

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
4 October 2000

Original: English

**Report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a
Special Court for Sierra Leone****I. Introduction**

1. The Security Council, by its resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, requested me to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court (hereinafter “the Special Court”) to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, as well as crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone.

2. The Security Council further requested that I submit a report on the implementation of the resolution, in particular on my consultations and negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone concerning the establishment of the Special Court. In the report I was requested, in particular, to address the questions of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court; an appeals process, including the advisability, feasibility and appropriateness of an appeals chamber in the Special Court, or of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda; and a possible alternative host State, should it be necessary to convene the Special Court outside the seat of the Court in Sierra Leone, if circumstances so require.

3. Specific recommendations were also requested by the Security Council on the following issues:

(a) Any additional agreements that might be required for the provision of the international assistance necessary for the establishment and functioning of the Special Court;

(b) The level of participation, support and technical assistance of qualified persons required from Member States, including, in particular, States members of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Commonwealth, and from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) that would be necessary for the efficient, independent and impartial functioning of the Special Court;

(c) The amount of voluntary contributions of funds, equipment and services, including expert personnel from States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations;

(d) Whether the Special Court could receive, as necessary and feasible, expertise and advice from the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda.

4. The present report, submitted in response to the above requests, is in two parts. The first part (chaps. II-VI) examines and analyses the nature and specificity of the Special Court, its jurisdiction (subject-matter, temporal and personal), the organizational structure (the Chambers and the nature of the appeals process, the offices of the Prosecutor and the Registry), enforcement of sentences in third States and the choice of the alternative seat. The second part (chaps. VII and VIII) deals with the practical implementation of the resolution on the establishment of the Special Court. It describes the requirements of the Court in terms of personnel, equipment, services and funds that would be required of States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the type of advice and expertise that may be expected from the two International Tribunals, and the logistical support and

security requirements for premises and personnel that could, under an appropriate mandate, be provided by UNAMSIL. The Court's requirements in all of these respects have been placed within the specific context of Sierra Leone, and represent the minimum necessary, in the words of resolution 1315 (2000), "for the efficient, independent and impartial functioning of the Special Court". An assessment of the viability and sustainability of the financial mechanism envisaged, together with an alternative solution for the consideration of the Security Council, concludes the second part of the report.

5. The negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone, represented by the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice, were conducted in two stages. The first stage of the negotiations, held at United Nations Headquarters from 12 to 14 September 2000, focused on the legal framework and constitutive instruments establishing the Special Court: the Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone and the Statute of the Special Court which is an integral part thereof. (For the texts of the Agreement and the Statute, see the annex to the present report.)

6. Following the Attorney General's visit to Headquarters, a small United Nations team led by Ralph Zacklin, Assistant Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, visited Freetown from 18 to 20 September 2000. Mr. Zacklin was accompanied by Daphna Shraga, Senior Legal Officer, Office of the Legal Counsel, Office of Legal Affairs; Gerald Ganz, Security Coordination Officer, Office of the United Nations Security Coordinator; and Robert Kirkwood, Chief, Buildings Management, International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. During its three-day visit, the team concluded the negotiations on the remaining legal issues, assessed the adequacy of possible premises for the seat of the Special Court, their operational state and security conditions, and had substantive discussions on all aspects of the Special Court with the President of Sierra Leone, senior government officials, members of the judiciary and the legal profession, the Ombudsman, members of civil society, national and international non-governmental organizations and institutions involved in child-care programmes and rehabilitation of child ex-combatants, as well as with senior officials of UNAMSIL.

7. In its many meetings with Sierra Leoneans of all segments of society, the team was made aware of the high level of expectations created in anticipation of the

establishment of a special court. If the role of the Special Court in dealing with impunity and developing respect for the rule of law in Sierra Leone is to be fully understood and its educative message conveyed to Sierra Leoneans of all ages, a broad public information and education campaign will have to be undertaken as an integral part of the Court's activities. The purpose of such a campaign would be both to inform and to reassure the population that while a credible Special Court cannot be established overnight, everything possible will be done to expedite its functioning; that while the number of persons prosecuted before the Special Court will be limited, it would not be selective or otherwise discriminatory; and that although the children of Sierra Leone may be among those who have committed the worst crimes, they are to be regarded first and foremost as victims. For a nation which has attested to atrocities that only few societies have witnessed, it will require a great deal of persuasion to convince it that the exclusion of the death penalty and its replacement by imprisonment is not an "acquittal" of the accused, but an imposition of a more humane punishment. In this public information campaign, UNAMSIL, alongside the Government and non-governmental organizations, could play an important role.

8. Since the present report is limited to an analysis of the legal framework and the practical operation of the Special Court, it does not address in detail specifics of the relationship between the Special Court and the national courts in Sierra Leone, or between the Court and the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It is envisaged, however, that upon the establishment of the Special Court and the appointment of its Prosecutor, arrangements regarding cooperation, assistance and sharing of information between the respective courts would be concluded and the status of detainees awaiting trial would be urgently reviewed. In a similar vein, relationship and cooperation arrangements would be required between the Prosecutor and the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission, including the use of the Commission as an alternative to prosecution, and the prosecution of juveniles, in particular.

II. Nature and specificity of the Special Court

9. The legal nature of the Special Court, like that of any other legal entity, is determined by its constitutive instrument. Unlike either the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, which were established by resolutions of the Security Council and constituted as subsidiary organs of the United Nations, or national courts established by law, the Special Court, as foreseen, is established by an Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone and is therefore a treaty-based *sui generis* court of mixed jurisdiction and composition. Its implementation at the national level would require that the agreement is incorporated in the national law of Sierra Leone in accordance with constitutional requirements. Its applicable law includes international as well as Sierra Leonean law, and it is composed of both international and Sierra Leonean judges,¹ prosecutors and administrative support staff.² As a treaty-based organ, the Special Court is not anchored in any existing system (i.e., United Nations administrative law or the national law of the State of the seat) which would be automatically applicable to its non-judicial, administrative and financial activities. In the absence of such a framework, it would be necessary to identify rules for various purposes, such as recruitment, staff administration, procurement, etc., to be applied as the need arose.³

10. The Special Court has concurrent jurisdiction with and primacy over Sierra Leonean courts. Consequently, it has the power to request at any stage of the proceedings that any national Sierra Leonean court defer to its jurisdiction (article 8, para. 2 of the Statute). The primacy of the Special Court, however, is limited to the national courts of Sierra Leone and does not extend to the courts of third States. Lacking the power to assert its primacy over national courts in third States in connection with the crimes committed in Sierra Leone, it also lacks the power to request the surrender of an accused from any third State and to induce the compliance of its authorities with any such request. In examining measures to enhance the deterrent powers of the Special Court, the Security Council may wish to consider endowing it with Chapter VII powers for the specific purpose of requesting the surrender of an accused from outside the jurisdiction of the Court.

11. Beyond its legal and technical aspects, which in many ways resemble those of other international jurisdictions, the Special Court is Sierra Leone-specific. Many of the legal choices made are intended to address the specificities of the Sierra Leonean conflict, the brutality of the crimes committed and the young age of those presumed responsible. The moral dilemma that some of these choices represent has not been lost upon those who negotiated its constitutive instruments.

III. Competence of the Special Court

A. Subject-matter jurisdiction

12. The subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court comprises crimes under international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law. It covers the most egregious practices of mass killing, extrajudicial executions, widespread mutilation, in particular amputation of hands, arms, legs, lips and other parts of the body, sexual violence against girls and women, and sexual slavery, abduction of thousands of children and adults, hard labour and forced recruitment into armed groups, looting and setting fire to large urban dwellings and villages. In recognition of the principle of legality, in particular *nullum crimen sine lege*, and the prohibition on retroactive criminal legislation, the international crimes enumerated, are crimes considered to have had the character of customary international law at the time of the alleged commission of the crime.

1. Crimes under international law

13. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council recommended that the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court should include crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law. Because of the lack of any evidence that the massive, large-scale killing in Sierra Leone was at any time perpetrated against an identified national, ethnic, racial or religious group with an intent to annihilate the group as such, the Security Council did not include the crime of genocide in its recommendation, nor was it considered appropriate by the Secretary-General to include it in the list of international crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Court.

14. The list of crimes against humanity follows the enumeration included in the Statutes of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, which were patterned on article 6 of the Nürnberg Charter. Violations of common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and of article 4 of Additional Protocol II thereto committed in an armed conflict not of an international character have long been considered customary international law, and in particular since the establishment of the two International Tribunals, have been recognized as customarily entailing the individual criminal responsibility of the accused. Under the Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), though it is not yet in force, they are recognized as war crimes.

15. Other serious violations of international humanitarian law falling within the jurisdiction of the Court include:

(a) Attacks against the civilian population as such, or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities;

(b) Attacks against peacekeeping personnel involved in a humanitarian assistance or a peacekeeping mission, as long as they are entitled to the protection given to civilians under the international law of armed conflict; and

(c) Abduction and forced recruitment of children under the age of 15 years into armed forces or groups for the purpose of using them to participate actively in hostilities.

16. The prohibition on attacks against civilians is based on the most fundamental distinction drawn in international humanitarian law between the civilian and the military and the absolute prohibition on directing attacks against the former. Its customary international law nature is, therefore, firmly established. Attacks against peacekeeping personnel, to the extent that they are entitled to protection recognized under international law to civilians in armed conflict, do not represent a new crime. Although established for the first time as an international crime in the Statute of the International Criminal Court, it was not viewed at the time of the adoption of the Rome Statute as adding to the already existing customary international law crime of attacks against civilians and persons hors de combat. Based on the distinction between peacekeepers as civilians and peacekeepers turned combatants, the crime defined in article 4 of the Statute of the Special Court is a

specification of a targeted group within the generally protected group of civilians which because of its humanitarian or peacekeeping mission deserves special protection. The specification of the crime of attacks against peacekeepers, however, does not imply a more serious crime than attacks against civilians in similar circumstances and should not entail, therefore, a heavier penalty.

17. The prohibition on the recruitment of children below the age of 15, a fundamental element of the protection of children, was for the first time established in the 1977 Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions, article 4, paragraph 3 (c), of which provides that children shall be provided with the care and aid they require, and that in particular:

“Children who have not attained the age of fifteen years shall neither be recruited in the armed forces or groups nor allowed to take part in hostilities”.

A decade later, the prohibition on the recruitment of children below 15 into armed forces was established in article 38, paragraph 3, of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child; and in 1998, the Statute of the International Criminal Court criminalized the prohibition and qualified it as a war crime. But while the prohibition on child recruitment has by now acquired a customary international law status, it is far less clear whether it is customarily recognized as a war crime entailing the individual criminal responsibility of the accused.

18. Owing to the doubtful customary nature of the ICC Statutory crime which criminalizes the conscription or enlistment of children under the age of 15, whether forced or “voluntary”, the crime which is included in article 4 (c) of the Statute of the Special Court is not the equivalent of the ICC provision. While the definition of the crime as “conscribing” or “enlisting” connotes an administrative act of putting one’s name on a list and formal entry into the armed forces, the elements of the crime under the proposed Statute of the Special Court are: (a) abduction, which in the case of the children of Sierra Leone was the original crime and is in itself a crime under common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions; (b) forced recruitment in the most general sense — administrative formalities, obviously, notwithstanding; and (c) transformation of the child into, and its use as, among other degrading uses, a “child-combatant”.

2. Crimes under Sierra Leonean law

19. The Security Council recommended that the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court should also include crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone. While most of the crimes committed in the Sierra Leonean conflict during the relevant period are governed by the international law provisions set out in articles 2 to 4 of the Statute, recourse to Sierra Leonean law has been had in cases where a specific situation or an aspect of it was considered to be either unregulated or inadequately regulated under international law. The crimes considered to be relevant for this purpose and included in the Statute are: offences relating to the abuse of girls under the 1926 Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act and offences relating to the wanton destruction of property, and in particular arson, under the 1861 Malicious Damage Act.

20. The applicability of two systems of law implies that the elements of the crimes are governed by the respective international or national law, and that the Rules of Evidence differ according to the nature of the crime as a common or international crime. In that connection, article 14 of the Statute provides that the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to proceedings before the Special Court, and that the judges shall have the power to amend or adopt additional rules, where a specific situation is not provided for. In so doing, they may be guided, as appropriate, by the 1965 Criminal Procedure Act of Sierra Leone.

B. Temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court

21. In addressing the question of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court as requested by the Security Council, a determination of the validity of the sweeping amnesty granted under the Lomé Peace Agreement of 7 July 1999 was first required. If valid, it would limit the temporal jurisdiction of the Court to offences committed after 7 July 1999; if invalid, it would make possible a determination of a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court at any time in the pre-Lomé period.

1. The amnesty clause in the Lomé Peace Agreement

22. While recognizing that amnesty is an accepted legal concept and a gesture of peace and reconciliation at the end of a civil war or an internal armed conflict,⁴ the United Nations has consistently maintained the position that amnesty cannot be granted in respect of international crimes, such as genocide, crimes against humanity or other serious violations of international humanitarian law.

23. At the time of the signature of the Lomé Peace Agreement, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone was instructed to append to his signature on behalf of the United Nations a disclaimer to the effect that the amnesty provision contained in article IX of the Agreement (“absolute and free pardon”) shall not apply to international crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law. This reservation is recalled by the Security Council in a preambular paragraph of resolution 1315 (2000).

24. In the negotiations on the Statute of the Special Court, the Government of Sierra Leone concurred with the position of the United Nations and agreed to the inclusion of an amnesty clause which would read as follows:

“An amnesty granted to any person falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Court in respect of the crimes referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall not be a bar to prosecution.”

With the denial of legal effect to the amnesty granted at Lomé, to the extent of its illegality under international law, the obstacle to the determination of a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court within the pre-Lomé period has been removed.

2. Beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction

25. It is generally accepted that the decade-long civil war in Sierra Leone dates back to 1991, when on 23 March of that year forces of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) entered Sierra Leone from Liberia and launched a rebellion to overthrow the one-party military rule of the All People’s Congress (APC). In determining a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court within the period since

23 March 1991, the Secretary-General has been guided by the following considerations: (a) the temporal jurisdiction should be reasonably limited in time so that the Prosecutor is not overburdened and the Court overloaded; (b) the beginning date should correspond to an event or a new phase in the conflict without necessarily having any political connotations; and (c) it should encompass the most serious crimes committed by persons of all political and military groups and in all geographical areas of the country. A temporal jurisdiction limited in any of these respects would rightly be perceived as a selective or discriminatory justice.

26. Imposing a temporal jurisdiction on the Special Court reaching back to 1991 would create a heavy burden for the prosecution and the Court. The following alternative dates were therefore considered as realistic options:

(a) *30 November 1996* — the conclusion of the Abidjan Peace Agreement, the first comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF. Soon after its signature the Peace Agreement had collapsed and large-scale hostilities had resumed;

(b) *25 May 1997* — the date of the coup d'état orchestrated by the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) against the Government that was democratically elected in early 1996. The period which ensued was characterized by serious violations of international humanitarian law, including, in particular, mass rape and abduction of women, forced recruitment of children and summary executions;

(c) *6 January 1999* — the date on which RUF/AFRC launched a military operation to take control of Freetown. The first three-week period of full control by these entities over Freetown marked the most intensified, systematic and widespread violations of human rights and international humanitarian law against the civilian population. During its retreat in February 1999, RUF abducted hundreds of young people, particularly young women used as forced labourers, fighting forces, human shields and sexual slaves.

27. In considering the three options for the beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court, the parties have concluded that the choice of 30 November 1996 would have the benefit of putting the Sierra Leone conflict in perspective without unnecessarily

extending the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court. It would also ensure that the most serious crimes committed by all parties and armed groups would be encompassed within its jurisdiction. The choice of 25 May 1997 would have all these advantages, with the disadvantage of having a political connotation, implying, wrongly, that the prosecution of those responsible for the most serious violations of international humanitarian law is aimed at punishment for their participation in the coup d'état. The last option marks in many ways the peak of the campaign of systematic and widespread crimes against the civilian population, as experienced mostly by the inhabitants of Freetown. If the temporal jurisdiction of the Court were to be limited to that period only, it would exclude all crimes committed before that period in the rural areas and the countryside. In view of the perceived advantages of the first option and the disadvantages associated with the other options, the date of 30 November 1996 was selected as the beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court, a decision in which the government negotiators have actively concurred.

28. As the armed conflict in various parts of the territory of Sierra Leone is still ongoing, it was decided that the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court should be left open-ended. The lifespan of the Special Court, however, as distinguished from its temporal jurisdiction, will be determined by a subsequent agreement between the parties upon the completion of its judicial activities, an indication of the capacity acquired by the local courts to assume the prosecution of the remaining cases, or the unavailability of resources. In setting an end to the operation of the Court, the Agreement would also determine all matters relating to enforcement of sentences, pardon or commutation, transfer of pending cases to the local courts and the disposition of the financial and other assets of the Special Court.

C. Personal jurisdiction

1. Persons "most responsible"

29. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council recommended that the personal jurisdiction of the Special Court should extend to those "who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of the crimes", which is understood as an indication of a limitation on the number of accused by reference to

their command authority and the gravity and scale of the crime. I propose, however, that the more general term “persons most responsible” should be used.

30. While those “most responsible” obviously include the political or military leadership, others in command authority down the chain of command may also be regarded “most responsible” judging by the severity of the crime or its massive scale. “Most responsible”, therefore, denotes both a leadership or authority position of the accused, and a sense of the gravity, seriousness or massive scale of the crime. It must be seen, however, not as a test criterion or a distinct jurisdictional threshold, but as a guidance to the Prosecutor in the adoption of a prosecution strategy and in making decisions to prosecute in individual cases.

31. Within the meaning attributed to it in the present Statute, the term “most responsible” would not necessarily exclude children between 15 and 18 years of age. While it is inconceivable that children could be in a political or military leadership position (although in Sierra Leone the rank of “Brigadier” was often granted to children as young as 11 years), the gravity and seriousness of the crimes they have allegedly committed would allow for their inclusion within the jurisdiction of the Court.

2. Individual criminal responsibility at 15 years of age

32. The possible prosecution of children for crimes against humanity and war crimes presents a difficult moral dilemma. More than in any other conflict where children have been used as combatants, in Sierra Leone, child combatants were initially abducted, forcibly recruited, sexually abused, reduced to slavery of all kinds and trained, often under the influence of drugs, to kill, maim and burn. Though feared by many for their brutality, most if not all of these children have been subjected to a process of psychological and physical abuse and duress which has transformed them from victims into perpetrators.

33. The solution to this terrible dilemma with respect to the Special Court⁵ could be found in a number of options: (a) determining a minimum age of 18 and exempting all persons under that age from accountability and individual criminal responsibility; (b) having children between 15 to 18 years of age, both victims and perpetrators, recount their story before the

Truth and Reconciliation Commission or similar mechanisms, none of which is as yet functional; and (c) having them go through the judicial process of accountability without punishment, in a court of law providing all internationally recognized guarantees of juvenile justice.

34. The question of child prosecution was discussed at length with the Government of Sierra Leone both in New York and in Freetown. It was raised with all the interlocutors of the United Nations team: the members of the judiciary, members of the legal profession and the Ombudsman, and was vigorously debated with members of civil society, non-governmental organizations and institutions actively engaged in child-care and rehabilitation programmes.

35. The Government of Sierra Leone and representatives of Sierra Leone civil society clearly wish to see a process of judicial accountability for child combatants presumed responsible for the crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Court. It was said that the people of Sierra Leone would not look kindly upon a court which failed to bring to justice children who committed crimes of that nature and spared them the judicial process of accountability. The international non-governmental organizations responsible for child-care and rehabilitation programmes, together with some of their national counterparts, however, were unanimous in their objection to any kind of judicial accountability for children below 18 years of age for fear that such a process would place at risk the entire rehabilitation programme so painstakingly achieved. While the extent to which this view represents the majority view of the people of Sierra Leone is debatable, it nevertheless underscores the importance of the child rehabilitation programme and the need to ensure that in the prosecution of children presumed responsible, the rehabilitation process of scores of other children is not endangered.

36. Given these highly diverging opinions, it is not easy to strike a balance between the interests at stake. I am mindful of the Security Council’s recommendation that only those who bear “the greatest responsibility” should be prosecuted. However, in view of the most horrific aspects of the child combatancy in Sierra Leone, the employment of this term would not necessarily exclude persons of young age from the jurisdiction of the Court. I therefore thought that it would be most prudent to demonstrate to the Security Council for its consideration how provisions on

prosecution of persons below the age of 18 — “children” within the definition of the Convention on the Rights of the Child — before an international jurisdiction could be formulated.⁶ Therefore, in order to meet the concerns expressed by, in particular, those responsible for child care and rehabilitation programmes, article 15, paragraph 5, of the Statute contains the following provision:

“In the prosecution of juvenile offenders, the Prosecutor shall ensure that the child-rehabilitation programme is not placed at risk, and that, where appropriate, resort should be had to alternative truth and reconciliation mechanisms, to the extent of their availability.”

37. Furthermore, the Statute of the Special Court, in article 7 and throughout the text, contains internationally recognized standards of juvenile justice and guarantees that juvenile offenders are treated in dignity and with a sense of worth. Accordingly, the overall composition of the judges should reflect their experiences in a variety of fields, including in juvenile justice (article 13, para. 1); the Office of the Prosecutor should be staffed with persons experienced in gender-related crimes and juvenile justice (article 15, para. 4). In a trial of a juvenile offender, the Special Court should, to the extent possible, order the immediate release of the accused, constitute a “Juvenile Chamber”, order the separation of the trial of a juvenile from that of an adult, and provide all legal and other assistance and order protective measures to ensure the privacy of the juvenile. The penalty of imprisonment is excluded in the case of a juvenile offender, and a number of alternative options of correctional or educational nature are provided for instead.

38. Consequently, if the Council, also weighing in the moral-educational message to the present and next generation of children in Sierra Leone, comes to the conclusion that persons under the age of 18 should be eligible for prosecution, the statutory provisions elaborated will strike an appropriate balance between all conflicting interests and provide the necessary guarantees of juvenile justice. It should also be stressed that, ultimately, it will be for the Prosecutor to decide if, all things considered, action should be taken against a juvenile offender in any individual case.

IV. Organizational structure of the Special Court

39. Organizationally, the Special Court has been conceived as a self-contained entity, consisting of three organs: the Chambers (two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber), the Prosecutor’s Office and the Registry. In the establishment of ad hoc international tribunals or special courts operating as separate institutions, independently of the relevant national legal system, it has proved to be necessary to comprise within one and the same entity all three organs. Like the two International Tribunals, the Special Court for Sierra Leone is established outside the national court system, and the inclusion of the Appeals Chamber within the same Court was thus the obvious choice.

A. The Chambers

40. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested that the question of the advisability, feasibility and appropriateness of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda should be addressed. In analysing this option from the legal and practical viewpoints, I have concluded that the sharing of a single Appeals Chamber between jurisdictions as diverse as the two International Tribunals and the Special Court for Sierra Leone is legally unsound and practically not feasible, without incurring unacceptably high administrative and financial costs.

41. While in theory the establishment of an overarching Appeals Chamber as the ultimate judicial authority in matters of interpretation and application of international humanitarian law offers a guarantee of developing a coherent body of law, in practice, the same result may be achieved by linking the jurisprudence of the Special Court to that of the International Tribunals, without imposing on the shared Appeals Chamber the financial and administrative constraints of a formal institutional link. Article 20, paragraph 3, of the Statute accordingly provides that the judges of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court shall be guided by the decisions of the Appeals Chamber of the Yugoslav and the Rwanda Tribunals; article 14, paragraph 1, of the Statute provides that the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Rwanda Tribunal shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings before the Special Court.

42. The sharing of one Appeals chamber between all three jurisdictions would strain the capacity of the already heavily burdened Appeals Chamber of the two Tribunals in ways which could either bring about the collapse of the appeals system as a whole, or delay beyond acceptable human rights standards the detention of accused pending the hearing of appeals from either or all jurisdictions. On the assumption that all judgements and sentencing decisions of the Trial Chambers of the Special Court will be appealed, as they have been in the cases of the two International Tribunals, and that the number of accused will be roughly the same as in each of the International Tribunals, the Appeals Chamber would be required to add to its current workload a gradual increase of approximately one third.

43. Faced with an exponential growth in the number of appeals lodged on judgements and interlocutory appeals in relation to an increasing number of accused and decisions rendered, the existing workload of the Appeals Chamber sitting in appeals from six Trial Chambers of the two ad hoc Tribunals is constantly growing. Based on current and anticipated growth in workload, existing trends⁷ and the projected pace of three to six appeals on judgements every year, the Appeals Chamber has requested additional resources in funds and personnel. With the addition of two Trial Chambers of the Special Court, making a total of eight Trial Chambers for one Appeals Chamber, the burden on the Yugoslav and Rwanda Appeals Chamber would be untenable, and the Special Court would be deprived of an effective and viable appeals process.

44. The financial costs which would be entailed for the Appeals Chamber when sitting on appeals from the Special Court will have to be borne by the regular budget, regardless of the financial mechanism established for the Special Court itself. These financial costs would include also costs of translation into French, which is one of the working languages of the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals; the working language of the Special Court will be English.

45. In his letter to the Legal Counsel in response to the request for comments on the eventuality of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the two international Tribunals with the Special Court, the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia wrote:

“With regard to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 1315 (2000), while the sharing of the Appeals Chamber of [the two International Tribunals] with that of the Special Court would bear the significant advantage of ensuring a better standardization of international humanitarian law, it appeared that the disadvantages of this option — excessive increase of the Appeals Chambers’ workload, problems arising from the mixing of sources of law, problems caused by the increase in travelling by the judges of the Appeals Chambers and difficulties caused by mixing the different judges of the three tribunals — outweigh its benefits.”⁸

46. For these reasons, the parties came to the conclusion that the Special Court should have two Trial Chambers, each with three judges, and an Appeals Chamber with five judges. Article 12, paragraph 4, provides for extra judges to sit on the bench in cases where protracted proceedings can be foreseen and it is necessary to make certain that the proceedings do not have to be discontinued in case one of the ordinary judges is unable to continue hearing the case.

B. The Prosecutor

47. An international prosecutor will be appointed by the Secretary-General to lead the investigations and prosecutions, with a Sierra Leonean Deputy. The appointment of an international prosecutor will guarantee that the Prosecutor is, and is seen to be, independent, objective and impartial.

C. The Registrar

48. The Registrar will service the Chambers and the Office of the Prosecutor and will have the responsibility for the financial management and external relations of the Court. The Registrar will be appointed by the Secretary-General as a staff member of the United Nations.

V. Enforcement of sentences

49. The possibility of serving prison sentences in third States is provided for in article 22 of the Statute. While imprisonment shall normally be served in Sierra Leone, particular circumstances, such as the security

risk entailed in the continued imprisonment of some of the convicted persons on Sierra Leonean territory, may require their relocation to a third State.

50. Enforcement of sentences in third countries will be based on an agreement between the Special Court⁹ and the State of enforcement. In seeking indications of the willingness of States to accept convicted persons, priority should be given to those which have already concluded similar agreements with either of the International Tribunals, as an indication that their prison facilities meet the minimum standards of conditions of detention. Although an agreement for the enforcement of sentences will be concluded between the Court and the State of enforcement, the wishes of the Government of Sierra Leone should be respected. In that connection, preference was expressed for such locations to be identified in an East African State.

VI. An alternative host country

51. In paragraph 7 of resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested that the question of a possible alternative host State be addressed, should it be necessary to convene the Special Court outside its seat in Sierra Leone, if circumstances so required. As the efforts of the United Nations Secretariat, the Government of Sierra Leone and other interested Member States are currently focused on the establishment of the Special Court in Sierra Leone, it is proposed that the question of the alternative seat should be addressed in phases. An important element in proceeding with this issue is also the way in which the Security Council addresses the present report, that is, if a Chapter VII element is included.

52. In the first phase, criteria for the choice of the alternative seat should be determined and a range of potential host countries identified. An agreement, in principle, should be sought both from the Government of Sierra Leone for the transfer of the Special Court to the State of the alternative seat, and from the authorities of the latter, for the relocation of the seat to its territory.

53. In the second phase, a technical assessment team would be sent to identify adequate premises in the third State or States. Once identified, the three parties, namely, the United Nations, the Government of Sierra Leone and the Government of the alternative seat, would conclude a Framework Agreement, or “an

agreement to agree” for the transfer of the seat when circumstances so required. The Agreement would stipulate the nature of the circumstances which would require the transfer of the seat and an undertaking to conclude in such an eventuality a Headquarters Agreement. Such a principled Agreement would facilitate the transfer of the seat on an emergency basis and enable the conclusion of a Headquarters Agreement soon thereafter.

54. In the choice of an alternative seat for the Special Court, the following considerations should be taken into account: the proximity to the place where the crimes were committed, and easy access to victims, witnesses and accused. Such proximity and easy access will greatly facilitate the work of the Prosecutor, who will continue to conduct his investigations in the territory of Sierra Leone.¹⁰ During the negotiations, the Government expressed a preference for a West African alternative seat, in an English-speaking country sharing a common-law legal system.

VII. Practical arrangements for the operation of the Special Court

55. The Agreement and the Statute of the Special Court establish the legal and institutional framework of the Court and the mutual obligations of the parties with regard, in particular, to appointments to the Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry and, the provision of premises. However, the practical arrangements for the establishment and operation of the Special Court remain outside the scope of the Agreement in the sense that they depend on contributions of personnel, equipment, services and funds from Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. It is somewhat anomalous, therefore, that the parties which establish the Special Court, in practice, are dependent for the implementation of their treaty obligations on States and international organizations which are not parties to the Agreement or otherwise bound by its provisions.

56. Proceeding from the premise that voluntary contributions would constitute the financial mechanism of the Special Court, the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to include in the report recommendations regarding the amount of voluntary contributions, as appropriate, of funds, equipment and services to the Special Court, contributions in

personnel, the kind of advice and expertise expected of the two ad hoc Tribunals, and the type of support and technical assistance to be provided by UNAMSIL. In considering the estimated requirements of the Special Court in all of these respects, it must be borne in mind that at the current stage, the Government of Sierra Leone is unable to contribute in any significant way to the operational costs of the Special Court, other than in the provision of premises, which would require substantial refurbishment, and the appointment of personnel, some of whom may not even be Sierra Leonean nationals. The requirements set out below should therefore be understood for all practical purposes as requirements that have to be met through contributions from sources other than the Government of Sierra Leone.

A. Estimated requirements of the Special Court for the first operational phase

1. Personnel and equipment

57. The personnel requirements of the Special Court for the initial operational phase¹¹ are estimated to include:

(a) Eight Trial Chamber judges (3 sitting judges and 1 alternate judge in each Chamber) and 6 Appeals Chamber judges (5 sitting judges and 1 alternate judge), 1 law clerk, 2 support staff for each Chamber and 1 security guard detailed to each judge (14);

(b) A Prosecutor and a Deputy Prosecutor, 20 investigators, 20 prosecutors and 26 support staff;

(c) A Registrar, a Deputy Registrar, 27 administrative support staff and 40 security officers;

(d) Four staff in the Victims and Witnesses Unit;

(e) One correction officer and 12 security officers in the detention facilities.

58. Based on the United Nations scale of salaries for a one-year period, the personnel requirements along with the corresponding equipment and vehicles are estimated on a very preliminary basis to be US\$ 22 million. The calculation of the personnel requirements is premised on the assumption that all persons appointed (whether by the United Nations or the Government of Sierra Leone) will be paid from United Nations sources.

59. In seeking qualified personnel from States Members of the United Nations, the importance of obtaining such personnel from members of the Commonwealth, sharing the same language and common-law legal system, has been recognized. The Office of Legal Affairs has therefore approached the Commonwealth Secretariat with a request to identify possible candidates for the positions of judges, prosecutors, Registrar, investigators and administrative support staff. How many of the Commonwealth countries would be in a position to voluntarily contribute such personnel with their salaries and emoluments is an open question. A request similar to that which has been made to the Commonwealth will also be made to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

2. Premises

60. The second most significant component of the requirements of the Court for the first operational phase is the cost of premises. During its visit to Freetown, the United Nations team visited a number of facilities and buildings which the Government believes may accommodate the Special Court and its detention facilities: the High Court of Sierra Leone, the Miatta Conference Centre and an adjacent hotel, the Presidential Lodge, the Central Prison (Pademba Road Prison), and the New England Prison. In evaluating their state of operation, the team concluded that none of the facilities offered were suitable or could be made operational without substantial investment. The use of the existing High Court would incur the least expenditure (estimated at \$1.5 million); but would considerably disrupt the ordinary schedule of the Court and eventually bring it to a halt. Since it is located in central Freetown, the use of the High Court would pose, in addition, serious security risks. The use of the Conference Centre, the most secure site visited, would require large-scale renovation, estimated at \$5.8 million. The Presidential Lodge was ruled out on security grounds.

61. In the light of the above, the team has considered the option of constructing a prefabricated, self-contained compound on government land. This option would have the advantage of an easy expansion paced with the growth of the Special Court, a salvage value at the completion of the activities of the Court, the prospect of a donation in kind and construction at no

rental costs. The estimated cost of this option is \$2.9 million.

62. The two detention facilities visited by the team were found to be inadequate in their current state. The Central Prison (Pademba Road Prison) was ruled out for lack of space and security reasons. The New England Prison would be a possible option at an estimated renovation cost of \$600,000.

63. The estimated cost requirements of personnel and premises set out in the present report cover the two most significant components of its prospective budget for the first operational stage. Not included in the present report are the general operational costs of the Special Court and of the detention facilities; costs of prosecutorial and investigative activities; conference services, including the employment of court translators from and into English, Krio and other tribal languages; and defence counsel, to name but a few.

B. Expertise and advice from the two International Tribunals

64. The kind of advice and expertise which the two International Tribunals may be expected to share with the Special Court for Sierra Leone could take the form of any or all of the following: consultations among judges of both jurisdictions on matters of mutual interest; training of prosecutors, investigators and administrative support staff of the Special Court in The Hague, Kigali and Arusha, and training of such personnel on the spot by a team of prosecutors, investigators and administrators from both Tribunals; advice on the requirements for a Court library and assistance in its establishment, and sharing of information, documents, judgements and other relevant legal material on a continuous basis.

65. Both International Tribunals have expressed willingness to share their experience in all of these respects with the Special Court. They have accordingly offered to convene regular meetings with the judges of the Special Court to assist in adopting and formulating Rules of Procedure based on experience acquired in the practice of both Tribunals; to train personnel of the Special Court in The Hague and Arusha to enable them to acquire practical knowledge of the operation of an international tribunal; and when necessary, to temporarily deploy experienced staff, including a librarian, to the Special Court. In addition, the

International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has offered to provide to the Special Court legal material in the form of CD-ROMs containing motions, decisions, judgements, court orders and the like. The transmission of such material to the Special Court in the period pending the establishment of a full-fledged library would be of great assistance.

C. Support and technical assistance from UNAMSIL

66. The support and technical assistance of UNAMSIL in providing security, logistics, administrative support and temporary accommodation would be necessary in the first operational phase of the Special Court. In the precarious security situation now prevailing in Sierra Leone and given the state of the national security forces, UNAMSIL represents the only credible force capable of providing adequate security to the personnel and the premises of the Special Court. The specificities of the security measures required would have to be elaborated by the United Nations, the Government of Sierra Leone and UNAMSIL, it being understood, however, that any such additional tasks entrusted to UNAMSIL would have to be approved by the Security Council and reflected in a revised mandate with a commensurate increase in financial, staff and other resources.

67. UNAMSIL's administrative support could be provided in the areas of finance, personnel and procurement. Utilizing the existing administrative support in UNAMSIL, including, when feasible, shared facilities and communication systems, would greatly facilitate the start-up phase of the Special Court and reduce the overall resource requirements. In that connection, limited space at the headquarters of UNAMSIL could be made available for the temporary accommodation of the Office of the Prosecutor, pending the establishment or refurbishment of a site for the duration of the Special Court.

VIII. Financial mechanism of the Special Court

68. In paragraph 8 (c) of resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to include recommendations on "the amount of voluntary contributions, as appropriate, of funds, equipment and

services to the special court, including through the offer of expert personnel that may be needed from States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations". It would thus seem that the intention of the Council is that a Special Court for Sierra Leone would be financed from voluntary contributions. Implicit in the Security Council resolution, therefore, given the paucity of resources available to the Government of Sierra Leone, was the intention that most if not all operational costs of the Special Court would be borne by States Members of the Organization in the form of voluntary contributions.

69. The experience gained in the operation of the two ad hoc International Tribunals provides an indication of the scope, costs and long-term duration of the judicial activities of an international jurisdiction of this kind. While the Special Court differs from the two Tribunals in its nature and legal status, the similarity in the kind of crimes committed, the temporal, territorial and personal scope of jurisdiction, the number of accused, the organizational structure of the Court and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence suggest a similar scope and duration of operation and a similar need for a viable and sustainable financial mechanism.

70. A financial mechanism based entirely on voluntary contributions will not provide the assured and continuous source of funding which would be required to appoint the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar, to contract the services of all administrative and support staff and to purchase the necessary equipment. The risks associated with the establishment of an operation of this kind with insufficient funds, or without long-term assurances of continuous availability of funds, are very high, in terms of both moral responsibility and loss of credibility of the Organization, and its exposure to legal liability. In entering into contractual commitments which the Special Court and, vicariously, the Organization might not be able to honour, the United Nations would expose itself to unlimited third-party liability. A special court based on voluntary contributions would be neither viable nor sustainable.

71. In my view, the only realistic solution is financing through assessed contributions. This would produce a viable and sustainable financial mechanism affording secure and continuous funding. It is understood, however, that the financing of the Special Court through assessed contributions of the Member

States would for all practical purposes transform a treaty-based court into a United Nations organ governed in its financial and administrative activities by the relevant United Nations financial and staff regulations and rules.

72. The Security Council may wish to consider an alternative solution, based on the concept of a "national jurisdiction" with international assistance, which would rely on the existing — however inadequate — Sierra Leonean court system, both in terms of premises (for the Court and the detention facilities) and administrative support. The judges, prosecutors, investigators and administrative support staff would be contributed by interested States. The legal basis for the special "national" court would be a national law, patterned on the Statute as agreed between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone (the international crimes being automatically incorporated into the Sierra Leonean common-law system). Since the mandate of the Secretary-General is to recommend measures consistent with resolution 1315 (2000), the present report does not elaborate further on this alternative other than to merely note its existence.

IX. Conclusion

73. At the request of the Security Council, the present report sets out the legal framework and practical arrangements for the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone. It describes the requirements of the Special Court in terms of funds, personnel and services and underscores the acute need for a viable financial mechanism to sustain it for the duration of its lifespan. It concludes that assessed contributions is the only viable and sustainable financial mechanism of the Special Court.

74. As the Security Council itself has recognized, in the past circumstances of Sierra Leone, a credible system of justice and accountability for the very serious crimes committed there would end impunity and would contribute to the process of national reconciliation and to the restoration and maintenance of peace in that country. In reviewing the present report and considering what further action must be taken, the Council should bear in mind the expectations that have been created and the state of urgency that permeates all discussions of the problem of impunity in Sierra Leone.

Notes

¹ At the request of the Government, reference in the Statute and the Agreement to “Sierra Leonean judges” was replaced by “judges appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone”. This would allow the Government flexibility of choice between Sierra Leonean and non-Sierra Leonean nationals and broaden the range of potential candidates from within and outside Sierra Leone.

² In the case of the Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, the non-inclusion in any position of nationals of the country most directly affected was considered a condition for the impartiality, objectivity and neutrality of the Tribunal.

³ This method may not be advisable, since the Court would be manned by a substantial number of staff and financed through voluntary contributions in the amount of millions of dollars every year.

⁴ Article 6, paragraph 5, of the 1977 Protocol II Additional to the Geneva Conventions and Relating to the Protection of Non-international Armed Conflicts provides that:

“At the end of hostilities, the authorities in power shall endeavour to grant the broadest possible amnesty to persons who have participated in the armed conflict, or those deprived of their liberty for reasons related to the armed conflict, whether they are interned or detained.”

⁵ The jurisdiction of the national courts of Sierra Leone is not limited by the Statute, except in cases where they have to defer to the Special Court.

⁶ While there is no international law standard for the minimum age for criminal responsibility, the ICC Statute excludes from the jurisdiction of the Court persons under the age of 18. In so doing, however, it was not the intention of its drafters to establish, in general, a minimum age for individual criminal responsibility. Premised on the notion of complementarity between national courts and ICC, it was intended that persons under 18 presumed responsible for the crimes for which the ICC had jurisdiction would be brought before their national courts, if the national law in question provides for such jurisdiction over minors.

⁷ The Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has so far disposed of a total of 5 appeals from judgements and 44 interlocutory appeals; and the Appeals Chamber of the Rwanda Tribunal of only 1 judgement on the merits with 28 interlocutory appeals.

⁸ Letter addressed to Mr. Hans Corell, Under-Secretary-General, The Legal Counsel, from Judge Claude Jorda, President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, dated 29 August 2000.

⁹ Article 10 of the Agreement between the United Nations and the Government endows the Special Court with a treaty-making power “to enter into agreements with States as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and for the operation of the Court”.

¹⁰ Criteria for the choice of the seat of the Rwanda Tribunal were drawn up by the Security Council in its resolution 955 (1994). The Security Council decided that the seat of the International Tribunal shall be determined by the Council “having regard to considerations of justice and fairness as well as administrative efficiency, including access to witnesses, and economy”.

¹¹ It is important to stress that this estimate should be regarded as an illustration of a possible scenario. Not until the Registrar and the Prosecutor are in place will it be possible to make detailed and precise estimates.

Annex

Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone on the Establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone

Whereas the Security Council, in its resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, expressed deep concern at the very serious crimes committed within the territory of Sierra Leone against the people of Sierra Leone and United Nations and associated personnel and at the prevailing situation of impunity;

Whereas by the said resolution, the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of serious violations of international humanitarian law and crimes committed under Sierra Leonean law;

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter “the Secretary-General”) and the Government of Sierra Leone (hereinafter “the Government”) have held such negotiations for the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone (hereinafter “the Special Court”);

Now therefore the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone have agreed as follows:

Article 1

Establishment of the Special Court

1. There is hereby established a Special Court for Sierra Leone to prosecute persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996.
2. The Special Court shall function in accordance with the Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The Statute is annexed to this Agreement and forms an integral part thereof.

Article 2

Composition of the Special Court and appointment of judges

1. The Special Court shall be composed of two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber.
2. The Chambers shall be composed of eleven independent judges who shall serve as follows:
 - (a) Three judges shall serve in each of the Trial Chambers, of whom one shall be appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and two judges appointed by the Secretary-General upon nominations forwarded by States, and in particular the member States of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commonwealth, at the invitation of the Secretary-General;

- (b) Five judges shall serve in the Appeals Chamber, of whom two shall be appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone and three judges shall be appointed by

the Secretary-General upon nominations forwarded by States, and in particular the member States of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commonwealth, at the invitation of the Secretary-General.

3. The Government of Sierra Leone and the Secretary-General shall consult on the appointment of judges.

4. Judges shall be appointed for a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

5. In addition to the judges sitting in the Chambers and present at every stage of the proceedings, the presiding judge of a Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber shall designate an alternate judge appointed by either the Government of Sierra Leone or the Secretary-General to be present at each stage of the trial and to replace a judge if that judge is unable to continue sitting.

Article 3

Appointment of a Prosecutor and a Deputy Prosecutor

1. The Secretary-General, after consultation with the Government of Sierra Leone, shall appoint a Prosecutor for a four-year term. The Prosecutor shall be eligible for reappointment.

2. The Government of Sierra Leone, in consultation with the Secretary-General and the Prosecutor, shall appoint a Sierra Leonean Deputy Prosecutor to assist the Prosecutor in the conduct of the investigations and prosecutions.

3. The Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutor shall be of high moral character and possess the highest level of professional competence and extensive experience in the conduct of investigations and prosecution of criminal cases. The Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutor shall be independent in the performance of their functions and shall not accept or seek instructions from any Government or any other source.

4. The Prosecutor shall be assisted by such Sierra Leonean and international staff as may be required to perform the functions assigned to him or her effectively and efficiently.

Article 4

Appointment of a Registrar

1. The Secretary-General, in consultation with the President of the Special Court, shall appoint a Registrar who shall be responsible for the servicing of the Chambers and the Office of the Prosecutor, and for the recruitment and administration of all support staff. He or she shall also administer the financial and staff resources of the Special Court.

2. The Registrar shall be a staff member of the United Nations. He or she shall serve a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

Article 5

Premises

The Government shall provide the premises for the Special Court and such utilities, facilities and other services as may be necessary for its operation.

Article 6

Expenses of the Special Court^a

The expenses of the Special Court shall ...

Article 7

Inviolability of premises, archives and all other documents

1. The premises of the Special Court shall be inviolable. The competent authorities shall take whatever action may be necessary to ensure that the Special Court shall not be dispossessed of all or any part of the premises of the Court without its express consent.
2. The property, funds and assets of the Special Court, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be immune from search, seizure, requisition, confiscation, expropriation and any other form of interference, whether by executive, administrative, judicial or legislative action.
3. The archives of the Court, and in general all documents and materials made available, belonging to or used by it, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be inviolable.

Article 8

Funds, assets and other property

1. The Special Court, its funds, assets and other property, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall enjoy immunity from every form of legal process, except insofar as in any particular case the Court has expressly waived its immunity. It is understood, however, that no waiver of immunity shall extend to any measure of execution.
2. Without being restricted by financial controls, regulations or moratoriums of any kind, the Special Court:
 - (a) May hold and use funds, gold or negotiable instruments of any kind and maintain and operate accounts in any currency and convert any currency held by it into any other currency;
 - (b) Shall be free to transfer its funds, gold or currency from one country to another, or within Sierra Leone, to the United Nations or any other agency.

Article 9

Seat of the Special Court

The Special Court shall have its seat in Sierra Leone. The Court may meet away from its seat if it considers it necessary for the efficient exercise of its functions, and may be relocated outside Sierra Leone, if circumstances so require, and subject to the conclusion of a Headquarters Agreement between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone, on the one hand, and the Government of the alternative seat, on the other.

^a The formulation of this article is dependent on a decision on the financial mechanism of the Special Court.

Article 10

Juridical capacity

The Special Court shall possess the juridical capacity necessary to:

- (a) Contract;
- (b) Acquire and dispose of movable and immovable property;
- (c) Institute legal proceedings;

(d) Enter into agreements with States as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and for the operation of the Court.

Article 11

Privileges and immunities of the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar

1. The judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar, together with their families forming part of their household, shall enjoy the privileges and immunities, exemptions and facilities accorded to diplomatic agents in accordance with the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. They shall, in particular, enjoy:

- (a) Personal inviolability, including immunity from arrest or detention;
- (b) Immunity from criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction in conformity with the Vienna Convention;
- (c) Inviolability for all papers and documents;
- (d) Exemption, as appropriate, from immigration restrictions and other alien registrations;
- (e) The same immunities and facilities in respect of their personal baggage as are accorded to diplomatic agents by the Vienna Convention;
- (f) Exemption from taxation in Sierra Leone on their salaries, emoluments and allowances.

2. Privileges and immunities are accorded to the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar in the interest of the Special Court and not for the personal benefit of the individuals themselves. The right and the duty to waive the immunity, in any case where it can be waived without prejudice to the purpose for which it is accorded, shall lie with the Secretary-General, in consultation with the President.

Article 12

Privileges and immunities of international and Sierra Leonean personnel

1. Sierra Leonean and international personnel of the Special Court shall be accorded:

- (a) Immunity from legal process in respect of words spoken or written and all acts performed by them in their official capacity. Such immunity shall continue to be accorded after termination of employment with the Special Court;
- (b) Immunity from taxation on salaries, allowances and emoluments paid to them.

2. International personnel shall, in addition thereto, be accorded:

(a) Immunity from immigration restriction;

(b) The right to import free of duties and taxes, except for payment for services, their furniture and effects at the time of first taking up their official duties in Sierra Leone.

3. The privileges and immunities are granted to the officials of the Special Court in the interest of the Court and not for their personal benefit. The right and the duty to waive the immunity in any particular case where it can be waived without prejudice to the purpose for which it is accorded shall lie with the Registrar of the Court.

Article 13

Counsel

1. The Government shall ensure that the counsel of a suspect or an accused who has been admitted as such by the Special Court shall not be subjected to any measure which may affect the free and independent exercise of his or her functions.

2. In particular, the counsel shall be accorded:

(a) Immunity from personal arrest or detention and from seizure of personal baggage;

(b) Inviolability of all documents relating to the exercise of his or her functions as a counsel of a suspect or accused;

(c) Immunity from criminal or civil jurisdiction in respect of words spoken or written and acts performed in his or her capacity as counsel. Such immunity shall continue to be accorded after termination of his or her functions as a counsel of a suspect or accused.

Article 14

Witnesses and experts

Witnesses and experts appearing from outside Sierra Leone on a summons or a request of the judges or the Prosecutor shall not be prosecuted, detained or subjected to any restriction on their liberty by the Sierra Leonean authorities. They shall not be subjected to any measure which may affect the free and independent exercise of their functions.

Article 15

Security, safety and protection of persons referred to in this Agreement

Recognizing the responsibility of the Government under international law to ensure the security, safety and protection of persons referred to in this Agreement and its present incapacity to do so pending the restructuring and rebuilding of its security forces, it is agreed that the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone shall provide the necessary security to premises and personnel of the Special Court, subject to an appropriate mandate by the Security Council and within its capabilities.

Article 16

Cooperation with the Special Court

1. The Government shall cooperate with all organs of the Special Court at all stages of the proceedings. It shall, in particular, facilitate access to the Prosecutor to sites, persons and relevant documents required for the investigation.
2. The Government shall comply without undue delay with any request for assistance by the Special Court or an order issued by the Chambers, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) Identification and location of persons;
 - (b) Service of documents;
 - (c) Arrest or detention of persons;
 - (d) Transfer of an indictee to the Court.

Article 17

Working language

The official working language of the Special Court shall be English.

Article 18

Practical arrangements

1. With a view to achieving efficiency and cost-effectiveness in the operation of the Special Court, a phased-in approach shall be adopted for its establishment in accordance with the chronological order of the legal process.
2. In the first phase of the operation of the Special Court, judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar will be appointed along with investigative and prosecutorial staff. The process of investigations and prosecutions and the trial process of those already in custody shall then be initiated. While the judges of the Appeals Chamber shall serve whenever the Appeals Chamber is seized of a matter, they shall take office shortly before the trial process has been completed.

Article 19

Settlement of disputes

Any dispute between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Agreement shall be settled by negotiation, or by any other mutually agreed-upon mode of settlement.

Article 20

Entry into force

The present Agreement shall enter into force on the day after both Parties have notified each other in writing that the legal instruments for entry into force have been complied with.

DONE at [place] on [day, month] 2000 in two copies in the English language.

For the United Nations

For the Government of Sierra Leone

Enclosure

Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone

Having been established by an Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone pursuant to Security Council resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, the Special Court for Sierra Leone (hereinafter “the Special Court”) shall function in accordance with the provisions of the present Statute.

Article 1

Competence of the Special Court

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996.

Article 2

Crimes against humanity

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed the following crimes as part of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population:

- (a) Murder;
- (b) Extermination;
- (c) Enslavement;
- (d) Deportation;
- (e) Imprisonment;
- (f) Torture;
- (g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy and any other form of sexual violence;
- (h) Persecution on political, racial, ethnic or religious grounds;
- (i) Other inhumane acts.

Article 3

Violations of article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions and of Additional Protocol II

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed or ordered the commission of serious violations of article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the Protection of War Victims, and of Additional Protocol II thereto of 8 June 1977. These violations shall include:

- (a) Violence to life, health and physical or mental well-being of persons, in particular murder as well as cruel treatment such as torture, mutilation or any form of corporal punishment;
- (b) Collective punishments;
- (c) Taking of hostages;

- (d) Acts of terrorism;
- (e) Outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment, rape, enforced prostitution and any form of indecent assault;
- (f) Pillage;
- (g) The passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgement pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples;
- (h) Threats to commit any of the foregoing acts.

Article 4

Other serious violations of international humanitarian law

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed the following serious violations of international humanitarian law:

- (a) Intentionally directing attacks against the civilian population as such or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities;
- (b) Intentionally directing attacks against personnel, installations, material, units or vehicles involved in a humanitarian assistance or peacekeeping mission in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as long as they are entitled to the protection given to civilians or civilian objects under the international law of armed conflict;
- (c) Abduction and forced recruitment of children under the age of 15 years into armed forces or groups for the purpose of using them to participate actively in hostilities.

Article 5

Crimes under Sierra Leonean law

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who have committed the following crimes under Sierra Leonean law:

- (a) Offences relating to the abuse of girls under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1926 (Cap. 31):
 - (i) Abusing a girl under 13 years of age, contrary to section 6;
 - (ii) Abusing a girl between 13 and 14 years of age, contrary to section 7;
 - (iii) Abduction of a girl for immoral purposes, contrary to section 12.
- (b) Offences relating to the wanton destruction of property under the Malicious Damage Act, 1861:
 - (i) Setting fire to dwelling-houses, any person being therein to section 2;
 - (ii) Setting fire to public buildings, contrary to sections 5 and 6;
 - (iii) Setting fire to other buildings, contrary to section 6.

Article 6

Individual criminal responsibility

1. A person who planned, instigated, ordered, committed or otherwise aided and abetted in the planning, preparation or execution of a crime referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall be individually responsible for the crime.
2. The official position of any accused persons, whether as Head of State or Government or as a responsible government official, shall not relieve such person of criminal responsibility nor mitigate punishment.
3. The fact that any of the acts referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute was committed by a subordinate does not relieve his or her superior of criminal responsibility if he or she knew or had reason to know that the subordinate was about to commit such acts or had done so and the superior had failed to take the necessary and reasonable measures to prevent such acts or to punish the perpetrators thereof.
4. The fact that an accused person acted pursuant to an order of a Government or of a superior shall not relieve him or her of criminal responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Special Court determines that justice so requires.
5. Individual criminal responsibility for the crimes referred to in article 5 shall be determined in accordance with the respective laws of Sierra Leone.

Article 7

Jurisdiction over persons of 15 years of age

1. The Special Court shall have jurisdiction over persons who were 15 years of age at the time of the alleged commission of the crime.
2. At all stages of the proceedings, including investigation, prosecution and adjudication, an accused below the age of 18 (hereinafter “a juvenile offender”) shall be treated with dignity and a sense of worth, taking into account his or her young age and the desirability of promoting his or her rehabilitation, reintegration into and assumption of a constructive role in society.
3. In a trial of a juvenile offender, the Special Court shall:
 - (a) Consider, as a priority, the release of the juvenile, unless his or her safety and security requires that the juvenile offender be placed under close supervision or in a remand home; detention pending trial shall be used as a measure of last resort;
 - (b) Constitute a “Juvenile Chamber” composed of at least one sitting judge and one alternate judge possessing the required qualifications and experience in juvenile justice;
 - (c) Order the separation of his or her trial, if jointly accused with adults;
 - (d) Provide the juvenile with the legal, social and any other assistance in the preparation and presentation of his or her defence, including the participation in legal proceedings of the juvenile offender’s parent or legal guardian;
 - (e) Provide protective measures to ensure the privacy of the juvenile; such measures shall include, but not be limited to, the protection of the juvenile’s identity, or the conduct of in camera proceedings;

(f) In the disposition of his or her case, order any of the following: care guidance and supervision orders, community service orders, counselling, foster care, correctional, educational and vocational training programmes, approved schools and, as appropriate, any programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration or programmes of child protection agencies.

Article 8

Concurrent jurisdiction

1. The Special Court and the national courts of Sierra Leone shall have concurrent jurisdiction.
2. The Special Court shall have primacy over the national courts of Sierra Leone. At any stage of the procedure, the Special Court may formally request a national court to defer to its competence in accordance with the present Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

Article 9

Non bis in idem

1. No person shall be tried before a national court of Sierra Leone for acts for which he or she has already been tried by the Special Court.
2. A person who has been tried by a national court for the acts referred to in articles 2 and 4 of the present Statute may be subsequently tried by the Special Court if:
 - (a) The act for which he or she was tried was characterized as an ordinary crime; or
 - (b) The national court proceedings were not impartial or independent, were designed to shield the accused from international criminal responsibility or the case was not diligently prosecuted.
3. In considering the penalty to be imposed on a person convicted of a crime under the present Statute, the Special Court shall take into account the extent to which any penalty imposed by a national court on the same person for the same act has already been served.

Article 10

Amnesty

An amnesty granted to any person falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Court in respect of the crimes referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall not be a bar to prosecution.

Article 11

Organization of the Special Court

The Special Court shall consist of the following organs:

- (a) The Chambers, comprising two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber;
- (b) The Prosecutor; and
- (c) The Registry.

Article 12**Composition of the Chambers**

1. The Chambers shall be composed of eleven independent judges, who shall serve as follows:

(a) Three judges shall serve in each of the Trial Chambers, of whom one shall be a judge appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and two judges appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter “the Secretary-General”);

(b) Five judges shall serve in the Appeals Chamber, of whom two shall be judges appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and three judges appointed by the Secretary-General.

2. Each judge shall serve only in the Chamber to which he or she has been appointed.

3. The judges of the Appeals Chamber and the judges of the Trial Chambers, respectively, shall elect a presiding judge who shall conduct the proceedings in the Chamber to which he or she was elected. The presiding judge of the Appeals Chamber shall be the President of the Special Court.

4. In addition to the judges sitting in the Chambers and present at every stage of the proceedings, the presiding judge of a Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber shall designate an alternate judge appointed by either the Government of Sierra Leone or the Secretary-General, to be present at each stage of the trial, and to replace a judge, if that judge is unable to continue sitting.

Article 13**Qualification and appointment of judges**

1. The judges shall be persons of high moral character, impartiality and integrity who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices. They shall be independent in the performance of their functions, and shall not accept or seek instructions from any Government or any other source.

2. In the overall composition of the Chambers, due account shall be taken of the experience of the judges in international law, including international humanitarian law and human rights law, criminal law and juvenile justice.

3. The judges shall be appointed for a four-year period and shall be eligible for reappointment.

Article 14**Rules of Procedure and Evidence**

1. The Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda obtaining at the time of the establishment of the Special Court shall be applicable mutatis mutandis to the conduct of the legal proceedings before the Special Court.

2. The judges of the Special Court as a whole may amend the Rules of Procedure and Evidence or adopt additional rules where the applicable Rules do not, or do not

adequately, provide for a specific situation. In so doing, they may be guided, as appropriate, by the Criminal Procedure Act, 1965, of Sierra Leone.

Article 15

The Prosecutor

1. The Prosecutor shall be responsible for the investigation and prosecution of persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and crimes under Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996. The Prosecutor shall act independently as a separate organ of the Special Court. He or she shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other source.

2. The Office of the Prosecutor shall have the power to question suspects, victims and witnesses, to collect evidence and to conduct on-site investigations. In carrying out these tasks, the Prosecutor shall, as appropriate, be assisted by the Sierra Leonean authorities concerned.

3. The Prosecutor shall be appointed by the Secretary-General for a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment. He or she shall be of high moral character and possess the highest level of professional competence and have extensive experience in the conduct of investigations and prosecution of criminal cases.

4. The Prosecutor shall be assisted by a Sierra Leonean Deputy Prosecutor, and by such other Sierra Leonean and international staff as may be required to perform the functions assigned to him or her effectively and efficiently. Given the nature of the crimes committed and the particular sensitivities of girls, young women and children victims of rape, sexual assault, abduction and slavery of all kinds, due consideration should be given in the appointment of staff to the employment of prosecutors and investigators experienced in gender-related crimes and juvenile justice.

5. In the prosecution of juvenile offenders, the Prosecutor shall ensure that the child-rehabilitation programme is not placed at risk and that, where appropriate, resort should be had to alternative truth and reconciliation mechanisms, to the extent of their availability.

Article 16

The Registry

1. The Registry shall be responsible for the administration and servicing of the Special Court.

2. The Registry shall consist of a Registrar and such other staff as may be required.

3. The Registrar shall be appointed by the Secretary-General after consultation with the President of the Special Court and shall be a staff member of the United Nations. He or she shall serve for a four-year term and be eligible for reappointment.

4. The Registrar shall set up a Victims and Witnesses Unit within the Registry. This Unit shall provide, in consultation with the Office of the Prosecutor, protective measures and security arrangements, counselling and other appropriate assistance

for witnesses, victims who appear before the Court and others who are at risk on account of testimony given by such witnesses. The Unit personnel shall include experts in trauma, including trauma related to crimes of sexual violence and violence against children.

Article 17

Rights of the accused

1. All accused shall be equal before the Special Court.
2. The accused shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing, subject to measures ordered by the Special Court for the protection of victims and witnesses.
3. The accused shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the provisions of the present Statute.
4. In the determination of any charge against the accused pursuant to the present Statute, he or she shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality:
 - (a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he or she understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him or her;
 - (b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his or her defence and to communicate with counsel of his or her own choosing;
 - (c) To be tried without undue delay;
 - (d) To be tried in his or her presence, and to defend himself or herself in person or through legal assistance of his or her own choosing; to be informed, if he or she does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him or her, in any case where the interests of justice so require, and without payment by him or her in any such case if he or she does not have sufficient means to pay for it;
 - (e) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him or her and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his or her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him or her;
 - (f) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he or she cannot understand or speak the language used in the Special Court;
 - (g) Not to be compelled to testify against himself or herself or to confess guilt.

Article 18

Judgement

The judgement shall be rendered by a majority of the judges of the Trial Chamber or of the Appeals Chamber, and shall be delivered in public. It shall be accompanied by a reasoned opinion in writing, to which separate or dissenting opinions may be appended.

Article 19**Penalties**

1. The Trial Chamber shall impose upon a convicted person, other than a juvenile offender, imprisonment for a specified number of years. In determining the terms of imprisonment, the Trial Chamber shall, as appropriate, have recourse to the practice regarding prison sentences in the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the national courts of Sierra Leone.
2. In imposing the sentences, the Trial Chamber should take into account such factors as the gravity of the offence and the individual circumstances of the convicted person.
3. In addition to imprisonment, the Trial Chamber may order the forfeiture of the property, proceeds and any assets acquired unlawfully or by criminal conduct, and their return to their rightful owner or to the State of Sierra Leone.

Article 20**Appellate proceedings**

1. The Appeals Chamber shall hear appeals from persons convicted by a Trial Chamber or from the Prosecutor on the following grounds:
 - (a) A procedural error;
 - (b) An error on a question of law invalidating the decision;
 - (c) An error of fact which has occasioned a miscarriage of justice.
2. The Appeals Chamber may affirm, reverse or revise the decisions taken by the Trial Chamber.
3. The judges of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court shall be guided by the decisions of the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda. In the interpretation and application of the laws of Sierra Leone, they shall be guided by the decisions of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone.

Article 21**Review proceedings**

1. Where a new fact has been discovered which was not known at the time of the proceedings before the Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber and which could have been a decisive factor in reaching the decision, the convicted person or the Prosecutor may submit an application for review of the judgement.
2. An application for review shall be submitted to the Appeals Chamber. The Appeals Chamber may reject the application if it considers it to be unfounded. If it determines that the application is meritorious, it may, as appropriate:
 - (a) Reconvene the Trial Chamber;
 - (b) Retain jurisdiction over the matter.

Article 22**Enforcement of sentences**

1. Imprisonment shall be served in Sierra Leone. If circumstances so require, imprisonment may also be served in any of the States which have concluded with the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda or the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia an agreement for the enforcement of sentences, and which have indicated to the Registrar of the Special Court their willingness to accept convicted persons. The Special Court may conclude similar agreements for the enforcement of sentences with other States.

2. Conditions of imprisonment, whether in Sierra Leone or in a third State, shall be governed by the law of the State of enforcement subject to the supervision of the Special Court. The State of enforcement shall be bound by the duration of the sentence, subject to article 23 of the present Statute.

Article 23**Pardon or commutation of sentences**

If, pursuant to the applicable law of the State in which the convicted person is imprisoned, he or she is eligible for pardon or commutation of sentence, the State concerned shall notify the Special Court accordingly. There shall only be pardon or commutation of sentence if the President of the Special Court, in consultation with the judges, so decides on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law.

Article 24**Working language**

The working language of the Special Court shall be English.

Article 25**Annual report**

The President of the Special Court shall submit an annual report on the operation and activities of the Court to the Secretary-General and to the Government of Sierra Leone.
