

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	17
2. WHAT IS COMPLEMENTARITY?.....	21
2.1. Complementarity in general.....	21
2.1.1 The conflict between national and international jurisdictions.....	21
2.1.2. The purpose of complementarity.....	24
2.2. Complementarity in the Rome Statute.....	28
2.2.1. The Preamble.....	28
2.2.2. Article 17: Issues of admissibility.....	29
2.2.2.1. The chapeau.....	29
2.2.2.2. Article 17, para. 1(a) & (b).....	30
2.2.2.2.1. Case or situation?.....	31
2.2.2.2.2. The problem of universal jurisdiction.....	33
2.2.2.2.3. The idea of reverse complementarity.....	38
2.2.2.3. Article 17, para. 1(c) & (d).....	39
2.2.2.4. Article 17, para. 2.....	40
2.2.2.4.1. Principles of due process.....	41
2.2.2.4.2. Are the indications for unwillingness exhaustive?.....	42
2.2.2.4.3. Show trials – Sham enforcement.....	43
2.2.2.4.4. Unjustified delay of the proceedings.....	45
2.2.2.4.5. Independent and impartial proceedings.....	46
2.2.2.5. Inability.....	47
2.2.2.5.1. The collapse of a national system.....	48
2.2.2.5.2. The unavailability of a national system.....	49
2.2.2.6. What’s genuine?.....	52
2.2.2.7. The burden and standard of proof.....	53
2.2.2.8. The Rules regarding issues on admissibility.....	54
2.2.2.9. Conclusions.....	56
3. WHEN IS THE COURT FACED WITH COMPLEMENTARITY?.....	59
3.1. The preliminary examination phase.....	59
3.1.1. Overview – What triggers the ICC?.....	59
3.1.1.1. Which trigger mechanism will realistically be activated first?.....	60
3.1.1.2. What will be the PTC’s first actions?.....	61
3.1.2. Preliminary examination by the Prosecutor.....	61
3.1.2.1. Testimony at the seat of the Court during the preliminary examination phase?.....	62

3.1.2.2. What kind of testimony can be taken at this early stage?	64
3.1.2.3. The dying witness.....	65
3.1.3. Conclusions.....	66
3.2. The Prosecutor asking for authorisation of an investigation	67
3.2.1. The relationship of art. 15 para. 3, rule 48, article 17, article 18 para. 1, and article 53, para. 1	68
3.2.1.1. What is a reasonable basis? Is it the same under articles 15, 18 and 53?	69
3.2.1.1.1. Is the initiation of an investigation the same under articles 15, 18 and 53?	70
3.2.1.1.2. <i>Prima facie</i> inadmissibility?	71
3.2.1.2. Conclusions	71
3.2.2. The role of the PTC under article 18	72
3.2.2.1 The verbal approach	74
3.2.2.1.1. The inconsistencies of article 18, para. 1.....	74
3.2.2.1.2. The history of article 18, para. 1.....	76
3.2.2.1.3. Further verbal confusions	77
3.2.2.1.4. A new approach for article 18, para. 1.....	78
3.2.2.2. The systematic and teleological approach.....	79
3.2.2.2.1. Necessary information to make a determination	80
3.2.2.2.2. Confidential or public?	80
3.2.2.2.3. Victims under article 18?.....	81
3.2.2.2.4. Further indications	82
3.2.2.2.5. The Prosecutor's actions.....	83
3.2.2.3. Conclusions	83
3.2.3. Article 18 and State deferral	84
3.2.3.1. The purpose of article 18.....	85
3.2.3.2. The notification of States	85
3.2.3.3. Deferral to a State – Work sharing?.....	86
3.2.3.4. The control procedure of article 18	87
3.2.3.5. Conclusions	88
3.3. The initiation of an investigation	89
3.3.1. What has happened up to this stage?	89
3.3.2. The authorization of an investigation	90
3.3.2.1. Civil complementarity	90
3.3.2.2. Authorization procedures	93
3.3.2.2.1. The start of the procedures.....	95
3.3.2.2.2. The Regulations regarding authorization.....	96
3.3.2.2.3. The participation in authorization procedures	96
3.3.2.2.4. The decision-making process.....	96

3.3.2.2.5. Undue restriction by the PTC?.....	97
3.3.2.3. Conclusions	98
3.3.3. Article 53	99
3.3.3.1. The three purposes of article 53	99
3.3.3.2. The parameters of article 53, para. 1	100
3.3.3.2.1. The Chapeau	100
3.3.3.2.2. Article 53, para. 1(a)	102
3.3.3.2.3. Article 53, para. 1(b) & 2(b)	102
3.3.3.2.4. Article 53, para. 1(c) & 2(c)	103
3.3.3.3. The parameters of article 53, para. 2.....	105
3.3.3.4. The consequences of a decision not to proceed	105
3.3.3.4.1. The obligation to inform article 53, para. 1 & 2.....	106
3.3.3.4.2. What can be done if the Prosecutor does not want to proceed?.....	107
3.3.3.4.3. Problems of article 53, para. 3(a) & (b) – The article	108
3.3.3.4.4. Problems with article 53, para. 3(a) & (b) – The Regulations.....	112
3.3.3.5. Conclusions	114
3.4. Challenges	116
3.4.1. When challenging?	116
3.4.1.1. Challenges in light of articles 15 and 18.....	117
3.4.1.1.1. The earliest opportunity	118
3.4.1.1.2. Case or situation?.....	119
3.4.1.1.3. When might jurisdiction be challenged?	121
3.4.1.1.4. Conclusions.....	121
3.4.1.2. The Prosecutor seeking a ruling	122
3.4.1.3. The procedure for challenges under article 19	123
3.4.1.4. The Prosecutor suspending the investigation.....	127
3.4.1.5. Competent organ to receive challenges.....	128
3.4.1.5.1. PTCs within the Regulations	128
3.4.1.5.2. Trial Chambers within the Regulations	129
3.4.1.6. Successful challenges	130
3.4.1.7. Article 19, par. 11.....	131
3.4.1.7.1. What happens after a successful challenge?.....	131
3.4.1.7.2. May the Prosecutor defer voluntarily?	133
3.4.1.7.3. A procedure to proceed with an investigation after a deferral.....	136
3.4.1.8. Conclusions	137
3.5. Downward complementarity	138
3.5.1. The ICTY sending indictees to national courts	139

3.5.2. May the ICC transfer the accused to national courts?	140
3.6. Double jeopardy	140
3.6.1. The three purposes of article 20.....	140
3.6.1.1. Trial before the ICC	142
3.6.1.2. „Downward <i>ne bis in idem</i> “	143
3.6.1.2.1. A fresh look at <i>ne bis in idem</i>	143
3.6.1.2.2. The roots and consequences of article 20, para. 2	144
3.6.1.2.3. A comparison with other international Tribunals.....	147
3.6.1.2.4. A rule for article 20, para. 2?	148
3.6.1.2.5. Conclusions.....	150
3.6.1.3. „Upward <i>ne bis in idem</i> “	151
3.6.1.3.1. The timeline between article 17 and 20.....	151
3.6.1.3.2. The difference between downward and upward.....	152
3.6.1.3.4. The conduct in question	153
3.6.1.3.4. Ordinary crimes	154
3.6.1.3.5. Proceedings in the other Court.....	155
3.6.1.3.6. The qualifications of article 20, para. 3:	156
3.6.1.3.7. Conclusions.....	156
4. AMNESTIES	159
4.1. Primacy or complementarity	159
4.2. Amnesties in international law	161
4.2.1. The SCSL and amnesties	162
4.2.1.1. A decision denying amnesties	162
4.2.1.2. The background for the ICC.....	162
4.2.2. Article 21	163
4.2.2.1. Applicable treaties.....	163
4.2.2.2. Principles and rules of international law	164
4.2.2.2.1. Customary international law through multilateral treaties? ...	165
4.2.2.2.2. Transitional governments to be treated differently?.....	167
4.2.2.2.3. How to deal with customary international law?	167
4.2.2.3. Other applicable law.....	168
4.2.2.4. Conclusion.....	168
4.3. Amnesties under the RS	170
4.3.1. Low level offender or top official?	170
4.3.2. Blanket or discrete amnesties?.....	171
4.3.2.1. Self- and Blanket Amnesty	171
4.3.2.2. Discrete amnesties.....	172
4.3.2.3. The quality of amnesties.....	174

4.3.3. Possibilities to subsume amnesties under the RS	175
4.3.3.1. Article 53 - Are amnesties in the interests of justice?.....	175
4.3.3.1.1. Accepting self- and blanket amnesties?.....	176
4.3.3.1.2. A way out.....	176
4.3.3.1.3. A dead-end street?.....	177
4.3.3.1.4. Are there amnesties that could be accepted?	178
4.3.3.2. Are amnesties subsumable under article 17?	179
4.3.3.2.1. The preconditions of article 17, para. 1(a) & (b), for amnesties.....	180
4.3.3.2.2. Different kinds of amnesties subsumed under article 17.....	182
4.3.3.3. Are amnesties subsumable under article 20?	182
4.3.4. Conclusions.....	183
5. CONCLUDING REMARKS	185
5.1. The crucial question regarding complementarity.....	185
5.1.1. First proposal: Only in the aftermath.....	186
5.1.2. Second proposal: The ICC must avoid investigations in regard to ongoing conflicts	187
5.1.3. Third proposal: The ICC as a catalyst for peace	187
5.2. A basic conclusion	189
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY	191