

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT BAR ASSOCIATION (ICCBA)



**ANNUAL REPORT
2025 - 2026**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ASSOCIATION INFORMATION	3
INTRODUCTION BY THE PRESIDENT.....	4
AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	12
ICCBA COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS.....	14
FINANCIAL UPDATE.....	16
ANNEX A - ANNUAL REPORT-DEFENCE COMMITTEE.....	17
ANNEX B - ANNUAL REPORT-VICTIMS COMMITTEE	19
ANNEX C - ANNUAL REPORT-COUNSEL SUPPORT STAFF	20
ANNEX D - ANNUAL REPORT PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	22
ANNEX E - ANNUAL REPORT-LEGAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.....	25
ANNEX F - ANNUAL REPORT-TRAINING COMMITTEE.....	28
ANNEX G - ANNUAL REPORT-AMICUS COMMITTEE	32
ANNEX H - ANNUAL REPORT-DUTY OF CARE WORKING GROUP	34
ANNEX I - ANNUAL REPORT-ECOCIDE WORKING GROUP.....	35
ANNEX J - BALANCE SHEET	47
ANNEX K - PROFIT AND LOSS.....	48
ANNEX L - PROPOSED BUDGET 2026-2027.....	49

ASSOCIATION INFORMATION

Executive Council	Philippe Larochelle, <i>President</i> Natalie von Wistighausen, <i>Vice-President for Victims</i> Anta Guisse, <i>Vice-President for Defence</i> Haneen Ghali <i>Vice President for Support Staff</i> Gregory Townsend, <i>Secretary</i> Audrey Mateo <i>Treasurer</i> Paul Bradfield Michael Herz Marie-Hélène Proulx
Executive Director	Dominic Kennedy
Internal Auditors	Megan Hirst Marie O’Leary
Parliamentarian	Natalie von Wistinghausen
Address	Oude Waalsdorperweg 10 The Hague 2597 AK
Bank	ABN-AMRO Account number 0412971259 IBAN NL06 ABNA 0412971259 Coolsingel Postbus 2059 3500 GB Utrecht
Chamber of Commerce No.	65873335

INTRODUCTION BY THE PRESIDENT – SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE ICCBA

21 September 2026

I am delighted to present this Annual Report on behalf of the Executive Council of the International Criminal Court Bar Association (ICCBA). This report provides an overview of the activities of the Association during the 2025–2026 term.

Throughout the year, the Executive Council has met monthly and maintained regular communication between meetings. The ICCBA has continued to work actively on matters affecting its membership and the wider legal profession practising before the International Criminal Court (ICC), while strengthening its engagement with the Court, States Parties, bar associations and other organisations involved in international criminal justice.

I would like to provide the following overview of the activities and areas of work undertaken by the ICCBA during the past year.

Legal Aid and Taxation

The Executive Council has continued to prioritise legal aid reform and the taxation of Defence and Victims' team members throughout the year. The ICCBA has remained actively engaged with the Hague Working Group Facilitation on Legal Aid and Taxation, the Joint Committee on Legal Aid (JCLA), the Registry, the Committee on Budget and Finance (CBF) and numerous States Parties in order to pursue further improvements to the legal aid system.

Discussions throughout the year focused on the continued implementation and development of the Reformed Legal Aid Policy, including proposals for the introduction of a fifth step in the salary scales, adjustments to remuneration, taxation reimbursement and other interim measures, appointment letters, the position and remuneration of support staff, and legal aid during sentencing and appeals phases. While progress on some proposals has been slower than hoped, the Registry confirmed that the introduction of Step 5 would be included in future budget discussions.

Discussions within the JCLA also addressed a number of substantive proposals for the further development of the legal aid system, including adjustments to remuneration over the coming years, the treatment of concurrent sentencing and appeals phases, taxation reimbursement and proposals concerning the future employment status of support staff. The ICCBA has continued to emphasise that reforms must preserve the independence of external teams, provide adequate and predictable remuneration and social protection, and ensure that the ability of Counsel to select and manage their teams is not unnecessarily restricted.

Significant efforts also continued regarding the taxation of external teams. Unfortunately, these efforts did not result in the outcome for which we had advocated. Throughout the year, the ICCBA engaged with numerous States Parties to advocate for an amendment to the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the Court (APIC) which would exempt members of Defence and Victims' teams from taxation. In June 2026, however, the Host State confirmed that it was not in favour of such an amendment, which effectively brought that possibility to an end, as no other State was willing to support an amendment opposed by the Host State. This was a disappointing development following the considerable work undertaken by the ICCBA and others over a number of years to seek a durable solution to this issue.

Following this development, discussions focused on alternative longer-term solutions. In particular, several States, including the Host State, asked the Registry to provide a possible model contract under the legal aid framework. The ICCBA commenced discussions concerning the possibility of introducing staff contracts for support staff, and potentially, at a later stage, for Counsel who wished to opt for such arrangements, while ensuring that there would be no impact on their independence. Such arrangements could provide greater certainty in relation to taxation and social protection. These discussions remain ongoing and are matters which the ICCBA will continue to pursue with the Registry and States Parties.

The ICCBA has also advocated for interim measures to provide more immediate relief to current external team members. Discussions have included the possibility of utilising unused taxation reserve funds, clarification of the taxation treatment of allowances and health insurance contributions, taxation reimbursement mechanisms and improvements to communication between the Registry and external teams. The Registry, however, indicated that it does not anticipate that there will be any funds available for interim measures from the 2026 budget. This was another disappointing development, particularly in light of our earlier discussions, and demonstrates the need to continue pressing for progress on this issue in the year ahead.

The Executive Council established a Legal Aid Task Force to coordinate these efforts and to support the Association's engagement with States Parties, the Registry, the International Bar Association and other relevant stakeholders. Legal aid and taxation remain among the ICCBA's highest priorities. Some States have been very supportive of the ICCBA, but the Registry has not provided the concrete and clear figures sought by States.

While discussions and continued engagement with States Parties and the Registry can at times be frustrating, we must continue putting forward proposals and emphasising that the *status quo* is not acceptable.

24th Session of the Assembly of States Parties

The 24th Session of the Assembly of States Parties was held in The Hague in December 2025. The ICCBA President addressed the Assembly on behalf of the Association,

highlighting the importance of effective cooperation with the Court, adequate resources for Defence and Victims' teams, continued reform of legal aid, the taxation of external team members and adequate support and protection for those practising before the Court.

The President also addressed the growing threats faced by the Court and those working within the international criminal justice system, including sanctions, intimidation and reprisals, and reaffirmed the importance of protecting the independence of Counsel and other legal professionals.

During the Assembly, the ICCBA organised a successful side event entitled *Protecting Counsel, Protecting Justice: The Role of the ICCBA and Local, Regional and International Bar Associations*, in partnership with the Conseil national des barreaux (CNB) and sponsored by France and Senegal. The event brought together judges, ambassadors, representatives of bar associations and practitioners to discuss the importance of an independent legal profession and the role of bar associations in safeguarding the rule of law and protecting lawyers engaged in international criminal justice.

The ICCBA also co-sponsored an additional side event addressing justice and diversity and held numerous bilateral meetings with representatives of States Parties throughout the Assembly.

Representation of the Legal Profession

The ICCBA continued to represent Defence Counsel, Legal Representatives of Victims and their support staff at official events and in discussions with the Court and other stakeholders throughout the year.

Vice President Anta Guissé delivered the ICCBA's address at the Opening of the Judicial Year, reaffirming the importance of judicial independence, the rule of law and the essential contribution of an independent legal profession to the proper administration of justice.

On 25 February 2026, the Vice President for Defence and the Vice President for Victims met with the Registrar to discuss the proposed relationship agreement between the ICCBA and the Registry, which has been under discussion for many years. Since that meeting, the Registrar has reiterated his willingness to conclude an agreement, but no concrete steps have yet been taken, and the ICCBA continues to await the Registry's counter-proposal to the draft agreement previously submitted by the Association.

The President also represented the ICCBA at the American Bar Association International Law Conference in Mexico City and participated in numerous meetings with the principals of the Court, representatives of States Parties, international organisations, professional associations and other stakeholders.

In July 2026, the Executive Council held a special meeting with the judges of the ICC as part of the Association's tenth anniversary activities. The meeting provided an opportunity to reflect on the ICCBA's work over the previous decade, the importance of maintaining a strong and independent bar association, future cooperation between the judiciary and the legal profession, and proposals concerning mandatory membership of the ICCBA for Counsel admitted to the ICC List of Counsel.

2026 ICC Judicial Elections

In advance of the election of six judges of the International Criminal Court at the 25th Session of the Assembly of States Parties, the ICCBA invited the judicial candidates to respond to a questionnaire addressing matters of particular relevance to the legal profession and the administration of justice before the Court.

The questionnaire addressed issues including judicial independence and impartiality, the rights of the Defence, equality of arms, legal aid, victims' participation, judicial ethics, workplace culture and emerging challenges affecting international criminal justice.

The ICCBA published the responses received from candidates in July 2026 in order to contribute to greater transparency and to support an informed judicial election process. This initiative formed part of the Association's continuing efforts to ensure that the views and concerns of practitioners are reflected in discussions concerning the future of the Court.

US Sanctions

The ICCBA has continued to respond to developments concerning sanctions affecting the Court and individuals associated with its work.

The Association issued public statements condemning sanctions imposed against judges and officials of the Court and reaffirmed the importance of judicial independence and the independence of the legal profession. In August 2026, the ICCBA specifically condemned further sanctions imposed against ICC President Judge Tomoko Akane and Senior Trial Lawyer Abdoulaye Seye.

The Executive Council regularly discussed developments relating to sanctions and remained in contact with the Registry to ensure that Defence and Victims' teams were kept informed of possible implications for their work.

The ICCBA has also prepared an *amicus curiae* submission in proceedings before a New York court challenging the sanctions regime. The submission focuses in particular on the purposes and activities of the ICCBA, the effect of the sanctions regime on the Association and its members, and the wider implications of such measures for the administration of international justice and the independence of legal professionals.

The ICCBA will continue to monitor developments closely and to speak out against measures which threaten the independence of the Court or those carrying out professional functions before it.

Events

Throughout the year, the ICCBA organised and participated in a wide range of events aimed at promoting international criminal justice, strengthening engagement with the legal profession and creating opportunities for discussion on issues of importance to practitioners.

In October 2025, the ICCBA partnered with the Bar of Marseille for a conference on *Proceedings in Absentia in International Criminal Law*.

During 2026, the Association organised a number of further successful events, including a conference on *Practising International Criminal Law Under Pressure: Sanctions, Threats and Protections*, addressing the increasingly difficult environment in which international criminal justice practitioners operate.

The Legal Advisory Committee also organised a roundtable examining Defence appeal time limits and possible proposals for reform, providing an opportunity for practitioners to discuss the practical impact of current procedures and possible improvements.

On 15 July 2026, the ICCBA marked its tenth anniversary with a special conference entitled *International Criminal Law in All Its States*. The conference brought together judges, diplomats, practitioners and academics to reflect on developments in international criminal law over the past decade and to consider future challenges facing the Court and the profession.

The anniversary provided an important opportunity not only to celebrate ten years since the establishment of the ICCBA, but also to reflect on the Association's evolution into an increasingly established representative body for the legal profession practising before the ICC.

Training and Professional Development

The ICCBA Training Committee continued to provide a comprehensive programme of professional development throughout the year.

Training activities addressed a wide range of subjects relevant to practice before the Court, including case strategy, artificial intelligence and legal practice, judicial independence, advocacy skills, professional ethics and practising international criminal law in an increasingly challenging international environment.

The Training Committee also organised a webinar on *Lessons from Nuremberg*, providing an opportunity to reflect on the continuing relevance of the Nuremberg proceedings to contemporary international criminal law and practice.

On 22 June 2026, the ICCBA organised an extensive hybrid training programme on *The Role of Rule 74 Counsel at the ICC*. The event attracted participants from around the world and formed part of the ICCBA's continuing commitment to practical advocacy training.

The Defence Committee also organised a webinar entitled *The Rules of The Hague: Adapting Domestic Criminal Practice to ICC Cases*. The event brought together experienced ICC practitioners to discuss the practical and procedural adjustments required when moving from domestic criminal practice to proceedings before the International Criminal Court.

From 22 to 24 September 2026, members of the ICCBA will participate in the annual Training for Counsel organised by the Training Committee together with the ICC Counsel Support Section, both at the Court and online. The programme will address a broad range of practical issues, including Article 55 representation, artificial intelligence tools, examination techniques, disciplinary proceedings, witness demeanour and memory, victims' representation and information security.

From 28 to 30 September 2026, the ICCBA and the Conseil national des barreaux will also hold a joint three-day practical training programme in Paris focusing on international criminal defence practice from the investigative phase through trial. The programme reflects the growing cooperation between the ICCBA and national bar associations in developing practical training opportunities for lawyers interested in appearing before international courts.

The ICCBA has also been consulting with the Counsel Support Section (CSS) and the Office of Public Counsel for the Defence (OPCD) on the implementation of mandatory training on the prevention of misconduct and all forms of workplace harassment. An online training programme entitled *United Respect for Dialogue*, which was already available to Court staff, was made accessible to all Defence and Victims' teams in late August. However, the training is not yet complete or fully satisfactory. It will need to be adapted to the specific circumstances of Defence and Victims' teams; interns do not currently have access; the training is not yet mandatory for Counsel; and the section intended for managers was not available. The ICCBA will continue to monitor progress and to engage with CSS and OPCD concerning the content and further development of this training.

Affiliation Agreements and Institutional Partnerships

Throughout the year, the ICCBA continued to strengthen its network of institutional partnerships by concluding new affiliation agreements with the Unione delle Camere

Penali Italiane, the American Bar Association International Law Section, the Ilustre y Nacional Colegio de Abogados de México and Universidad Siglo 21.

These agreements strengthen cooperation between the ICCBA and leading professional and academic institutions, promote the exchange of expertise and support joint initiatives in the fields of international criminal law, professional training, the independence of the legal profession and the rule of law.

The Executive Council continued to seek opportunities to expand the ICCBA's international network and to develop meaningful partnerships with bar associations, universities and other professional organisations in the coming year.

Outreach and Communications

The ICCBA has continued to develop its outreach activities and to highlight the work and experiences of practitioners involved in international criminal justice.

The Association continued its *ICCBA Journey* series, providing a platform for Counsel, assistants and other legal professionals to discuss their professional paths into international criminal justice and the different roles performed by those working before the Court. The series seeks to increase understanding of the profession, promote diversity of professional backgrounds and encourage the next generation of international criminal law practitioners.

The ICCBA also continued its engagement through its Regional and National Focal Points and through its website and social media channels, helping to communicate developments affecting members and to increase awareness of the Association's work among the wider legal community.

Organisational Development and Financial Sustainability

The Executive Council has also continued to consider the long-term development and financial sustainability of the Association.

Following discussions at the 2025 General Assembly, a Fundraising Working Group was established to explore new sources of financial support and opportunities to strengthen the ICCBA's activities and institutional capacity. Two members of the Working Group stepped down during the course of the year, but the remaining members continued their work. The principal focus was on identifying potential grant opportunities, including EU funding, and developing potential partnerships with Asian countries. The Executive Council submitted an application for EU funding for a project with a partner organisation; the application remains pending.

The Executive Council has continued to consider ways in which the Association can build a sustainable financial basis for its future work while maintaining and expanding the services, representation, training and advocacy provided to members.

The work undertaken during the past year demonstrates the breadth of the ICCBA's activities and the increasingly important role played by the Association in representing the legal profession before the International Criminal Court.

I would like to thank all members of the Executive Council, Committee members, Working Groups, Regional and National Focal Points, and the entire membership for their continued dedication, support and contributions to the work of the ICCBA.

I would also like to thank the Court, States Parties, bar associations and our partner organisations for their engagement with the Association over the past year.

It has been a privilege to serve as President of the ICCBA over the past two years. I am proud of what the Association has achieved during this period and of the contribution made by so many of our members to strengthening the legal profession and the administration of international criminal justice.

As the ICCBA enters its next chapter, I wish my successor and the incoming Executive Council every success in continuing this important work.

Best wishes,

Philippe Larochelle
President
ICCBA

I. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the ICCBA are:

1. To support the functions, efficiency and independence of Counsel practising before the ICC;
2. To promote and uphold the highest professional standards and ethics of Counsel, relevant to their duties, responsibilities and obligations pursuant to the Rome Statute, the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, the Code of Professional Conduct for Counsel, and all related directives and regulations;
3. To promote and facilitate the proficiency and competence of Counsel in the field of advocacy, procedural and substantive international criminal law and information technology systems relevant to their function before the ICC;
4. To facilitate Counsel in having the necessary support, assistance and information from the Organs and Offices of the ICC to enable them to provide effective legal representation;
5. To enhance the quality of justice at the ICC required under the provisions of the Rome Statute and other recognized texts;
6. To assist in resolving legal issues impacting Counsel;
7. To ensure independent representation of the interests of Counsel and their Support Staff;
8. To advocate for the enhancement of the rights of clients and Counsel before the ICC;
9. To establish channels of communication and hold consultations with the Registrar on matters related to Counsel and their staff in the performance of their duties before the ICC.
10. To consult with the Registrar on any developments or amendments which are proposed to the Code of Professional Conduct;

11. To promote equality of arms between the parties before the ICC;
12. To represent the interests, concerns of Members and the aims of the ICCBA before the Assembly of States Parties (“ASP”);
13. To assist in resolving incidents between its Members and between Counsel and the Organs and Offices of the ICC, as appropriate;
14. To liaise with the national Bars of ICCBA members as required;
15. To engage with counsel at other international, internationalized or hybrid courts or tribunals, or with a bar or association of counsel which has been established at such a court or tribunal on professional matters of mutual benefit and concerns;
16. To provide any other reasonable and necessary services as a Bar might provide to its members.

ICCBA Committees and Working Groups

DEFENCE COMMITTEE Ana Tuiketeti (Chair) Hassan M.S Alhattab Kate Gibson Elisabetta Galeazzi Emmanuel Molina Nkomu Mabaso Idenyemih Stella Omiyi Annual Report See Annex A	VICTIMS COMMITTEE Kimberley Motley (Chair) Aurélie Berthet Elisabetta Galeazzi Jessica Lescs Emmanuel Molina Cristina Perozzi Natalie von Wistinghausen Annual Report See Annex B
COUNSEL SUPPORT STAFF COMMITTEE Marcela Velarde (Chair) Camille Divet Vugar Gadimov Haneen Ghali Eva Kalb Dr Denys V. Keshkentii Dr Abbas Poorhashemi Annual Report See Annex C	PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE Anand A. Shah (Chair) Jens Dieckmann Marie-Hélène Proulx Juan Carlos Manríquez Ingo Klaus Wamser Annual Report See Annex D
LEGAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE James Onalaja (Chair) Giovanni Chiarini Astrid Odete Escobedo Barrondo Ariel Liniado Juan Carlos Manríquez Annual Report See Annex E	TRAINING COMMITTEE Mylène Dimitri (Chair) Mélissa Beaulieu-Lussier Dignité Bwiza James Onalaja Ahmed Zuhair Bajalan Annual Report See Annex F
AMICUS COMMITTEE Committee Members Aurélie Berthet (Chair) Franck Arnaud Giovanni Chiarini Idenyemih Stella Omiyi Ahmed Zuhair Bajalan Annual Report See Annex G	ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE WORKING GROUP Working Group Members Marina Aksenova Jason Antley Maya Avci Charles Chua Haneen Ghali Toks Hussain Hélène Raïs

CODE OF CONDUCT WORKING GROUP Iain Edwards Michael Herz Marie O'Leary Anand Shah	DETENTION ISSUES WORKING GROUP Iain Edwards Despoina Eleftheriou Philippe Larochele Barbara Szmatala
DUTY OF CARE WORKING GROUP Abigail Bridgman Haydee Dijkstal Fiona McKay Evelyne Ombeni Caroline Walter Annual Report See Annex H	ECOCIDE WORKING GROUP Thomas Hannis Drazen Plavec Juan Carlos Manriquez Kimberley Motley Javier Ruiz Regina Weiss Annual Report See Annex I
FUNDRAISING WORKING GROUP Vugar Gadimov Juan Carlos Manriquez Audrey Mateo Fuhua Ni Enet Somers-Dehaney	GENDER, DIVERSITY, AND SEXUAL AND GENDER BASED VIOLENCE Astrid Escobedo Joanna Heskia Kathryn McCormack Eduardo Visconti

II. FINANCIAL UPDATE

A. Accounts Receivable

The ICCBA has been successful in collecting Membership Dues. From 27 September 2025 to 21 September 2026 a total of € 58,904.58 has been received in membership fees.

The ICCBA has a total membership of 282 and the following in each membership category:

- 155 Full Members
- 57 Associate Members
- 70 Affiliate Members

B. Balance Sheet

The ICCBA currently has assets in the bank account amounting to €22,543.95.

See attached Annex J.

C. Profit and Loss

A full account of the income and expenditure for the year from 27 September 2025 to 21 September 2026, please see Annex K.

D. Proposed Budget 2026-2027

Annex L contains two budget proposals for 2026-2027 based on an estimation of income and predicted expenditure.

DEFENCE COMMITTEE REPORT 2025- 2026

While our Committee is mandated to protect the rights and interests of suspects and accused persons before the International Criminal Court, we have integrated our key responsibilities—Advocacy & Protection, Training, and Advisory services—into our 2025–2026 activities, remaining mindful of our members' varying time zones and professional commitments.

As Chairperson, I have been honored and blessed to work alongside these experienced professionals who have not only supported our mandate but have passionately carried out our activities with enthusiasm.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

- i. Ana Tuiketēi (Chair / President)
- ii. Hassan M.S Alhattab
- iii. Kate Gibson
- iv. Elisabetta Galeazzi
- v. Emmanuel Molina
- vi. Nkomu Mabaso
- vii. Idenyemih Stella Omiy

ACTIVITIES FOR 2026:

The Committee completed these activities, driven by meeting discussions, past goals, active commitment, and enthusiasm for new projects:

A. Professional Advocacy and Training:

The Rules of The Hague: Adapting Domestic Criminal Practice to ICC Cases:

Thursday, 10 September, 4pm CET

Background

The seminar organized by the ICCBA Defense Committee explored the practical differences between domestic criminal litigation and defense practice before the ICC, with a focus on the realities that Counsel encounter when transitioning into international proceedings. From hybrid procedural rules and extensive written litigation to victim participation, multilingual evidence and investigations conducted across jurisdictions, appearing before the ICC demands approaches that often differ significantly from domestic criminal practice.

Speckers:

- i. Moderator: Ana Tuiketēi, ICCBA Defence Committee Chair
- ii. Anta Guissé, Defence Counsel, ICC
- iii. Iain Edwards, Defence Counsel, ICC
- iv. Kate Gibson, Defence Counsel, ICC
- v. Anouk Julien, Legal Assistant, ICC

This webinar event was received well and is available on this you tube link:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jsoMzmUUrYs>

B. Governance: Meeting & Liasson with ICCBA Executive:

27th May, 8:30pm CET

We met with Executive Representative Anta Guissé, who commended our upcoming events and support for other committee activities. She also offered suggestions on promoting admission to the ICC List of Counsel and ICCBA activities.

Through Committee member Nkomu Mabaso the Defense Committee proposed that the official list of the ICCBA members be hosted on the website for verification purposes. In June 2026 the Executive Council responded that they had granted the Defense Committee's proposal to have a Directory on the ICCBA website on a voluntary basis.

This link is now active:

https://www.iccba-abcpi.org/_files/ugd/ff5a5e_e6128c71216245a8af9f3702432b622b.pdf

The Committee is proud of this accomplishment to allow better networks, collaborations and communication between members of the ICCBA.

C. Support to Other ICCBA Committees:

LAC Roundtable on Defense Appeal Time Limits

23 April, 5pm CET

The Defense Committee, through Kate Gibson and myself, supported this roundtable because active defense teams have raised concerns regarding the workability of the existing deadlines for filing notices of appeal and appeal briefs. Some counsels have suggested that current time limits do not reflect today's more complex cases, the extensive requirements at the notice of appeal stage, and the practical constraints modern defense teams face. We were able to:

- i. Exchange experiences and perspectives on the current appeal deadlines;
- ii. Assess whether there is a need for reform; and
- iii. Consider possible avenues for amendment, including changes to the legal texts or updates to the Chambers Practice Manual.

CONCLUSION:

On behalf of the ICCBBA Defense Committee, I want to thank Dominic and the Secretariat for their support during our tenure. I also want to take this time to thank my committee members for their dedication.

Submitted by:

Ana Tuiketeti (Chairperson)

Victims Committee Annual Report 2025-2026

No Report

COUNSEL SUPPORT STAFF COMMITTEE
Annual Report 2025-2026

International Criminal Court Bar Association
Counsel Support Staff Committee
2025-2026

Annual Report to the ICCBA General Assembly for 2025-2026

I. COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- Marcela Velarde (Chair)
- Camille Divet
- Vugar Gadimov
- Haneen Ghali
- Eva Kalb
- Dr Denys V. Keshkentii
- Dr Abbas Poorhashemi

II. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the Constitution of the International Criminal Court Bar Association (ICCBA), the Counsel Support Staff Committee (CSSC) is established to protect the interests of support staff, as well as provide proposals to the Executive Council and report to the General Assembly on all matters affecting the support staff. With the present report, the Chair of the CSSC presents the Committee's Annual Report to the ICCBA General Assembly for 2025-2026. This annual report includes results from the previous CSSC term (2024-2025), as well as new proposals for the subsequent term (2026-2027).

III. KEY ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The CSSC accomplished the following tasks during the 2025-2026 term:

1) Revised and Updated the Welcome Package for Support Staff

The CSSC reviewed and overhauled the Welcome Package from 2023, designed for members newly appointed to a case, to be fully up to date. The finalized resource is substantially more practical, informative, and beneficial for incoming support staff to the ICC who will reside in The Hague. The main topics addressed in this Welcome Package are relocation, accommodation, daily life in The Hague, remuneration and labor rights, and filing taxes.

2) Contribute to the implementation of the Legal Aid Policy Reform

The CSSC continued collaborating with the Executive Council on implementing LAP reforms, with an emphasis on improving conditions for external support staff. The CSSC insisted on the advancement of discussions with the Host State and other State Parties on the

issue of taxation for support staff, in particular, since there was a new government instated in the Host State. Further, the CSSC remarked how the letter of appointment for support staff lacked clarity on the relationship between external staff members and the ICC, as well as highlighted the difficulties support staff could encounter when relocating to the Netherlands. The CSSC supported the Executive Council in engaging with the Registry to further conversations on the obligations owed between them. The CSSC encourages the subsequent CSSC (2026-2027) to continue supporting the Executive Council on the topics of taxation and letters of appointment for support staff.

3) Designed Survey identify Support Staff needs

The CSSC inquired on the work of the previous CSSC (2024-2025) and developed a comprehensive survey aimed at identifying the specific needs of Support Staff of the Court, such as core training needs and daily operational challenges. The CSSC will provide the results of this survey to the subsequent CSSC (2026-2027) to address those needs.

4) Developed working relationship with the ICCBA Executive Council to continue to promote the interests of Support Staff

The CSSC developed a working relationship with the Executive Council, in particular with two representatives for the support staff so that the CSSC could be consulted and informed on developments worked on by the Executive Council. Because of this working relationship, the CSSC insisted for the Executive Council to start negotiations on potential “contracts” with the Registry for support staff, as well as determine the rights and advantages these “contracts” could offer under the Legal Aid system. The CSSC encourages the subsequent CSSC (2026-2027) to continue supporting the Executive Council in its conversations with the Registry on this topic.

5) Commenced discussions on the framework for a Mentoring Program within the ICCBA

The CSSC commenced discussions with the Executive Council on the framework for a possible mentoring program within the ICCBA. The CSSC was highly interested in this and provided suggestions, ideas, and concerns for a possible mentoring program, as well as inquired on its role and potential collaboration with other ICCBA committees to pursue the program. The next CSSC (2026-2027) is encouraged to continue these discussions with the Executive Council for the implementation of the mentoring program.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcela Velarde
Chair, Counsel Support Staff Committee

Date: 20th September, 2026



PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 2025-2026 Term

Members: Jens Dieckman; Juan Carlos Manriquez; Marie-Hélène Proulx; Anand Shah (*Chair*);
Ingo Klaus Wamser

The composition and duties of the Professional Standards Advisory Committee (PSAC) are addressed at articles 19 and 20 of the ICCBA Constitution. This report of the PSAC is prepared and presented pursuant to Article 5(3)(b) of the ICCBA Constitution, and is submitted to the General Assembly to inform the members of the ICCBA of the activities of the PSAC during the 2025-2026 ICCBA term.

I. Provision of Advisory Opinion to ICCBA Member

On 3 February 2026, following a request from an ICCBA Associate Member, the PSAC issued an advisory opinion to assist in the proper determination of professional misconduct proceedings opened against the member by his national judiciary, in the member's capacity as a public defender and judicial officer. With the member's consent, the full opinion has been made available on the PSAC page of the ICCBA website (<https://www.iccba-abcpi.org/psac>).

The opinion addresses whether admission to the List of Assistants to Counsel before the ICC may constitute practice before the Court or engagement in proceedings before the ICC, as well as any obligations that might attach to an individual admitted to the List of Assistants vis-à-vis the Court. The opinion also sets out the PSAC's view that the Committee's factual and legal analysis applies, in large measure, to the situation of individuals admitted to the List of Counsel before the ICC. Lastly, the opinion considers the

relevance of the Rome Statute's legal framework in respect of how national authorities and judiciaries of States Parties may view members of their national bars, government staff or officials, or judicial officials, inclusion on these two ICC lists.

Having considered the Court's legal texts, relevant Registry administrative procedures, and the jurisprudence of the Disciplinary Board of the ICC, the PSAC concluded that inclusion on these ICC lists does not constitute an appointment to represent or assist in representing a defendant or victims in proceedings before the ICC, or any other type of contractual relationship with the Court. Further, inclusion on these lists does not, in and of itself, constitute advertising an individual's current availability to be appointed as Counsel, Associate Counsel, or Assistant to Counsel, in proceedings before the Court. Additionally, there is no obligation on an individual admitted to these lists to accept such an appointment should they be approached by the Court or an ICC defendant or victim.

The PSAC also opined that inclusion on these ICC lists does not imply support for, or endorsement of, any specific decisions or actions taken, or statements made by, ICC officials, organs, or the Court as a whole.

The PSAC lastly expressed the view that the relevant legal authorities and bodies in all States Parties to the Rome Statute should view the Rome Statute system, and the Court, not as a foreign law and institution, but instead a legal framework that is linked to national legal systems, and one that is built on foundations of cooperation, collaboration and collectivity.

II. Database of summary of ICC Disciplinary Body Decisions

The PSAC updated the existing PSAC summary database of ICC Disciplinary Board and ICC Disciplinary Appeals Board issuances to include most of the nine procedural and substantive decisions issued by these bodies since the last iteration of this database (available on the PSAC page of the ICCBA website: <https://www.iccba-abcpi.org/psac>).

III. Continuing review and assessment of ICC framework governing the conduct, and protecting the rights, of members of ICC defence and victim's team

With the Executive Council's approval, the PSAC continued the ICCBA's work on conducting a comprehensive review of the ICC's legal framework governing the conduct, and protecting the rights, of ICC defence and victim's team members. The PSAC's assessment and recommendations in this subject area will be provided to the incoming PSAC members (2026-2027 term) to carry forward the ICCBA's mandate in this important area, in coordination with the Executive Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Anand Shah, Chair
on behalf of the ICCBA Professional Standards Advisory Committee

Legal Advisory Committee Draft Annual Report 2025/26 Term

Committee Members:

Giovanni Chiarini

Astrid Escobedo

Ariel Liniado

Juan Carlos Marinquez

James Onalaja (Chair)

[English]

The Legal Advisory Committee (LAC) hereby submits to the ICCBA Executive Council (EC) and the full ICCBA membership, the following annual report for the LAC's 2025 – 26 term.

1. The LAC held several meetings remotely during its term of office and further remained in regular contact by electronic means on a variety of issues impacting the ICC, ICCBA and the LAC.
2. A key objective for the LAC in the 2025/26 term was to identify committees, working groups and other agencies whose work intersects with the LAC's mandate, in order to foster a collaborative approach to comprehensive legal text review and amendment proposals.
3. The committee was able to begin this collaborative process by organising two roundtable meetings which brought together experienced ICL practitioners, representative from the: ICC Office of Public Counsel for the Defence (OPCD); ICCBA Executive Committee; Defence Committee, ICC defence team members and the LAC to discuss systemic challenges related to appeal notice deadlines and associated time limits issues in proceedings before the ICC.

4. The discussions were prompted by recurring concerns raised by certain representatives of defence teams regarding the adequacy of current timelines, particularly following the 12th July 2017 regulation changes (RoC 57) that made notices of appeal more substantive.
5. The meetings aimed to: Identify practical challenges arising from current deadlines; share experiences across cases; explore potential avenues for reform or improvement; consider realistic next steps for collective action.
6. Participants emphasized that the current 30-day deadline for filing a notice of appeal no longer reflects the document's substantive nature, which now requires detailed legal grounds and the identification of alleged errors. Additionally, participants were of the view that the standard deadline to serve the appeal briefs within 90 days of notification of the relevant decision (RoC 58) was consistently insufficient. This has created a structural imbalance between procedural expectations and practical feasibility.
7. The discussion confirmed that current appeal deadlines present systemic challenges that affect not only defence teams but also the fairness and quality of proceedings. While formal reform may be complex, there was consensus that practical, incremental steps, particularly through engagement, documentation, and guidance, can begin to address these issues, with a view to working towards an ultimate goal of extending the time limits.
8. The participants agreed to: develop a working document to identify the core issues and possible solutions; explore channels of engagement with relevant stakeholders and decision makers; establish a collaborative process over the long term, recognising that this will inevitably be a multi-stage and multi-year initiative.
9. The participants were in agreement and hope that the next cohort of the LAC will proceed with the agreed coordination of the preparation of a questionnaire for current and former members of defence teams, to gather information on the

impact of the current time limit issues and potential proposals and avenues for reform, and will work with the OPCD who have agreed to act as a depository for the draft questions and a central body of knowledge on the issue, in order to facilitate a seamless continuation of the project especially during the transition of committee terms and memberships.

10. The LAC is grateful for the insightful engagement and contributions of all the participants set out above and wishes the next membership of the LAC all the best in moving forward with this initiative.

Date: 20th September '26

ICCBA Training Committee Activity Report – February to September 2026

Introduction

During the first semester of 2026, the ICCBA Training Committee continued its commitment to strengthening the skills and professional development of counsel practising before the International Criminal Court. Through webinars, expert panels and practical training sessions, the Committee provided opportunities for members to engage with judges, counsel, academics and other practitioners on issues directly affecting international criminal practice. The activities were organised in both English and French whenever possible, reflecting the bilingual working environment of the Court.

At the beginning of its mandate, the Training Committee conducted a survey among ICCBA members to identify their training needs and the topics they wished to see addressed during the year. The survey was circulated to all ICCBA members. Based on the responses received, a list of priority training topics was established and used by the Committee as a reference in developing its training programme. A full copy of the survey results is annexed to this report. While the Committee was able to address several of the topics identified through the survey developed in the current report, it was not possible, within the available timeframe, to organise training sessions on all the subjects requested by members. The remaining topics are therefore also annexed to this report and may provide a useful starting point for the incoming Training Committee members when planning its future activities.

February 2026 – Webinar: Building a Case Strategy Before the ICC

In February 2026, the Committee organised a bilingual webinar on case strategy featuring Catherine Mabilie, Lead Defence Counsel, and Simon Laws KC, Lead Counsel for Victims. They discussed developing a theory of the case, conducting field missions, meeting clients, victims and witnesses, collecting and assessing evidence, selecting experts and investigators, assembling multidisciplinary teams, maintaining communication with clients and adapting litigation strategy throughout proceedings.

21 April 2026 – Practising International Criminal Law Under Pressure

The Committee partnered with the Office of Public Counsel for the Defence (OPCD) and IILAT to organise a panel entitled 'Practising International Criminal Law Under Pressure'. The discussion explored the threats, risks and pressures faced by counsel practising before international courts and tribunals and how to address them. It also highlighted developments aimed at strengthening protections for lawyers, such as the recent Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Profession of Lawyer (Luxembourg Convention). The event aimed to bring together counsel and staff practising at international criminal tribunals, judges and the diplomatic community.

1 May 2026 – Panel on Judicial Independence

A high-level panel on Judicial Independence brought together H.E. Hugh Adsett, Ambassador of Canada to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Judge Kimberly Prost, Judge Luz del Carmen Ibáñez Carranza, Judge Beti Hohler and the UN Special Rapporteur on the Independence of

Judges and Lawyers. The discussion examined the importance of judicial independence, current challenges, public confidence and the role of States and legal professionals in protecting judicial independence.

28 May 2026 – Artificial Intelligence and Ethics

In partnership with OPCD, the Committee organised a panel on the ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in international criminal practice featuring Sarah Codde. The discussion covered opportunities for AI, confidentiality, verification of AI outputs, bias, transparency, accountability, human oversight and equality of arms.

22 June 2026 – Rule 74 Practical Advocacy Training

The Committee organised a full-day practical Rule 74 training with Judge Nicolas Guillou, Judge Samba, Counsel Anta Guissé and Counsel Bafadhel. The programme combined judicial presentations with advocacy exercises and practical feedback on Rule 74 applications and courtroom practice.

17 July 2026 – Book Presentation: From Nuremberg to The Hague

To mark International Justice Day on 17 July 2026, the ICCBA Training Committee organised an online book presentation and discussion entitled 'From Nuremberg to The Hague: What Defence Counsel can Learn About Intent, Responsibility, and Psychiatric Evidence', based on Jack El-Hai's *The Nazi and the Psychiatrist: Hermann Göring, Dr. Douglas M. Kelley, and a Fatal Meeting of Minds at the End of WWII*. The event brought together author Jack El-Hai and international criminal defence counsel Jean-Pierre Jacques. The discussion examined the historical experience of psychiatrist Dr. Douglas M. Kelley with Hermann Göring and other Nuremberg defendants and its continuing relevance to international criminal practice, including criminal intent, individual responsibility, psychiatric and expert evidence, the rights of the accused, and the distinction between explaining conduct and justifying it. The event provided an opportunity to connect the legacy of Nuremberg with contemporary challenges of individual accountability, fair trials and effective defence before international criminal courts and tribunals.

Looking Ahead – September 2026

The Committee will continue its programme during the ICC List Counsel Seminar (22–24 September 2026) in collaboration with CSS. Planned sessions include:

Article 55 session will take the form of a debate combined with a role play involving a witness who may become a suspect. Different scenarios will be put to Prosecution and Defence counsel to discuss how duty counsel should react and advise the person concerned.

Enhancing Efficiency through AI Tools is Part II of the AI training. Part I, delivered by the ICCBA earlier this year, focused on the ethical use of AI. This second session brings together three AI experts to explore how these tools can be used responsibly to increase the efficiency of legal teams, including in investigative and case-related work. The panel will feature Sarah Codde, Jason Antley and Christophe Anglade on the responsible use of AI in international criminal practice.

The Disciplinary Board panel will discuss key provisions of the Code of Professional Conduct, including counsel's obligations, responsibilities and duties, and conduct that may constitute a violation. The second part will examine recent disciplinary jurisprudence, including the two cases in which decisions were appealed and decisions were subsequently issued by the Disciplinary Appeals Board.

The session on witness demeanour and memory will consider the assessment of credibility, different aspects of witness demeanour and what they may, or may not, indicate, as well as issues relating to memory. The panel will feature Dr Marc-Olivier Del Grosso.

The examination-in-chief and cross-examination session will be interactive and will introduce the factual case and advocacy principles that will then be used during the practical exercises on 24 September before ICC judges and counsel.

The victim representation session will focus on the practical work of legal representatives, both in the field and before the Court, including collecting, understanding and presenting the views and concerns of their clients.

The Committee is also exploring a special ICCBA event on the morning of 25 September 2026 immediately preceding the ICCBA General Assembly.

Acknowledgements

The ICCBA Training Committee are most grateful to all the contributors and speakers, including judges, external guest speakers, fellow practitioners and members of the ICCBA who have provided their time and expertise so enthusiastically and thus ensuring the success of the committee's training events. The Training Committee has also benefited from the steadfast support of the Court's leadership throughout its activities. The President of the Court and the Registrar generously contributed to a number of the Committee's events by delivering opening or closing remarks, underscoring the importance of continuous professional training for counsel and reaffirming the Court's commitment to constructive engagement with the legal profession. Their participation greatly enhanced the quality and visibility of the Committee's programme.

ICCBA Training Committee Survey Results

Rank	Preferred training topic	Selections	% of respondents*
1	Case-study/fact-pattern series covering the key stages of ICC case preparation and presentation	43	84.3%
2	Collecting evidence for the referral/transmission of a case to the ICC Prosecutor	38	74.5%
3	IHL refresher, with particular regard to recent developments in ICC jurisprudence	36	70.6%
4	Issues relating to the detention of accused persons during the pre-trial, trial and post-verdict phases	27	52.9%
5	Addressing cultural aspects and considerations when handling a case before the ICC	17	33.3%

Preferred topics for the case-study/fact-pattern training series

Rank	Proposed training topic	Selections	% of respondents*
1	Investigations: investigation planning, open-source and field investigations, witness proofing and statements, and avoiding inappropriate contact/interference	37	77.1%
2	Building case strategy	32	66.7%
3	Legal drafting at the ICC	31	64.6%
4	Appearance at the ICC: opening and closing submissions, examination of witnesses, motions and objections	29	60.4%
5	Introduction to ICC disclosure software and effective case-management tools	26	54.2%
6	Examination and cross-examination: handling expert evidence and expert witnesses	24	50.0%
7	Reparations	11	22.9%

Amicus Committee Annual Report 2025-2026

International Criminal Court Bar Association (ICCBA)

Amicus Curiae Committee

Annual Report – 2025-2026 Term

Committee Members:

- Franck Arnaud
- Aurélie Berthet, Chair
- Giovanni Chiarini
- Idenyemih Stella Omiyi
- Ahmed Zuhair Bajalan

1. General framework and mandate of the Committee

The Amicus Curiae Committee, pursuant to Section XVI of the ICCBA Statutes and the provisions of Article 103 of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence, and Articles 68(3) and 75(3) of the Rome Statute, is responsible for (i) considering and responding to requests from the ICC President or from an ICC Chamber for the submission of an ICCBA Amicus Curiae brief before the ICC; and (ii) considering and responding to requests submitted to the ICCBA Executive Council by any third party, including, but not limited to, ICC counsel, governments, NGOs and individuals, for the submission of ICCBA Amicus Curiae briefs before the ICC or any other relevant forum.

The Committee also maintains a catalogue of requests and observations submitted under Article 103 and Article 75(3), together with in-depth analyses of a selection of Amicus Curiae interventions before the Court.

2. Activities and achievements

2.1. Updating of the catalogue of Amicus Curiae interventions

During the 2025-2026 term, the Committee undertook work to update the catalogue of requests and observations submitted under Articles 103 and 75(3). This work remains unfinished to date and will be finalised shortly.

2.2. Request concerning a brief before another forum

Under the second limb of its mandate, the Committee received a request concerning the possible submission of an ICCBA Amicus Curiae brief before a jurisdiction other than the ICC, whether national or international. The requesting party presented its request to both the Executive Council and the Amicus Curiae Committee. Following this presentation, and at this stage, the Executive Council has not tasked the Committee with the preparation of the requested brief.

2.3. Absence of a request before the ICC

Unlike the previous term, during which the Committee handled one request for leave to file submissions under Rule 103, the Committee neither submitted nor received any request for the

preparation or coordination of an Amicus Curiae brief before the ICC during the 2025-2026 term.

2.4. Organisational difficulties and practical constraints

The Committee once again faced organisational difficulties during the 2025-2026 term, in particular linked to the geographical distance separating its members. As Committee members are located across different time zones, it proved difficult to organise effective plenary meetings allowing for the participation of all members.

3. Critical assessment and recommendations

3.1. Assessment of the 2025-2026 term

The 2025-2026 term remains characterised by:

- the absence of any Amicus Curiae brief submitted before the ICC;
- the Committee's consideration, under its mandate, of a request concerning a brief before another forum, which the Executive Council has not, at this stage, taken forward;
- continued work updating the catalogue, which remains to be finalised;
- persistent difficulties linked to the geographical distance and differing time zones of Committee members.

3.2. Recommendations for the 2026-2027 term

In light of this assessment, the Committee makes the following recommendations:

- To finalise the update to the catalogue initiated during the 2025-2026 term;
- To consider meeting arrangements that take into account members' different time zones (for example, alternating meeting times or greater use of asynchronous exchanges), in order to facilitate broader and more regular participation by Committee members;
- To continue reflecting on the essence and visibility of the Committee, in order to better respond to the needs of the ICC and the ICCBA.

4. Conclusion

The 2025-2026 term was marked by the absence of any Amicus Curiae brief submitted before the ICC, as well as by organisational difficulties linked to the geographical distance separating Committee members. The Committee nevertheless continued its work, including updating the catalogue and considering a request concerning a brief before another forum. We remain fully committed to strengthening our contribution to international criminal justice and to establishing the Committee as a key actor in the analysis of complex legal issues.

Yours faithfully,

Aurélie Berthet
Chair, Amicus Curiae Committee

Paris, September 20th, 2026

Duty of Care Working Group Report 2025-2026

The Working Group, composed of Haydee Dijkstal, Abigail Bridgman, Fiona McKay, Evelyne Komerwa Ombeni and Caroline Walter is pleased to share this status update to the ICCBA membership.

The working group was created in May 2024 with a mandate to identify gaps in the current court framework with regard to the support offered to defence and victims' representatives, particularly in field missions.

The working group has done outreach to teams and individuals to ensure a diversity in the responses. We have received 6 responses in total from victims and defence teams and in both English and French. We are grateful to those who thoughtfully engaged with the questionnaire.

The working group is now studying these carefully with a view to preparing a report and recommendations. We welcome continued engagement on this and will be sharing more on next steps soon.

ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group
Briefing Paper for the
ICC Bar Association General Assembly (25 September 2026)

To: ICC Bar Association Executive Council:

Philippe LaRochelle – *President*; Natalie von Wistinghausen – *Vice President for Victims*;
Anta Guissé – *Vice President for Defence*; Haneen Ghali – *Vice President for Support Staff*;
Gregory Townsend – *Secretary*; Audrey Mateo – *Treasurer*; Paul Bradfield – *Member*;
Michael Herz – *Member*; Marie-Hélène Proulx – *Member*.

Through: Dominic Kennedy – *ICC Bar Association Executive Director*

From: ICC Bar Association Ecocide Working Group (EWG):

Regina Weiss - *Chair*; Javier Ruiz; Drazen Plavec; Juan Carlos Manríquez; Kimberly Motley
- *Members*.

Date: 21 September 2026

Re: Paper on Ecocide for presentation at the ICCBA General Assembly (25 September 2026)

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 The EWG was formed in February 2024 and hereby presents its third annual briefing paper to the ICCBA Presidency and Executive. The purpose of this paper is to update the Presidency and Executive on the global progression of the crime of ecocide and its relevance to the ICC.
- 1.2 As noted in the 2024 paper, ICC Member States Vanuatu, Fiji and Samoa formally introduced the crime of ecocide for consideration by ICC State Parties to the UN Secretary-General and the Working Group on Amendments of the Assembly of States Parties on 9 September 2024. Two years have passed since that date, which triggered global discussions on the prospect of adopting ecocide as the fifth most serious crime of international concern for humanity.
- 1.3 The progression of ecocide being included as a fifth crime is without doubt being stymied by the consistent and deplorable attacks on the institution as a whole and individuals who work in it. **The EWG condemns in the strongest of terms the sanctions imposed on judges and prosecution staff by the United States of America.** It further condemns the rhetoric threatening the future existence of the ICC and urges all State Parties to reiterate their unwavering support of the institution and its staff. The EWG notes and endorses the ICCBA condemnation of further US sanctions against the President of the ICC and a Senior Trial Lawyer dated 20 August 2026.

2. Work of the ICCBA EWG in 25/26

- 2.1 The EWG members originate from Argentina, Australia, Chile, Croatia and the United States and thus met regularly online. Since its formation, the EWG has met in The Hague for its annual in-person sessions. Due to personal commitments of its members, the EWG were not in a position to do so in 2026, however aim to reconvene

in June 2027 for 2-3 days, with the intention of inviting academics, practitioners and experts to engage with the group, as it did in 2024 and 2025.

3. Progression of ecocide as a crime globally, 25/26

- 3.1 On 10 September 2026, the Croatian Government formally approved amendments to the Croatian Penal Code to include the offence of ecocide, which has been referred to the Croatian parliament for consideration. The Croatian Minister of Justice confirmed that the forthcoming amendments will introduce a new offence of “particularly serious environmental protection violations”, with proposed penalties including up to 10 years’ imprisonment and the possibility of long-term or life imprisonment in the most serious cases.
- 3.2 In February 2026, the Scottish Parliament voted to advance the *Ecocide (Scotland) Bill*, although it did not progress with the dissolution of the Scottish Parliament in April 2026. In April 2026, Mauritius introduced the crime of ecocide in its domestic legislation, with penalties including fines and up to 10 years’ imprisonment. The definition of ecocide is akin to that initially proposed for introduction in the Rome Statute: “an unlawful or wanton act committed with knowledge that there is a substantial likelihood of severe and either widespread or long-term environmental damage.” Other States to introduce bills in the last 12 months include India, Sweden and the Philippines.
- 3.3 The new Belgian Penal Code, in force from 1 September 2026, reflects explicit recognition of ecocide, with significant penalties for individuals.
- 3.4 Ecocide and environmental crimes have also been highlighted in the context of ongoing conflicts, with Iran’s Vice President and Foreign Minister describing strikes on oil storage facilities and fuel depots in Tehran as ‘ecocide’ with focus on the serious and long-term impacts on public health. In Lebanon, the government commissioned a report focusing on the destruction to forests, agricultural lands, marine ecosystems, water resources and atmospheric quality resulting from military activity in 2023 and 2024, and which described harm to the environment as ‘ecocide’.
- 3.5 The *Council of Europe Convention on the Protection of the Environment through Criminal Law* (CETS No. 228) (**CoE Convention**)¹ was adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 14 May 2025 and opened for signature on 3 December 2025, becoming the first international legally binding instrument dedicated specifically to environmental crime. It covers a wide range of offences including pollution, waste, hazardous substances, natural resources and biodiversity. There is also a separate category of “particularly serious offences” for intentional acts causing irreversible or long-lasting, widespread and substantial damage to ecosystems, habitats, or the quality of air, soil or water — language widely described as covering conduct “tantamount to ecocide.” The preamble explicitly references the concept of ecocide

¹ Available at: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/reykjavik-process-and-the-environment/protection-of-the-environment-through-criminal-law>

and also addresses corporate liability, restorative measures, protection of whistle-blowers, and international cooperation.

- 3.6 The Convention will enter into force once it is ratified by 10 States, including at least eight by Council of Europe member States. To date, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Sweden, Luxemburg, Montenegro, Latvia and Cyprus have becoming signatories, in addition to the European Union.
- 3.7 European developments supply concrete domestic and regional practice that can strengthen complementarity arguments and demonstrate that State Parties (and neighbouring jurisdictions) are already moving to criminalise the most severe forms of environmental destruction. They also create a practical baseline with which any future Rome Statute ecocide provision could usefully align. The EU's own signature of the CoE Convention and the May 2026 transposition deadline for the Directive make 2026 a pivotal implementation year in this regard.
- 3.8 Since its proposal as a fifth crime in the Rome Statute, the term 'ecocide' has become increasingly utilised in describing criminal acts which cause widespread harm to the environment. Despite the complex hurdles facing international criminal law globally, including the blatant disregard for rules of international law, normalising the term 'ecocide' as demonstrated by States domestically is indicative of a global acceptance that it is indeed a crime of the most serious order. This provides a glimmer of hope at a time where the rule of international law is actively being denigrated by world leaders.

4. Recent developments in international environmental cases and the impact on ecocide discussions

Overview

- 4.1 Between early 2024 and the end of 2025, international courts, regional human-rights tribunals and domestic judges handed down an unusually dense cluster of rulings on climate change and environmental harm. None of these cases decided "ecocide" as a legal question — the term has no binding definition in any court's jurisdiction yet — but they are indicative of the fact that international law is converging on the idea that severe environmental destruction deserves the same seriousness of legal response as the crimes already recognised at the ICC.
- 4.2 This section reviews the key cases and rulings in four groups — international courts and tribunals, regional human-rights courts, domestic and cross-border corporate litigation, and the international criminal law track.

International Courts and advisory opinions

- 4.3 Three advisory opinions issued in 2024 and 2025 form the backbone of current legal debate *vis-à-vis* environmental crimes, because each was requested specifically to clarify what international law already requires of states on climate and environmental

protection — questions that bear directly on how "seriously" environmental harm is treated in international law generally.

- **21 May 2024 — International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS), advisory opinion on climate change:** Requested by the Commission of Small Island States on Climate Change and International Law (COSIS), the Tribunal unanimously held that greenhouse gas emissions constitute marine pollution under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and that States have a binding obligation to take "all necessary measures" to prevent, reduce and control such pollution, applying a stringent standard of due diligence. This was the first international court to rule that existing treaty law already imposes hard climate obligations on states.
- **3 July 2025 — Inter-American Court of Human Rights, advisory opinion on the climate emergency:** The Court held that the obligation to prevent severe and irreversible environmental harm has attained the status of a peremptory norm of international law (*jus cogens*) — a category reserved for the most fundamental prohibitions, such as those against genocide and slavery. This was the strongest judicial statement yet that large-scale environmental destruction sits at the top tier of international legal concern.
- **23 July 2025 — International Court of Justice, advisory opinion on the Obligations of States in respect of Climate Change:**² Requested by the UN General Assembly after a campaign led by Pacific youth activists and championed diplomatically by Vanuatu (backed by more than 130 states), the ICJ confirmed that States owe binding, in places "stringent," due-diligence obligations to prevent significant harm to the climate system; that these obligations are owed *erga omnes* (to the international community as a whole, so any State may invoke another's responsibility); that a "sufficiently direct and certain causal nexus" can link specific emissions to specific harm; and that breaching states must make full reparation.

Regional Human Rights Courts

4.4 Regional courts moved in unison, but their rulings also exposed the jurisdictional limits of using human rights law, rather than criminal law, to address environmental harm.

- **22 March 2024 — Inter-American Court of Human Rights, *La Oroya v Peru*:** Ruling on two decades of toxic contamination from a metal smelter in La Oroya, Peru, the Court found Peru responsible for violating residents' rights to a healthy environment, health, personal integrity and access to information, in the first

² See also ICCBA EWG briefing paper to the ICCBA GA dated 23 September 2025, at [4].

Inter-American Court judgment to directly recognise state responsibility for breach of the right to a healthy environment. It ordered wide-ranging reparations, including environmental remediation, medical care, and prosecution of those responsible — and, notably, directed the state to investigate and prosecute the individuals responsible for the harm, a criminal-accountability dimension advocates see as a small-scale precedent for the individual-liability logic behind ecocide law.

- **9 April 2024 — European Court of Human Rights, Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz v Switzerland:** In its first climate ruling, the Grand Chamber found that Switzerland's inadequate climate mitigation measures violated the right to respect for private and family life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights, and that the applicant association had standing to bring the case on behalf of its members. The judgment established that States Parties to the Convention have binding obligations to adopt and effectively implement climate mitigation measures.
- **9 April 2024 — European Court of Human Rights, Duarte Agostinho and Others v Portugal and 32 Other States:** Decided the same day, this case — brought by six Portuguese young people against 33 states over transboundary climate harm — was declared inadmissible. The Court held it lacked jurisdiction over states other than Portugal because the applicants were not under those states' jurisdiction in the Convention sense, and that domestic remedies in Portugal had not been exhausted. The ruling illustrated a structural limit of human rights litigation for diffuse, transboundary environmental harm: existing jurisdictional doctrine struggles to reach the states and actors most responsible when the harm crosses borders — precisely the gap that a universally applicable international crime of ecocide is designed to close.

Domestic and cross-border corporate litigation

4.5 A parallel track of corporate climate and environmental litigation tested how far domestic courts would go in holding companies liable — with mixed results that advocates say demonstrate both the promise and the limits of civil remedies.

- **12 November 2024 — The Hague Court of Appeal, Milieudefensie v Shell:** The appeals court overturned the 2021 District Court order requiring Shell to cut its group-wide CO₂ emissions by 45% by 2030, holding that a specific numerical target could not be judicially imposed on an individual company. However, the court affirmed that companies with a large carbon footprint bear an unwritten duty of care under Dutch law to help prevent dangerous climate change, and that protection from climate change is a human right giving rise to indirect corporate obligations. The ruling preserved the principle of corporate climate accountability while rejecting the specific remedy — a pattern advocates cite as evidence that

private civil law can establish duties but struggles to enforce them at the scale ecocide-level harm requires.

- **28 May 2025 — Higher Regional Court of Hamm (Germany), *Lliuya v RWE***: In a case brought by a Peruvian farmer against German energy company RWE over glacial flood risk linked to its historic emissions, the court dismissed the claim on the facts (the specific flood risk to the claimant's property was found insufficiently proven) but, for the first time by a high court anywhere, held as a matter of law that a major greenhouse gas emitter can be held civilly liable for its proportional contribution to climate change harms occurring far from where it operates. Commentators have called this an "empty victory" for the plaintiff but a structural win for climate liability doctrine — establishing the legal principle for future claims even though this claim failed.
- **November 2025 — High Court of England and Wales, *Município de Mariana and Others v BHP Group* ([2025] EWHC 3001 (TCC))**: In what is described as the largest group litigation in English legal history — roughly 620,000 claimants seeking about £36 billion over the 2015 Fundão tailings dam collapse in Brazil, one of the worst environmental disasters in Brazilian history — the High Court held BHP's UK and Australian parent companies strictly liable as "polluters" under Brazilian environmental law, and separately liable in negligence for failing to remediate known risks. The ruling confirmed that parent companies can be held directly liable in their home jurisdiction for environmental catastrophes caused by foreign subsidiaries and joint ventures, a cross-border accountability model frequently invoked in ecocide advocacy as proof that mass ecological destruction can and should be litigated where the corporate decision-makers are based. A second phase to quantify damages is scheduled for late 2026, with final resolution not expected before 2028–2029 — underscoring, in advocates' telling, how slow and resource-intensive civil litigation is even when liability is established, compared to criminal prosecution.

International Criminal Law

4.6 Alongside civil and human rights litigation, 2025 saw the first prosecutorial-level move within the existing international criminal law framework.

- **4 December 2025 — ICC Office of the Prosecutor, *Policy on Addressing Environmental Damage Through the Rome Statute***: Released at the 24th Assembly of States Parties in The Hague, this policy sets out, for the first time, a systematic framework for how environmental destruction can be prosecuted under the Rome Statute's four existing crimes — genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression — without any amendment to the Statute. It addresses environmental harm connected to persecution, forcible transfer and starvation as a method of warfare, among other pathways, and

states that senior individuals responsible for decisions causing serious ecological harm, not corporations, can face liability. Stop Ecocide International called it *"a significant and welcome development"* that *"closes longstanding gaps in accountability"* and reinforces *"the wider legal trajectory toward recognising ecocide as a crime,"* while some commentators have noted the opposite reading is also possible: if existing crimes can absorb most environmental harm through prosecutorial policy alone, that could reduce the urgency some states feel to support a formal Rome Statute amendment adding ecocide as a fifth crime.

What this body of international case law means for the progression of Ecocide as a crime

4.7 Four threads run through how this jurisprudence impacts of the progression of ecocide as a globally recognised crime:

- **A rising legal ceiling.** Across very different bodies — a law-of-the-sea tribunal, two regional human-rights courts, and the world's highest court — the direction of progression of environmental crimes is aligned. From treating environmental protection as a matter of policy discretion to now defining it as a binding legal obligation shows significant progress and is indicative of a global movement which will simply not accept impunity for crimes against the environment. This rising legal ceiling makes ecocide's core claim — that the very worst environmental destruction belongs among international law's most serious wrongs — considerably easier to defend than it was even three years ago.
- **Documented gaps that criminal law is moving to fill.** Duarte Agostinho's dismissal on jurisdictional grounds, Milieudefensie's partially overturned remedy, and Lliuya's loss on the facts despite winning the legal principle all illustrate structural limits of human rights and civil litigation: narrow jurisdiction, difficulty fashioning enforceable remedies against individual companies, and demanding evidentiary burdens on causation. Transboundary harm, diffusing corporate responsibility and slow multi-year timelines seen in the BHP/Mariana litigation justify the need for a universal criminal offence of ecocide in the Rome Statute. This will enable the ability to prosecute the crime of ecocide regardless of where the harm or the responsible actors are located and will work alongside civil and human rights remedies.
- **Convergence without consolidation.** None of the above rulings are binding on, or formally linked to, any of the others: ITLOS speaks only to the law of the sea, the ECtHR and IACtHR bind only their own regional systems, and the ICJ opinion is advisory. That is, they exist in silos. The resulting body of law remains fragmented and non-binding across jurisdictions, which is itself part of the

argument for a single, universally applicable Rome Statute crime rather than relying on a patchwork of regional and domestic rulings.

- **A live debate about whether criminalisation is still necessary.** The ICC Prosecutor's December 2025 policy is the clearest illustration of the tension between a fifth crime of ecocide or utilising the current Rome Statute framework: it shows environmental harm can be prosecuted today, under existing crimes, without waiting for a Rome Statute amendment — which strengthens accountability in the short term but confines the prosecution of environmental crimes to the context of conflict and war.³ For noting, environmental crimes are yet to be charged or prosecuted before the ICC.

Judicial and prosecutorial developments | 2026

4.8 The first half of 2026 moved the international criminal law track from policy statements toward a live, state-level test case, while the corporate-liability track produced a reminder of how long enforcement takes even after a liability finding.

- **23 January 2026 — Ukraine's environmental-damage database:** Ukraine's government completed a database documenting 10,668 environmental crimes committed during the Russian invasion, valuing the damage at approximately £108 billion. The database is intended as the evidentiary foundation for both domestic prosecution and international claims.
- **3 March 2026 — Ukraine's multi-track ecocide campaign against Russia:** Ukraine confirmed it was pursuing accountability for wartime environmental destruction through three parallel channels: domestic courts prosecuting the June 2023 Kakhovka Dam destruction as both a war crime and ecocide under Ukraine's own criminal code (one of the few national codes to already include the offence); the new International Claims Commission for Ukraine, agreed at a December 2025 Council of Europe and Netherlands conference attended by 52 states and the EU and pending ratification during 2026, which is expected to address war-related ecological damage; and continued diplomatic advocacy for adding ecocide to the Rome Statute. Observers described this as the most concrete real-world attempt yet to use "ecocide" as an operative legal charge and compensation basis against a state, rather than only as an advocacy term, though commentators also noted the significant evidentiary and jurisdictional obstacles to proving ecocide against a non-cooperating state under any existing framework.
- **16 March 2026 — England and Wales Court of Appeal, *Município de Mariana v BHP*:** In a procedural ruling arising from the same litigation above, the Court of Appeal found in BHP's favour on a dispute over whether the company's parallel filings in Brazil's Supreme Court — seeking to challenge the municipalities'

³ See further ICCBA EWG briefing paper to the ICCBA GA, 23 September 2025 at [6].

standing to sue in England — amounted to criminal contempt of the English court. The Court of Appeal held that invoking a foreign court in good faith, under that court's own procedural rules, will "only exceptionally" amount to contempt, and that comity between national courts weighs against treating such filings as improper even when their timing is strategic. The ruling does not disturb the November 2025 finding that BHP is liable for the Fundão dam collapse, but it illustrates how much procedural litigation can follow even after liability is established — the case's damages phase is not scheduled until late 2026, with final resolution not expected before 2028–2029.

- 4.9 Read together, these two threads pull in different directions on the question of urgency. Ukraine's case shows real-world demand for exactly the kind of universal, state-level ecocide liability that Rome Statute lawyers have been arguing for in the abstract since 2024–2025. The BHP procedural ruling shows that even the strongest existing civil-liability precedent to date remains, years after the underlying disaster, tied up in litigation about litigation — reinforcing the argument that criminal accountability mechanisms, where available, could resolve responsibility for mass environmental harm considerably faster than civil claims.

Summation

- 4.10 Taken together, cross-jurisdictional case law since the 24/25 EWG GA briefing paper did not create a crime of ecocide, and no international court has yet decided a case that turns on the term. What it did was substantially bolster the legal record which ecocide advocates draw on: binding due-diligence obligations (ITLOS, ICJ), a *jus cogens* prohibition on severe environmental harm (IACtHR), recognised human-rights dimensions of environmental protection (*KlimaSeniorinnen*, *La Oroya*), documented limits of existing remedies (*Duarte Agostinho*, *Milieudefensie*, *Lliuya*), a precedent for cross-border corporate liability (*BHP/Mariana*), a prosecutorial roadmap for environmental harm within the ICC's current jurisdiction (the OTP policy), and, as of early 2026, an actual state-versus-state attempt to invoke ecocide as an operative charge and claims basis (*Ukraine v Russia*). Whether this accumulation translates into the two-thirds majority needed to add Ecocide as a fifth crime to the Rome Statute remains, in 2027, an open political question rather than a legal one.

5. Next steps:

- 5.1 The EWG resolves to continue its work in advising the ICCBA Presidency and Executive for the 2026/2027 period if the Executive so sees fit. It will continue to engage with experts in environmental and international law when doing so. As noted above, it is intended that an in-person meeting will take place in The Hague in around June 2027 for those members who can attend.
- 5.2 The EWG remains of the view, as it did in its 2024 and 2025 briefing paper, that ecocide is a crime of the most serious concern to humanity and bringing to justice individual perpetrators of ecocide is crucial to ensure global environmental protection and sustainability for generations to come.
- 5.3 The EWG is pleased to contribute to the conversation which will assist in preserving the earth's precious and fragile environment.

SOURCES

- Center for International Environmental Law — "Historic Climate Opinion: States Must Protect Oceans from Greenhouse Gas Emissions" (ITLOS) — <https://www.ciel.org/news/historic-climate-opinion-states-must-protect-oceans-from-greenhouse-gas-emissions/>
- Columbia Climate Law Blog — "More than a Sink: The ITLOS Advisory Opinion on Climate Change and State Responsibility" — <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2024/06/07/more-than-a-sink-the-itlos-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change-and-state-responsibility/>
- AIDA Americas — "Inter-American Court Ruling on La Oroya Case Sets Key Precedent for the Protection of a Healthy Environment" — <https://aida-americas.org/en/press/inter-american-court-ruling-la-oroya-case-sets-key-precedent-protection-healthy-environment>
- Opinio Juris — "The Right to a Healthy Environment in La Oroya v. Peru: A Landmark Judgement of the IACtHR" — <https://opiniojuris.org/2024/05/25/the-right-to-a-healthy-environment-in-la-oroya-v-peru-a-landmark-judgement-of-the-iacthr/>
- Global Litigation News (Baker McKenzie) — "Verein KlimaSeniorinnen Schweiz and Others v. Switzerland" — <https://globallitigationnews.bakermckenzie.com/2024/04/17/verein-klimaseniorinnen-schweiz-and-others-v-switzerland-european-court-of-human-rights-identifies-shortfalls-in-swiss-climate-mitigation-measures-and-access-to-justice/>
- Verfassungsblog — "On the Duarte Agostinho Decision" — <https://verfassungsblog.de/on-the-duarte-agostinho-decision/>
- Mayer Brown — "Milieudefensie v Shell: Dutch appeals court overturns ruling that Shell must reduce its CO2 emissions by 45%" — <https://www.mayerbrown.com/en/insights/publications/2024/11/milieudefensie-v-shell-dutch-appeals-court-overturns-ruling-that-shell-must-reduce-its-co2-emissions-by-45-percent>
- Verfassungsblog — "Lessons of a Landmark Lost: The Judgment of the Hague Court of Appeal in Shell v Milieudefensie" — <https://verfassungsblog.de/shell-milieudefensie-climate-litigation/>
- Germanwatch — "Groundbreaking climate ruling against RWE" (Lliuya v RWE) — <https://www.germanwatch.org/en/groundbreaking-climate-ruling-against-rwe>
- Columbia Climate Law Blog — "What Lliuya v. RWE Means for Climate Change Loss and Damage Claims" — <https://blogs.law.columbia.edu/climatechange/2025/06/19/what-lliuya-v-rwe-means-for-climate-change-loss-and-damage-claims/>
- Law Gazette — "BHP 'strictly liable' for pollution caused by Brazil dam collapse, High Court in London finds" — <https://www.lawgazette.co.uk/news/bhp-strictly-liable-for-brazil-dam-collapse-pollution/5125109.article>
- Serle Court — "Município de Mariana v BHP [2025] EWHC 3001 (TCC)" — <https://www.serlecourt.co.uk/news/article/municipio-de-mariana-v-bhp-2025-ewhc-3001-tcc>

- EJIL:Talk! — "State Responsibility in the ICJ's Advisory Opinion on Climate Change" — <https://www.ejiltalk.org/state-responsibility-in-the-icjs-advisory-opinion-on-climate-change/>
- Stop Ecocide International — "International Court of Justice Sets Out States' Climate Obligations — Major Implications for Ecocide Law" — <https://www.stopecocide.earth/bn-2025/international-court-of-justice-sets-out-states-climate-obligations-major-implications-for-ecocide-law>
- Stop Ecocide International — "Historic ICC Policy Puts Ecological Harm at the Centre of International Criminal Law" — <https://www.stopecocide.earth/bn-2025/historic-icc-policy-puts-ecological-harm-at-the-centre-of-international-criminal-law>
- International Criminal Court — "ICC Office of the Prosecutor launches Policy on Addressing Environmental Damage Through the Rome Statute" — <https://www.icc-cpi.int/news/icc-office-prosecutor-launches-policy-addressing-environmental-damage-through-rome-statute>
- Business & Human Rights Resource Centre — "ICC Office of the Prosecutor unveils policy on environmental damage in international crimes" — <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/latest-news/icc-office-of-the-prosecutor-unveils-policy-on-environmental-damage-in-international-crimes/>
- CEOBS — "Has the ICC just advanced accountability for wartime environmental damage?" — <https://ceobs.org/has-the-icc-just-advanced-accountability-for-wartime-environmental-damage/>
- Opinio Juris — "From Policy to Practice: Operationalising Environmental Justice" — <https://opiniojuris.org/2026/01/09/from-policy-to-practice-operationalising-environmental-justice/>
- Byline Times — "Ukraine Launches Landmark Legal Action to Hold Russia Accountable for 'Ecocide'" — <https://bylinetimes.com/2026/03/03/ukraine-launches-landmark-legal-action-to-hold-russia-accountable-for-ecocide/>
- Justice Info — "Kakhovka Dam: Ukraine Pioneers Prosecution of Ecocide" — <https://www.justiceinfo.net/en/119148-kakhovka-dam-ukraine-pioneers-prosecution-ecocide.html>
- England and Wales Court of Appeal — *Município de Mariana v BHP*, CA-2025-001750 (approved judgment) — <https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2026/03/CA-2025-001750-BHP-v-Mariana-Approved-Judgment.pdf>

ICCBA-ABCPi
Balance Sheet
As of 21 Sep, 2026

	Total
Assets	
Current Assets	
ABN-AMRO Current Account	22,543.95
Total for Current Assets	€22,543.95
Total for Assets	€22,543.95

ICCBA-ABCPi
Profit and Loss
27 September, 2025-21 September, 2026

	Total
Income	
Credit Interest	616.00
Membership Dues / Cotisations	58,904.38
Training Income	
Advocacy Training	1,025.46
Total for Training Income	€1,025.46
Total for Income	€60,545.84
Gross Profit	€60,545.84
Expenses	
Accounting Software	244.18
Advertising/Promotional	
Merchandise	186.00
Total for Advertising/Promotional	€186.00
Bank charges	462.67
Consultancy Services	60,000.00
Events	
10th Anniversary Event	499.40
ASP	1,769.85
General Assembly	241.22
Total for Events	€2,510.47
Office expenses	19.99
Website	60.86
Zoom Subscription	59.67
Total for Expenses	€63,543.84
Net Earnings	-€2,998.00

Provisional Budget 1 October 2026 - 30 September 2027					
Revenue				Expenditure	
Membership fees				Consultancy	
	Members	Fee			
Full Members	160	€295	€47.200		Executive Director €60.000
Associate Members	55	€180	€9.900	Organization costs	
					Accountancy Software €250
					Banking Costs €500
Affiliate Members	60	€100	€6.000		Email System €300
					Office Costs €100
Training			€1.100		Video Telecommunications €150
					Website €300
				Events	
					General Assembly €400
					ASP €2.000
Total			€64.200	Total	€64.000