International (PIJ);
7. Ms. Karen Naimer, Director of Programs, Physicians for Human Rights (PHR);
8. Mr. Daniele Perissi, Head of the Great Lakes Program, TRIAL International;
9. Ms. Susana SáCouto, Director, War Crimes Research Office at the Washington College of Law;
10. Ms. Kim Thuy Seelinger, Special Adviser on Sexual Violence in Conflict, International Criminal Court (ICC); and
11. Ms. Patricia Viseur Sellers, Special Adviser on Slavery Crimes, ICC.

# ANNEX B

## High-Level Opening Participation

The following Member States took the floor during the High-Level Opening and/or delivered statements that were published online following the Conference:

- **Ms. Caroline Gennez**, Minister of Development Cooperation and of Major Cities of the Kingdom of Belgium
- **Mr. Julian Camilo Silva**, Charge d'affaires, Embassy of Colombia to the Netherlands
- **Ms. Shefali Razan Duggal**, Ambassador of the United States to the Netherlands
- **Mr. Dren Doli**, Ambassador of Kosovo to the Netherlands
- **Ms. Anne Møller Ege**, Chargé d'Affaires of Denmark to the Netherlands
- **Ms. Corinne Cicéron Bühler**, Ambassador of Switzerland to the Netherlands
- **Mr. Giorgio Novello**, Ambassador of Italy to the Netherlands
- **Mr. Greg French**, Ambassador of Australia to the Netherlands
- **Mr. Brendan Rogers**, Ambassador of Ireland to the Netherlands
- **Ms. Margareta Kassangana**, Ambassador of the Republic of Poland to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.



**These statements  
are available on**

[The Conference website](#)



# ANNEX C

## Closing Session

The following speakers delivered remarks during the closing session of the Conference:



### **Andriy Kostin**

former Prosecutor-General of Ukraine



### **Pramila Patten**

Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict



### **Peter Derrek Hof**

Ambassador Women's Rights and Gender Equality and the Director Social Development for the Kingdom of the Netherlands



### **Chloe Marnay Baszanger**

Team Leader of the United Nations Team of Experts

# ANNEX D

## Outcomes from the Conference

To inform the ongoing work of the Team of Experts, the direct outputs from the Conference include:

- (a) This report, summarising the discussions at the Conference;
- (b) A repository of material, currently held at the Conference website, including material provided by participants about the prosecution of CRSV crimes in their jurisdictions;
- (c) Four short films of emblematic case studies where CRSV crimes have been prosecuted in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Germany, Guatemala and Kenya. The films will become part of a media library of materials managed by the Team of Experts and will be used for future trainings;
- (d) Publication of the revised working papers that formed the substance of the thematic sessions at the Conference;
- (e) The ongoing development, by the Team of Experts, of a community of practice to provide an established forum amongst like-minded global practitioners to share their experiences and best practices; to foster both informal and formal judicial cooperation; and to provide solidarity and support amongst colleagues.