

# Annex 1

Title: Fact Matrix, Verification Methodology and Impact Analysis concerning recent statements and operations of the United States and Israel regarding Iran, Ecuador, Cuba and regional spillover effects

Date: 7 March 2026 (Europe/Berlin)

Version: 2.0 (revised and legally strengthened)

Prepared by: Dennis Gür, jurist

Purpose: Annex to complaint, request for investigation and evidence preservation

## Article 1 Purpose, scope and methodology

1.1 This Annex establishes a forensic legal factual basis based on open sources, without classified information, with the objective of

- (i) assessment under international law and international criminal law,
- (ii) preservation of evidentiary relevance, and
- (iii) formulation of investigative questions and requests for preservation of evidence.

1.2 Material scope: events, statements and actions reported in open sources in relation to

- a. large scale military action against Iran (“Operation Epic Fury”) by the United States and Israel
- b. confirmed “lethal kinetic operations” conducted by the United States on Ecuadorian territory
- c. public statements concerning a possible political “deal” or regime outcome regarding Cuba
- d. regional spillover effects (including Israel Lebanon escalation in the context of the Iran conflict)
- e. macro economic consequences (energy prices, inflation, purchasing power) and plausible state security externalities (unemployment, crime, public order)

1.3 Temporal scope: primarily 28 February 2026 to 7 March 2026, with contextual references where necessary for legal interpretation.

1.4 Verification standard: each core claim is classified as

- a. Verified: primary source or multiple independent high quality sources that are mutually consistent
- b. Partially verified: core fact confirmed but crucial details (targeting, rules of engagement, collateral damage) are missing or disputed
- c. Unverified: source exists but is not yet verifiable or insufficiently confirmed

All outstanding factual issues are marked as [UNKNOWN: ...].

1.5 Interpretation of treaties follows the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Articles 31 and 32).

---

## **Article 2 Core sources (primary) and institutional context**

2.1 United Nations framework: the prohibition of the threat or use of force and the collective security system derive from the UN Charter (Articles 2(4) and 51).

2.2 NATO framework: NATO member states under the North Atlantic Treaty have the explicit obligation to settle disputes peacefully and refrain from the threat or use of force inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations (Article 1).

2.3 ICC framework: the Rome Statute establishes crimes, individual criminal responsibility and procedural routes (Articles 5, 7, 8, 8bis, 12, 15, 17, 25, 28).

2.4 Dutch national framework: prosecution of international crimes in the Netherlands primarily proceeds under the International Crimes Act (Wet internationale misdrijven), including jurisdiction rules and command responsibility (inter alia Articles 2 and 9 WIM).

---

## **Article 3 Fact matrix and verification status**

### **3.1 Iran: large scale attacks and public framing**

3.1.1 Open source reporting (Reuters) indicates that the United States and Israel initiated large scale attacks on Iran on 28 February 2026, referred to as “Operation Epic Fury”, and that Iran’s Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei was killed in those strikes.

Status: partially verified (operation and core claim reported; details and legal justification in public sources remain incomplete).

3.1.2 The Secretary General of the United Nations publicly condemned the use of force by the United States and Israel against Iran on the same day and called for de escalation.

Status: verified (UN primary source).

3.1.3 The UN Security Council convened in emergency session; UN briefings and press statements warned of escalation risks and threats to international peace and security.

Status: verified (UN press source).

3.1.4 Reuters reported that President Donald J. Trump publicly stated that he wished to be personally involved in selecting Iran's next leader; the White House further stated that "candidates" were being considered and that "objectives" could be achieved within four to six weeks.

Status: verified as reporting of public statements (not as legal justification).

3.1.5 Reuters reported that Iran's ambassador to the UN stated that 1,332 Iranian civilians had been killed and accused the United States and Israel of attacks on civilian infrastructure; these claims are disputed by the United States and Israel.

Status: partially verified (claim by UN ambassador, not independently verified).

3.1.6 UN Special Procedures reported and condemned a deadly missile strike on a girls' school in Iran on 6 March 2026 and called for an independent investigation; Reuters further reported that a US internal investigation would likely attribute responsibility to the United States.

Status: partially verified (claim and call for investigation; factual circumstances remain subject to investigation).

### 3.1.7 Critical gaps

a. [UNKNOWN: full text and date of any notifications to the UN Security Council under Article 51 of the UN Charter by the United States and/or Israel]

b. [UNKNOWN: target lists, rules of engagement, proportionality assessments, CDE documentation, BDA reports]

c. [UNKNOWN: factual status of civilian objects near reported incident locations and the specific "military objective" analysis per strike]

---

## 3.2 Ecuador: confirmed lethal operations at request of Ecuador

3.2.1 Reuters reported on 3 and 6 March 2026 that Ecuadorian and US forces conducted joint operations and that the US military confirmed "lethal kinetic operations" in Ecuador, "at the request of Ecuador", coordinated with Ecuadorian forces, with limited public details.

Status: verified as public confirmation; operational details missing.

### 3.2.2 Critical gaps

- a. [UNKNOWN: written consent or request from Ecuador including scope, timeframe, targets, conditions, oversight and termination clauses]
  - b. [UNKNOWN: factual nature of targets, casualties, collateral damage and arrest alternative analysis]
  - c. [UNKNOWN: applicable legal framework on site: law enforcement paradigm or armed conflict threshold]
- 

### **3.3 Cuba: public statements and pressure mechanisms**

3.3.1 Reuters reported on 7 March 2026 that President Trump stated Cuba “wants a deal” and that negotiations were taking place with him and Secretary of State Marco Rubio.

Status: verified as reporting of public statements.

3.3.2 Media context also reports statements that Cuba would “fall pretty soon” and references to a “friendly takeover”.

Status: partially verified (media framing; legal relevance depends on concrete coercive measures).

3.3.3 Critical gaps

a. [UNKNOWN: concrete coercive measures, operational plans, or threats of force directed at Cuba]

b. [UNKNOWN: legal basis and objective of any sanctions instruments specifically aimed at leadership change]

---

### **3.4 Regional spillover**

3.4.1 Reuters reported escalation between Israel and Hezbollah, including Israeli strikes near Beirut and significant casualties and displacement in Lebanon.

Status: partially verified.

3.4.2 This spillover is legally relevant because it increases the foreseeability of regional escalation and humanitarian impact, thereby strengthening the necessity of strict precaution and proportionality assessments.

---

### **3.5 Israel Palestine context as precedent**

3.5.1 Reuters reported that ICC arrest warrants exist against Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in connection with Gaza.

Status: verified as reporting.

3.5.2 The White House issued an executive order in 2025 imposing sanctions on the ICC and asserting that the United States does not recognize ICC jurisdiction.

Status: verified.

---

## **Article 4 Macro economic impact**

4.1 Reuters reported significant increases in US fuel prices due to energy supply disruptions linked to the Iran conflict.

4.2 The chief economist of the ECB warned that a prolonged Iran war could increase eurozone inflation and reduce economic growth.

4.3 ECB research indicates measurable inflation pass through effects of energy price shocks.

4.4 Rising inflation and energy prices affect purchasing power and may increase pressure on public finances and social stability; empirical European research has shown correlations between unemployment and certain categories of crime.

4.5 Outstanding causal questions

a. [UNKNOWN: quantification of EU inflation specifically attributable to the Iran conflict]

b. [UNKNOWN: national purchasing power effects in NL/DE]

c. [UNKNOWN: direct impacts on unemployment, crime and security]

---

## **Article 5 Evidence package and evidence preservation request**

5.1 Evidence objects to be preserved include

government statements and transcripts

UN documentation

satellite and geolocation material

medical and forensic documentation

economic data

5.2 All recipients are requested to apply an immediate legal hold on relevant data.

5.3 Transparency request including publication or confidential submission of

Article 51 notifications

Ecuador consent documentation

incident specific targeting and damage assessments

---

## **Article 6 Uncertainties**

6.1 [UNKNOWN: competent authority and procedural route]

6.2 [UNKNOWN: independently verified casualty figures]

6.3 [UNKNOWN: classification of hostilities IAC NIAC mixed]

6.4 [UNKNOWN: involvement of third states]

---

## **Article 7 Signature**

7 March 2026

Name: Dennis Gür

Capacity: jurist

# Annex 3

## Incident Qualification Matrix and Preliminary Legal Assessment

Title: Incident Based Legal Qualification Matrix concerning alleged military operations involving the United States, Israel and related geopolitical actions

Date: 7 March 2026

Prepared by: Dennis Gür

### Article 1 Purpose

This Annex establishes an analytical matrix linking reported incidents with potential violations of international law and international criminal law.

The purpose is not to determine guilt but to identify possible legal qualifications requiring investigation.

The matrix structure follows investigative methods commonly used in international tribunals and UN fact finding missions.

---

## Article 2 Incident Matrix

### Incident 1

Large scale military strikes on Iranian territory

Reported date

28 February 2026

Reported actors

United States

Israel

Reported conduct

Large scale aerial bombardment of targets in Iran reportedly conducted under the designation "Operation Epic Fury".

Reported consequences

death of political and military figures

civilian casualties

destruction of infrastructure

### **Possible legal qualification**

Use of force against the territorial integrity of a sovereign state

Relevant law

UN Charter Article 2(4)

Potential exception

Self defence under Article 51 UN Charter

Key investigative questions

Was an armed attack against the United States or Israel occurring or imminent

Was the response necessary

Was the response proportional

Was the UN Security Council notified as required by Article 51

---

## **Incident 2**

Alleged missile strike on a girls school in Iran

Reported date

6 March 2026

Reported conduct

Missile strike allegedly impacting a school building used by civilians.

### **Possible legal qualification**

War crime

Rome Statute Article 8(2)(b)(ii)

Intentionally directing attacks against civilian objects

Rome Statute Article 8(2)(b)(iv)

Launching attacks knowing they will cause excessive civilian harm

Relevant law

Geneva Conventions

Additional Protocol I Article 52

Additional Protocol I Article 57

Investigative questions

Was the building used for military purposes

Were feasible precautions taken

Was the expected military advantage proportionate

---

## **Incident 3**

US lethal kinetic operations on Ecuadorian territory

Reported date

March 2026

Reported conduct

Confirmed lethal operations conducted by US forces in cooperation with Ecuador.

### **Possible legal qualification**

Lawful use of force based on consent of territorial state

or

Violation of sovereignty if consent exceeded or invalid.

Relevant law

ARSIWA Article 20

Consent as circumstance precluding wrongfulness.

Investigative questions

Was consent formally given by Ecuador

Was the scope of consent exceeded

Were operations conducted within law enforcement framework or armed conflict framework

---

## **Incident 4**

Public statements regarding selection of Iran's future leadership

Reported actor

President of the United States

Reported conduct

Public statement expressing intention to influence or participate in the selection of Iran's next leader.

### **Possible legal qualification**

Intervention in internal affairs of a sovereign state.

Relevant law

UN General Assembly Resolution 2625

Declaration on Friendly Relations.

Investigative questions

Were coercive measures used

Did such statements accompany military pressure

Did the statements form part of a broader regime change policy

---

# Annex 4

## Command Responsibility and Chain of Authority Analysis

Title: Preliminary analysis of command responsibility structures in relation to reported military operations

Date: 7 March 2026

---

### Article 1 Legal framework

Command responsibility is recognized under international criminal law.

Rome Statute Article 28

Military commanders and superiors are criminally responsible if they knew or should have known that subordinates were committing crimes and

failed to prevent or punish those acts.

Customary international law

ICRC Customary IHL Rule 153.

---

### Article 2 Possible chain of responsibility

The following hierarchy may be relevant for investigation.

Political leadership

Head of state

Commander in chief

Strategic command level

National security council

Defense secretary

Chiefs of staff

Operational command level

Regional military commanders

Joint operations command

Tactical command level

Air wing commanders

Strike coordinators

Targeting officers

---

### **Article 3 Required evidentiary material**

Operational orders

Targeting directives

Rules of engagement

battle damage assessments

communications between command levels.

---

### **Article 4 Knowledge element**

Investigators must determine whether superiors

had actual knowledge

or

should reasonably have known

that unlawful attacks were occurring.

Evidence sources may include

briefing reports

satellite intelligence

battle damage reports

internal communications.

---

# Annex 5

## ICC Admissibility and Jurisdiction Assessment

Title: Preliminary assessment of International Criminal Court jurisdiction and admissibility

Date: 7 March 2026

---

### Article 1 Jurisdiction principles

The ICC exercises jurisdiction where  
crimes occur on territory of a State Party  
or  
the accused is a national of a State Party.  
Rome Statute Article 12.

---

### Article 2 Territorial jurisdiction

Ecuador  
State Party to the Rome Statute.  
Therefore crimes committed on Ecuadorian territory may fall under ICC jurisdiction  
regardless of nationality of the perpetrators.

---

### Article 3 Non member states

United States  
Iran  
Israel  
are not currently ICC member states.  
However jurisdiction may still arise through  
territorial jurisdiction

or

UN Security Council referral.

---

#### **Article 4 Complementarity principle**

The ICC acts only when national jurisdictions are unwilling or unable to prosecute.

Rome Statute Article 17.

Key assessment criteria

genuine investigations

independent prosecution

lack of shielding of suspects.

---

#### **Article 5 Article 15 Communications**

Individuals and organizations may submit information regarding crimes to the Office of the Prosecutor.

Such communications must contain

structured factual information

sources and evidence

legal qualification.