

ANNEX I

Methodology and Evidentiary Framework

This Annex is submitted in support of an Article 15 communication to the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court. It is structured to provide incident-based, verifiable, and legally testable information.

All incidents listed herein are derived from publicly available and identifiable sources, primarily United Nations reporting and internationally recognized wire services.

This Annex does not assert criminal liability. It formulates legally relevant questions under the Rome Statute, Additional Protocol I, and customary international humanitarian law for prosecutorial assessment.

Evidentiary Structure per Incident:

- Incident ID
- Date
- Location
- Type of attack
- Reported civilian impact
- Source reference
- Potential legal relevance under Rome Statute
- Open legal questions
- Status of national investigations, if known

Only incidents with identifiable source documentation are included.

ANNEX II

Situation: State of Palestine (Gaza and Occupied Palestinian Territory)

Primary Source Base:

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Gaza Humanitarian Response Situation Report No. 69, 27 February 2026.

Incident ID: P-2026-02-20-25-A

Timeframe: 20–25 February 2026

Location: Gaza Strip (multiple locations)

Incident Type: Airstrikes, shelling, gunfire

Reported Civilian Impact: 7 fatalities and 33 injuries within reporting period; cumulative 618 fatalities and 1,663 injuries since 10 October 2025, as reported by Gaza Ministry of Health and cited by OCHA

Source: OCHA Situation Report No. 69

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Article 8(2)(b)(i) Rome Statute (intentionally directing attacks against civilians)
- Article 8(2)(b)(ii) Rome Statute (attacks against civilian objects)
- Article 8(2)(b)(iv) Rome Statute (disproportionate attacks)
- Articles 48, 51, and 57 Additional Protocol I

Open Legal Questions:

- Were the objects targeted military objectives within the meaning of Article 52 Additional Protocol I?
 - Were feasible precautions taken prior to the attack?
 - Was proportionality assessed based on anticipated civilian harm versus concrete and direct military advantage?
 - Were internal investigations initiated?
-

Incident ID: P-2026-02-18-24-EO

Timeframe: Since ceasefire commencement

Location: Gaza Strip

Incident Type: Explosive ordnance remnants incidents

Reported Civilian Impact: 34 explosive ordnance incidents; 76 casualties including 18 children; 9 fatalities and 67 injuries

Source: OCHA Situation Report No. 69

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Article 51 Additional Protocol I
- Civilian protection obligations post-hostilities

– Possible relevance under Article 8 Rome Statute depending on origin and context of ordnance

Open Legal Questions:

- Were marking and clearance obligations fulfilled?
 - Were returning civilian populations adequately warned?
 - Were feasible measures taken to mitigate post-conflict harm?
-

Incident ID: P-2026-02-AID

Timeframe: 18–26 February 2026

Location: Gaza Strip crossings and internal routes

Incident Type: Humanitarian access restrictions

Reported Operational Impact: 55 UN missions coordinated; 7 denied; 15 impeded; low cargo offloading rates; reported risks to food security

Source: OCHA Situation Report No. 69

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Article 8(2)(b)(xxv) Rome Statute (starvation of civilians as a method of warfare)
- Fourth Geneva Convention provisions on humanitarian relief
- Additional Protocol I Articles 70 and 71

Open Legal Questions:

- Do access denials materially contribute to civilian deprivation?
 - Are restrictions temporary and security-based, or systematic?
 - Is there evidence of intent to use deprivation as a method of warfare?
-

ANNEX III

Situation: Escalation Involving the United States, Israel, and Iran (2026)

Jurisdiction Note:

Jurisdiction under the Rome Statute must be separately assessed. This Annex provides incident cataloguing for potential preliminary examination.

Primary Source Base:

Reuters and Associated Press reports dated 28 February – 3 March 2026.

Incident ID: IR-2026-02-28-STRIKE

Date: 28 February 2026

Location: Tehran and multiple reported sites

Incident Type: Joint airstrikes

Reported Impact: Targeting of military infrastructure; reported casualties; regional escalation

Source: Reuters reporting

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Article 8(2)(b)(i) Rome Statute
- Article 8(2)(b)(ii) Rome Statute
- Article 8(2)(b)(iv) Rome Statute
- Articles 48, 51, 57 Additional Protocol I

Open Legal Questions:

- Were targeted sites verified as military objectives?
 - Were civilian harm estimates conducted prior to strikes?
 - Were alternative methods considered?
 - Are there publicly documented civilian casualty assessments?
-

Incident ID: IR-2026-03-02-SCHOOL-CLAIM

Date: 2 March 2026

Location: Reported school site

Incident Type: Strike allegedly impacting civilian educational facility

Reported Impact: Iranian claims of significant civilian fatalities; U.S. response denying intentional targeting of school

Source: Reuters

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Article 8(2)(b)(ii) Rome Statute
- Article 8(2)(b)(iv) Rome Statute
- Article 52 Additional Protocol I

Open Legal Questions:

- Was the site being used for military purposes at the time of attack?
 - Were feasible precautions implemented?
 - Was proportionality analysis documented?
-

Incident ID: IR-2026-03-03-ESCALATION

Date: 3 March 2026

Location: Multiple sites

Incident Type: Continued strikes and regional escalation

Source: Reuters and Associated Press

Potential Legal Relevance:

- Assessment of cumulative civilian harm
- Pattern analysis for potential Article 7 consideration, subject to evidentiary threshold

Open Legal Questions:

- Is there evidence of widespread or systematic attack directed against civilian population?
 - Are national investigations underway?
 - What is the chain of command and degree of effective control?
-

ANNEX IV

Cumulative Impact and Pattern Assessment Framework

This section identifies analytical criteria for the Prosecutor's consideration:

1. Repetition of similar incident types over defined periods

2. Consistent civilian casualty reporting from independent sources
3. Recurring targeting of infrastructure with civilian dependency
4. Evidence or absence of internal military review mechanisms
5. Existence or absence of credible national investigations

No conclusions are asserted.

This Annex is submitted for the sole purpose of enabling structured legal evaluation under Articles 7, 8, and 28 of the Rome Statute and relevant provisions of international humanitarian law.