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I. OVERVIEW

This report examines both the irresponsible and the illegal supplies of weapons and related materiel to warring parties in Côte d’Ivoire and their misuse, particularly in the January-April 2011 armed conflict. In so doing, it demonstrates the need for stronger action by the international community to assist Côte d’Ivoire end the pattern of crimes under international law and grave violations of human rights, including incidents of gender-based violence against women and girls.

The disturbing issues raised in the report pose fundamental questions for the international community regarding the lack of effective control of international transfers of conventional arms by states, including the relative ease with which UN arms embargoes can be circumvented.

Based on analysis of the facts, key recommendations are proposed in the report. In particular, Amnesty International is urging all member states of the United Nations – as well as non-member states maintaining permanent observer missions to the United Nations – to make every effort at the forthcoming Final UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, scheduled from 18 to 28 March 2013, to agree a treaty text with strong rules to protect human rights and observe international humanitarian law. These rules should be consistent with states’ obligations under international law and enable all states to effectively regulate, with robust and transparent control mechanisms, all types of weapons, munitions and related equipment, including technology and parts and components. Amnesty International believes the evidence in the case of Côte d’Ivoire - and in other cases - shows that without the robust implementation of a strong global Arms Trade Treaty, as well as other specific measures by the international community, UN Security Council arms embargoes such as the one imposed on Côte d’Ivoire in November 2004 will continue to be violated.

This report focuses first of all on the longer term consequences of a series of irresponsible international arms transfers made to the government of Côte d’Ivoire and New Forces (the armed opposition group who controlled the north of the country following the 2002 September armed uprising) in the period immediately prior to the arms embargo imposed on the country by the United Nations Security Council in November 2004. While these transfers were generally legal from the perspective of not having breached the UN arms embargo, they facilitated a near-immediate escalation in hostilities at the time and fuelled a pattern of violent crime and armed violations of human rights.

The report profiles the use of these pre-2004-transferred weapons during the 2011 post-electoral conflict – by supporters of the outgoing President Laurent Gbagbo and supporters of President Alassane Ouattara – and the consequent grave human rights violations and abuses and serious violations of international humanitarian law committed. These violations and abuses included the targeting of civilians by pro-Gbagbo forces in Abidjan and unlawful killings in the west of the country by the new army created in March 2011 by Alassane Ouattara. This army, the Republican Forces of Côte d’Ivoire (FRCI), was composed mainly at the time by members of the New Forces.

In addition to the pre-November 2004 instances of irresponsible, but not necessarily illegal, supplies of weapons, ammunition and related equipment to Côte d’Ivoire, this report also summarises recent findings of the UN Group of Experts investigating violations of the UN arms embargo which has uncovered numerous instances of arms embargo violations since the UN embargo was imposed in 2004. Some of these illegal arms transfers have also been subsequently used in serious violations of international humanitarian law and human rights violations. Both legal and illegal supplies of small arms, light weapons and ammunition have also contributed to the proliferation of armed violence in the country.
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The paper concludes with an assessment of arms-related issues in post-conflict Côte d'Ivoire and recommends measures necessary to curtail arms-related human rights abuses in the country.

**A DECADE OF CONFLICT OPPOSING SEVERAL ARMED FORCES**

Since the September 2002 armed uprising that resulted in the de facto partition of the country, Côte d'Ivoire has been the scene of sporadic violence in the wider context of an armed conflict between the government security forces, the Forces de défense et de sécurité (FDS, Defence and Security Forces) - which includes military personnel, gendarmes (paramilitary police forces) and police forces on one hand - and several armed opposition groups reunited under the name of Forces Nouvelles (New Forces), on the other.

Each party recruited militias and, in the government's case, mercenaries composed notably of Liberians. These forces acted within a very loose chain of command without being held to account for their acts.

During the first three years of conflicts (2002-2004), all warring parties resorted to rape and other sexual violence against women and girls as a weapon of war.¹

In November 2004, the UN Security Council adopted the 1572 resolution that imposed a comprehensive UN arms embargo, prohibiting the transfer of arms and related materiel to any party within Côte d'Ivoire.²

Several attempts at political mediation took place under the aegis of France and Burkina Faso and ended in the signature of the Linas-Marcoussis (2003) and Ouagadougou (2007) Agreements. Following the latter agreement, Laurent Gbagbo appointed the then General Secretary of the New Forces, Guillaume Soro, as his prime minister.

Despite the signature of several agreements seeking to reunify Côte d'Ivoire and to carry out a process of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR), the country remained divided in two until the 2011 post-electoral crisis.

The violence that followed the disputed presidential election in November 2010 caused the most serious humanitarian and human rights crisis in Côte d'Ivoire since the de facto partition of the country in September 2002. International monitors generally regarded this election to be free and fair and the UN - mandated to certify the results - confirmed the victory of Alassane Ouattara. This result was immediately contested by the outgoing President Laurent Gbagbo, who proclaimed himself president after the Constitutional Council cancelled votes in four regions in the north of the country. The international community, notably the African Union and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), recognized Alassane Ouattara's victory and the country found itself in a political stalemate with two presidents and two governments. Efforts to mediate, particularly by the African Union, failed to peacefully resolve the political crisis and the situation deteriorated into an armed conflict.

Evidence collected by Amnesty International clearly demonstrates that all sides committed crimes under international law, including war crimes and crimes against humanity. Hundreds of people were unlawfully killed, often targeted on the grounds of their ethnicity or presumed political affiliation. Women and girls were subjected to sexual violence, including rape, and hundreds of thousands of people were forced to flee their homes to seek refuge in other regions of Côte d'Ivoire or in neighbouring countries, especially Liberia.³

Pro-Gbagbo security forces are suspected of criminal responsibility for extrajudicial executions and arrests of individuals - mostly men but also a number of women - who were demonstrating against the former President, in the streets or in their homes. Some were victims of enforced disappearance. Most of those executed or arrested were Diouls - a generic term designating
those with a Muslim name or from the north of Côte d’Ivoire or other countries in the sub-region (See Box 2 below). Pro-Gbagbo militia members allegedly raped women accused of supporting Alassane Ouattara, in some cases with the involvement of security forces loyal to the former President. The Republican Forces of Côte d’Ivoire (FRCI), created in March 2011 by Alassane Ouattara, killed and tortured real or presumed supporters of Laurent Gbagbo, notably in the west of the country. FRIC members were also allegedly responsible for rape and other crimes of sexual violence against women and girls.

On 23 November 2011, the Pre-Trial Chamber of the International Criminal Court issued a warrant of arrest - under seal - against Laurent Gbagbo, for his alleged criminal responsibility for the crimes against humanity of murder, rape and other forms of sexual violence, persecution and other inhuman acts committed in the territory of Côte d’Ivoire during the period between 16 December 2010 and 12 April 2011. The arrest warrant was unsealed on 30 November 2011 and that same day Gbagbo surrendered to the custody of the Court. A second warrant of arrest has been issued against Gbagbo’s wife, Simone Gbagbo, for four counts of crimes against humanity. The warrant is still pending execution by Ivorian authorities.

A CONFLICT WITH A STRONG ETHNIC DIMENSION

The 2011 post-electoral crisis was fuelled by long-standing ethnic dissensions that stemmed from the ideology of the “ivoirité” which sought to put “genuine” Ivorians against “non-indigenous” (or allogenous) populations, commonly known as Diouls. Depending on the circumstances, this term may describe anyone with a Muslim name or from the north of Côte d’Ivoire or other countries in the sub-region (Mali, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Senegal, etc.).

While the pro-Gbagbo forces targeted the Diouls, armed elements loyal to Alassane Ouattara attacked people belonging to southern ethnic groups, including the Bété, the Didas and the Guérés, generally perceived as being supporters of the outgoing President.
II. IRRESPONSIBLE ARMS TRANSFERS TO CÔTE D’IVOIRE PRIOR TO THE 2004 EMBARGO

To any international observer in 2002-2004, Côte d’Ivoire appeared at the crossroads of a destabilising civil war. A military uprising in September 2002 resulted in a dangerous standoff, which left several armed opposition groups (later reunited under the name of New Forces) in control of the northern half of country and government forces controlling the south. Although a January 2003 agreement established a ceasefire, the parties continued to rearm and reorganise.

Recognising the fragility of the situation, on 27 February 2004 the Security Council determined that the situation in Côte d’Ivoire continued to pose a threat to international peace and security in the region and authorized the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping force. Violence continued, however, and in October and November 2004 New Forces units launched attacks on government forces and the government launched air strikes against New Forces’ positions and northern towns.

Despite growing international concern about a conflict with the potential to destabilise the entire region, several foreign states and commercial actors continued to supply large volumes of weapons to Côte d’Ivoire throughout the 2002-2004 period. Moreover, the destabilising impact of foreign-supplied weapons was not just a potential impact; it had a clear and immediate effect on the intensity of the conflict in Côte d’Ivoire.

On 4 November 2004, Ivorian government forces launched an attack against positions held by the New Forces. Several air raids, in particular by Sukhoi fighter-bombers, were directed against the towns of Bouaké and Korhogo in the north of the country, resulting in several deaths and injuries. These attacks ended the ceasefire that had held for 18 months. The supply of foreign Mi-24V attack helicopters enabled government forces to attack civilians indiscriminately in the northern city of Bouaké on 4 November 2004. Further, on 6 November 2004, an attack, using a newly acquired Sukhoi Su-25 ground attack aircraft, killed nine French military personnel and one American national. After the killing of 9 French soldiers the French forces retaliated by destroying the air assets (Su-25, MiG-23, MI-8T) of the Ivorian Armed Forces. As a result, huge demonstrations were organized in the following days in Abidjan to protest against the action of the French troops leading to a confrontation between the Ivorian army and population and the French troops.

Between 2002 and 2004, as this report summarises, foreign states supplied Ivorian parties with a range of weapons, from small arms, light weapons and ammunition to armoured vehicles and military aviation. A majority of these international transfers occurred during the January 2003-November 2004 period, when international peace negotiations and Security Council involvement made it starkly evident that the crisis in Côte d’Ivoire had the potential to escalate dramatically. Moreover, transfers continued after February 2004, when the Security Council had deemed that the situation could not be contained by diplomacy alone and had authorised the deployment of a UN peacekeeping mission.

In November 2004, the Security Council condemned the attack on French forces and, by its resolution 1572, imposed an comprehensive UN arms embargo, prohibiting the transfer of arms and related materiel to any party within Côte d’Ivoire. The UN embargo remained in force, but the damage had already been done. As the following sections of this report describe, weapons and ammunition supplied from foreign countries flowed into the country during the pre-embargo 2002-2004 period and these weapons and ammunition shaped the course of armed violence and gross human rights abuses in Côte d’Ivoire ever since.
A. 2002-2004 SUPPLIES OF WEAPONS TO GOVERNMENT FORCES

Prior to the 2002 mutiny, government forces had relied on weapons and ammunition acquired piecemeal from various sources since the 1960s, including ageing French weapons and ammunition, and Soviet-era Russian equipment. Not only were many of these weapons obsolete, but the September 2002 military mutiny also resulted in the transfer of large quantities of government weapons and ammunition to the New Forces.

In response, the government of Côte d’Ivoire embarked on a sustained arms acquisition programme. Between September 2002 and December 2003, Ivorian government spending on military hardware rose from an estimated USD 113 million to USD 175 million, totalling more than 10 per cent of the national budget in 2004-2005.10

In 1998, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) had declared a voluntary three-year Moratorium on the Importation, Exportation and Manufacture of Small Arms and Light Weapons11 in order to prevent the proliferation of such arms in West Africa. The Moratorium was extended in 2001 and again in 2004. As a Member State of ECOWAS, Côte d’Ivoire government should not have carried out these arms imports until it had first notified the ECOWAS secretariat of the imports and obtained an exemption from ECOWAS. Yet, according to the UN Group of Experts12 the majority of these shipments of small arms and light weapons were not reported to ECOWAS by the government of Côte d’Ivoire.13

1. ARMOURED VEHICLES FROM ANGOLA

In 2002, Angola supplied two BMP-2 armoured personnel carriers and two T-55 tanks to the government of Côte d’Ivoire.14 The exact circumstances of the transfer are unclear, although the equipment was delivered by sea to the Port of Abidjan.

2. CHINESE SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION DELIVERIES

Evidence collected since 2004 indicates that the government of Côte d’Ivoire was in possession of very large quantities of Chinese-manufactured 7.62 x 39 mm ammunition, produced in 2002. These stocks comprised an estimated 30 per cent or more of all government ammunition of this calibre, suggesting transfer volumes in the hundreds of thousands of rounds at least.15

The date of manufacture indicates transfer at some time after January 2002 and before the November 2004 UN arms embargo.16 Shipping information on ammunition boxes (see image below), which denotes a Chinese exporter and the destination of ‘Abidjan,’ suggests that China supplied the ammunition directly to Côte d’Ivoire (rather than re-export by a third state). Given usual time lags between manufacture and export, in addition to shipping times, it is plausible that delivery of the ammunition occurred after 2002.17 In the absence of additional information, however, the exact date of delivery cannot be established.
2002-manufactured Chinese 7.62 x 39 mm ammunition (boxed), Abidjan


Notes: Date of manufacture (2002) confirmed by lot numbers applied to packaging and ammunition head stamps.

3. MAJOR CONVENTIONAL WEAPON SUPPLIES FROM BELARUS

Between 2002 and 2003 Belarus delivered a range of major conventional weapons to the government of Côte d’Ivoire. Transfers of military aircraft included one AN-12 transport aircraft, two Mi-24V attack helicopters, one Mi-8T helicopter and four SU-25 ground attack fixed wing aircraft. Belarusian deliveries also included numerous armoured vehicles, including 13 BMP-1P, 13 BRDM-2 and six BTR-80 armoured personnel carriers. Heavy, indirect fire weapon deliveries included ten 120 mm mortars and six truck-mounted BM-21 122 mm multiple rocket launch systems.18

Belarusian assistance to the government of Côte d’Ivoire also appears to have continued post-November 2004, with the supply of 22 UAZ-3151 military 4x4 vehicles, which were destined for the Centre de commandement des opérations de sécurité (CECOS) and arrived in Abidjan on 23 June 2005.19 UN Groups of Experts also reported the presence, between April 2005 and the end of 2006, of technicians of Belarusian nationality repairing a government Mi-24 attack helicopter.20

4. MAJOR CONVENTIONAL WEAPON DELIVERIES FROM BULGARIA

In 2003, Bulgaria supplied major conventional weapons to the government of Côte d’Ivoire including three 120 mm mortars, two Mi-24V attack helicopters, two MiG-23ML, two MiG-23MLD fighter aircraft.21

5. ARMoured PERSONNEL CARRIER FROM UKRAINE

In 2003, Ukraine supplied one BMP-2 armoured personnel carrier to the government of Côte d’Ivoire.22

6. SMALL ARMS, LIGHT WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION DELIVERIES FROM BULGARIA

In October 2004, Bulgaria delivered more than 1,000 AR-M 7.62 x 39 mm Kalashnikov-pattern assault rifles, heavy machine guns, ATGL (RPG-7-type) rocket launchers and PG-7VM and OG-7V anti-personnel rockets.23 The Small Arms Survey reports that, in 2004, Bulgaria also supplied ‘(t)wo thousand offensive hand grenades, 2,000 defensive hand grenades, 1,500 OG-7V anti-personnel rockets for use in RPG-7 rocket launchers, 20,000 rounds of 12.7 x 108 mm ammunition, and 250,000 rounds of 7.62 x 39 mm ammunition,’ with an estimated value of USD 700,642.24
There is also evidence of 2004-manufactured Bulgarian RGD-5 hand grenades in the hands of government forces in Abidjan (see image below). The late date of manufacture suggests the potential for transfer close to the November 2004 embargo. There is no available evidence, however, to specify the month of manufacture, or date of supply to Côte d’Ivoire.

2004-manufactured Bulgarian RGD-5 grenades (box of 20), Abidjan 2009

Source: Confidential
Notes: The third, ‘04’ component of the lot number indicates the year of manufacture (2004).

7. DRONE DELIVERIES FROM ISRAEL

Some time in 2004, Israel delivered two unmanned aerial surveillance aircraft to the government of Côte d’Ivoire. Israeli technicians initially operated the aircraft, but were later withdrawn once Israel recognised that their presence violated the sanctions regime, which was introduced in November 2004. The two unmanned aircraft remained in the country.25

B. SUPPLIES OF WEAPONS TO THE NEW FORCES

With the exception of weapons captured during 2011 hostilities, elements of the New Forces did not deploy major conventional weapons in the conflict during the period 2002-2011. For these reasons, the visibility of foreign weapon transfers is much reduced in comparison to supplies to the government of Côte d’Ivoire.

Throughout the 2002-2011 period, the New Forces deployed a range of weapons, including Chinese, Russian and Polish assault rifles and ammunition of diverse origins and calibres. Unknown parties had removed the serial numbers from almost all assault rifles, which led successive UN Groups of Experts to conclude that the weapons had been re-transferred in violation of the sanctions regime (rather than supplied directly by manufacturing states). In addition, large quantities of New Forces ammunition had been removed from its original packaging (and identifying lot numbers) for ostensibly the same reasons.26

These factors make it difficult to draw any direct conclusions regarding irresponsible arms transfers to the New Forces prior to the November 2004 embargo. This is for the following reasons: 1) the absence of weapon serial numbers and ammunition lot numbers makes it impossible to trace the transfer history of the ordnance concerned and 2) the items may, therefore, have changed hands several times before entering service with the New Forces. However, there is growing evidence of arms transfers from the territory of Burkina Faso, both prior to and following the November 2004 arms embargo.

1. ESCORTED ARMS TRANSFERS FROM BURKINA FASO IN 2002-03

Reliable eyewitness testimony reports uniformed Burkinabé military forces escorting supplies of weapons and ammunition to elements of the New Forces in the 2002-early 2003 period. The exact nature of these shipments is unclear, but later investigations suggest they probably contained a variety of arms and ammunition, including assault rifles and small-calibre ammunition ranging from 7.62 x 39 mm to 12.7 x 108 mm in calibre.27
2. ARMS TRANSFERS FROM BURKINA FASO DURING AND AFTER 2003

The 2011 UN Group of Experts on Côte d’Ivoire noted various indications of long-term support to the New Forces emanating from the territory of Burkina Faso. This included evidence of supplies of Kalashnikov-pattern assault rifles, the presence of small-calibre ammunition formerly in the hands of security forces in Burkina Faso and later found in Côte d’Ivoire and shipments of other military materiel, including vehicles, uniforms and radio communications equipment.28

Despite this evidence, it is difficult to establish exactly which weapons and ammunition Burkina Faso supplied—particularly since the transfers appear to have been of a mixture of often-old weapon types. In addition, the removal of serial and lot numbers complicates matters. The result is that a weapon used by the New Forces cannot be attributed to any particular transfer, which makes the question of transfer ‘responsibility’ difficult to answer.

That said, post-2004 conflict analysis by the UN Group of Experts on Côte d’Ivoire reveals quantities of 2005-manufactured Romanian 7.62 x 39 mm ammunition circulating in the country resulting from the illicit diversion of this ammunition from Burkina Faso to Côte d’Ivoire (see further below).29
III. MISUSE OF WEAPONS BY GOVERNMENT FORCES IN 2010-2011

There is clear evidence that many of the weapons supplied to the government of Côte d’Ivoire during 2002-2004 not only had an immediate impact on hostilities at the time but were also later used to target civilians in the lead up to and during the 2011 conflict. The cases presented below are illustrative, rather than exhaustive.

In November 2004, the government of Côte d’Ivoire launched air strikes against New Forces positions in the north of Côte d’Ivoire, using a range of air assets acquired from 2002 to 2004. These included Mi-24V attack helicopters supplied by Belarus and Bulgaria (2002 and 2003, respectively) and SU-25 ground attack aircraft supplied by Belarus in 2003 and 2004.

The use of these weapon systems confirms that foreign supplies of weapons to the government of Côte d’Ivoire had a near-immediate impact on escalating hostilities associated with attacks on civilians in the country. For example, unexploded ordnance and Belarusian-supplied S-5 rocket fragments recovered from residential areas in the northern city of Bouaké indicate that air strikes extensively targeted civilian areas. An attack on 6 November carried out by a Belarusian-supplied SU-25 on the French military base in Bouaké, which resulted in ten deaths, provides further evidence of the impact of these pre-embargo arms transfers.

The proliferation and abuse of small arms and light weapons also had tragic effects. In a report published in March 2007, Amnesty International documented a pattern of violence against women and girls by armed men, including rape by all parties to the conflict. Many women and girls were gang raped by men holding them at gunpoint. Others were beaten with Kalashnikov rifle butts before or after being raped.

After the series of agreements were signed to initially impose a ceasefire and then to put an end to the conflict, and pledged to demobilize, disarm and reintegrate all forces, a lack of funding for the regrouping of the New Forces caused significant delays in the disarmament of the New Forces. Disorder also arose from a number of demonstrations held in 2007 and 2008 by soldiers who had not received payment. Both these factors aggravated the longstanding debate over having elections before disarmament, which eventually ended in another postponement of elections, and increased tensions in the country.

A. JANUARY AND FEBRUARY 2011 TARGETING OF PROTESTORS IN ABIDJAN

In January and February 2011, government forces used live ammunition to disperse and dissuade civilian protests by men and women, mainly from the Dioula community, which took place in several areas of Abidjan, including Abobo, Adjameré, Atacoubé, Port-Bouët and Treichville.

With the exception of Abobo (see below), these events tended to follow a standard pattern of escalation by security forces completely contrary to the UN standards for the use of force by law enforcement officials, involving in particular:

- shots fired into the air to disperse protestors;
- shots aimed at protestors who either did not disperse or attempted to light fires/erect barricades;
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- the use of grenades, rockets and other explosive light weaponry to clear (often residential) areas of residual protestor groups.\textsuperscript{33}

On 18 January 2011, for example, gendarmerie and republican guard forces dispersed protesters who had set fires and erected barricades along Boulevard de la Paix, near to the UN headquarters in Attecoubé. Security forces fired live ammunition to disperse protesters and proceeded to set fire to ‘maquis’ (small shops) at the intersection between Boulevard de la Paix and Boulevard de l'Ouest.

Protesters dispersed into residential areas to the south of Boulevard de la Paix, into which security forces launched a rocket from an RPG-7-pattern launcher, threw at least two high-explosive fragmentation grenades and launched, or threw, one grenade from the armoured vanguard vehicle.

All of these uses of excessive and unwarranted force were directed into the shanty residential area, which is largely constructed of sheet steel and offered little protection from bullets and explosive ordnance (as in image below).\textsuperscript{34}

**Targeting of civilians in Attecoubé, Abidjan, 18 January 2011**


Note: Targets are approximately (+/- 10 m) Circles indicate the source of fire (or throw). Arrows indicate the direction and target of fire.

**B. MORTAR BOMB ATTACKS IN ABBOBO, ABIDJAN**

In late February, security forces loyal to Laurent Gbagbo began to mortar densely populated
areas of Abobo, a district of Abidjan that had come under the control of anti-Gbagbo “Invisible Commando” elements. More than ten people, including women, men and children, were killed. Information gathered by Amnesty International also indicates that when they crossed the Abobo district, security forces fired recklessly, killing and wounding unarmed residents.

On 11 March 2011, shortly before midnight, a mortar bomb landed in the courtyard of a family residence, killing three children and seriously wounding several members of the same family. One of the people present at the scene told Amnesty International:

"When we went to bed, we couldn’t hear any noise or gunfire but suddenly, in the middle of the night, around 11:30pm, we heard a loud noise. A shell had hit our neighbour’s courtyard. An adolescent aged 12, who was asleep, was killed immediately. Koné Toumoutou, aged six and Bakary Koné, aged two, were mortally wounded and died after being transferred to a health centre. Two other children from the same family were wounded. Several adults, including the grandmother, aged 53, were wounded."

On 17 March 2011, bombs were launched at a marketplace in Abobo, killing at least 20 people and wounding approximately 60 other people, mainly women.

An eyewitness told Amnesty International: "That afternoon, before the prayer, some women were selling their produce at Gagnoa Station market, in Abobo. Everything was quiet when we suddenly heard a big noise as the place was hit by a shell. At least ten people, mainly women, were killed and others were wounded."

Another witness said that, a short while after the 1pm prayer, children were playing on the ground when the shell hit the place. "A woman, Bamba Aminata, entered the courtyard with her baby. She was hit by the shell. She died of her wounds at the hospital a few hours later. Her baby was wounded and another baby aged 18 months was killed by that same shell."

A man in Abobo Hospital told Amnesty International that he had seen the corpses of 13 people, 11 men, a woman and a child aged about five or six who had been killed as a result of this bombing.

On 21 March 2011, another mortar bomb hit the Céleste neighbourhood of Abobo. An eyewitness told Amnesty International: "Everything was quiet except for the noise being made by the children and the water in which we were washing before prayers at 6.30pm, when suddenly, a shell hit the courtyard. Three people, including a child aged 12, were killed and two others were wounded."

Another witness said: "I can still see those two women, with their legs blown off by the shell. They were taken to hospital but they did not survive their injuries. One of them had several shrapnel wounds."

Some of the mortar bombing appears to have been conducted by mobile units of the security forces. There is also evidence that units of the gendarmerie launched mortar bombs from bases in Abobo.

For example, the following map illustrates the trajectory of an 82 mm mortar sited in the ‘Camp Commando’ gendarmerie base in Central Abobo, which sources confirm was used to fire against targets in the PK-18 area between 4 and 7 March 2011. Not only do such indirect-fire weapons have the potential to cause widespread unintended casualties because the operators cannot see the target area, but also the trajectory of this weapon suggests mortaring into and over a contiguous, densely populated area of Abidjan. In addition, the weapon would have been operating at close to maximum range, suggesting the great potential for the bombs to fall short of the intended target.
Disposition of an 82 mm mortar at the 'Camp Commando' Gendarmerie base in Abobo, Abidjan, 4-7 March 2011

Site of 82 mm mortar
Angle of fire: 280˚ - 290˚
Direction PK-18

PK-18 District

3000+ m

Central Abobo


Note: Exact location (within 1 metre) and trajectory of mortar confirmed by a confidential source.
C. THE ORIGIN OF WEAPONS USED IN SECURITY FORCE OPERATIONS IN ABIDJAN

Security force operations in Abobo involved the use of the following types of weapon: assault rifles (primarily Kalashnikov-pattern); grenades; PK machine guns; 12.7 mm and 14.5 mm heavy machine guns; RPG-7-pattern rocket launchers; vehicle-mounted 20 mm cannon and mortars of 82 mm and 120 mm in calibre. Security forces also deployed a variety of armoured vehicles, including armed VAB, BTR-80 and BMP-2 armoured personnel carriers.

Security force personnel harass, kick and beat with rifles a group of minibus passengers in Boulevard de la Paix, Abidjan, 19 January 2011

Source: Confidential.
Note: The author of this photograph positively identified the Bulgarian weapons not by means of the photograph. These particular weapons were most probably transferred to Côte d’Ivoire in October 2004.

Analysis of weapon deployment on the streets of Abidjan at the time confirms that the government of Côte d’Ivoire imported many of these types of weapon and munitions in the period leading-up to the November 2004 arms embargo (see the table on arms imports below).
Confirmed weapons and munitions used during operations against civilians in Abidjan: January-March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of weapon</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AR-M assault rifles</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Numerous locations. Expert eyewitness confirmation at the time of use (also see image above).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.62 x 39 mm assault rifle ammunition</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Numerous locations. Confirmed through analysis of spent cartridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7 x 108 mm heavy machine gun</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Numerous locations. Confirmed through analysis of spent cartridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 mm mortar</td>
<td>Belarus/Bulgaria</td>
<td>2002 or 2004</td>
<td>PK-18 area of Abobo. Expert eyewitness confirmation at the time of use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: All cases confirmed through the assessment of weapons holdings prior to the 2011 conflict, eyewitness observations in January-March 2011 and analysis of post-conflict weapons in April 2011. Confidential sources.

It is important to recognise that the weapons listed above comprise only a small proportion of those transferred to the government of Côte d’Ivoire in the immediate period prior to the imposition of the UN embargo imposed in November 2004. An analysis of weapon and ammunition stockpiles of those armed units involved in civilian repression, before and after the 2011 conflict, suggests that the armed units deployed virtually all such weapon types, with the exception of aircraft and large-calibre ordnance, such as BM-21 rocket systems. These units included the Ivorian police, gendarmerie and special units, such as the Command Center for Security Operations (Centre de commandement des opérations de sécurité, CECOS).

While none of the aforementioned transfers of weapons and munitions to Côte d’Ivoire violated the UN arms embargo imposed in November 2004, they took place either at a time when the country experienced a fragile ceasefire, or when it was clear that the ceasefire had collapsed and there was renewed fighting in the country. For these reasons, there is strong evidence to suggest that:

1. Supplier states were well aware or ought to have been aware of the precarious security situation and grave violations of human rights in Côte d’Ivoire at the time of transfer;
2. The international transfers were, therefore, irresponsible from the perspective of potentially escalating armed conflict and endangering regional security and, ultimately, human rights - particularly given Security Council decisions after February 2004; and;
3. Ivorian security forces used the foreign supplied weapons and munitions to target civilians and UN peacekeepers and French armed force personnel in 2004 and again in 2011.
IV. ILLEGAL ARMS SUPPLIES TO THE IVORIAN SECURITY FORCES

In addition to the above instances of irresponsible supplies of weapons, munitions and related equipment to Côte d’Ivoire, which were imported before the belated UN arms embargo on the country and subsequently used in serious violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, the UN Group of Experts has uncovered numerous instances of arms embargo violations since the UN embargo was imposed in 2004, adding to the concerns previously raised by Amnesty International.36

Between April 2011 and April 2012, the UN Group of Experts investigating arms embargo violations repeatedly observed the presence in Côte d’Ivoire of 7.62 x 39 mm calibre ammunition manufactured in Romania. On 22 March 2012, the Romanian authorities informed the Group that the ammunition had been delivered to the government of Burkina Faso on 16 December 2005 and on 21 June 2006.37 On 23 April 2012, in a second reply, Romanian authorities informed the Group that the aforementioned ammunition was also delivered to Burkina Faso on 18 June 2008.38 The ammunition was authorized for two transfers (200,000 and 800,000 rounds) by the Romanian National Agency for Export Controls in licenses E/2005/183 and E/2006/915 to the Ministry of Defense of Burkina Faso. Both these sales were performed with end user certificate and exemption certificates from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). It is therefore believed that the ammunition was illegally diverted from Burkina Faso to Côte d’Ivoire in violation of the UN arms embargo.

According to the UN Group of Experts report in April 2012, weapons and related materiel also entered Côte d’Ivoire directly until 2009, sometimes with the approval of the authorities of the country of origin. In 2009, Senegal started to be used as a transit country. The Group was able to document that authorities within Senegal authorized the transfer of weapons and related materiel to Côte d’Ivoire.

For instance, the UN Group of Experts stated in April 2012 that it had “documented with incontrovertible evidence the modus operandi of, as well as repeated violations to the sanctions regime carried out by a trafficking network that is composed of two groups: (a) Robert Montoya, Mikhail Kaplyou, Frédéric Lafont and their respective companies; and (b) a para-institutional group of individuals, namely Kadet Bertin (former security adviser of Mr. Gbagbo, now living in Ghana) and Commander Anselme Seka Yapo. These two groups maintained links and at times carried out joint business deals. The Group can document that these two groups have had access to and support from key Ivorian officials, as well as strong links with authorities within Guinea.”39

According to the UN investigators, the above-mentioned trafficking network “repeatedly violated the sanctions regime by importing weapons, ammunition, aircraft parts and equipment for the Ivorian security forces and other entities.”40 Analysis of the documents collected by the UN Group of Experts suggests that, during the period from 2006 to 2010, Protec-Cl, Protec-SA and Darkwood Logistics sold weapons and related materiel to the former government of Côte d’Ivoire for about $16.3 million.41 Transactions paid by the Gbagbo Presidency may have increased this total, according to the UN Group. Amnesty International obtained a list of weapons which the Togolese based company, Darkwood, proposed to obtain for the Ivorian government.42

To this end, the network benefited from the complicity of numerous foreign companies specialized in the production of law enforcement equipment, weapons and related materiel. The UN investigators reported that Messrs Lafont, Montoya and Kaplyou have been involved, directly or indirectly, in a complex structure of companies based in Côte d’Ivoire, Tunisia and
Latvia, which allowed them to violate consistently the sanctions regime imposed on Côte d’Ivoire. According to the UN experts report, “repeated violations of the sanctions regime have occurred using companies such as Protec-SA, Darkwood Logistics (see annex 9), which is based in Côte d’Ivoire and owned up to 90 per cent by Robert Montoya, and UAZ-CI (see annex 10), which is based in Côte d’Ivoire and owned by Atlantis Corporation. Atlantis Corporation is based in Latvia and managed by Taurenis Agris and Ilmars Blumbergs (see annex 11). Mikhail Kapylou is the Director of UAZ-CI. Protec-SA has been used as a platform by two companies owned and/or controlled by Robert Montoya, namely Darkwood Logistics and UAZ-CI.” The UN Group said it documented that the companies UAZ-CI and Bel Tech Export (based in Belarus) are trading partners.

From 2006 to 2009, weapons and military materiel imported in violation of the UN embargo by the consortium of Mr. Montoya and Mr. Lafont could be defined as “less than lethal”, such as tear gas ammunition (grenades, spray), rubber bullets (gomme-cogne), tear gas grenade launcher (Cougar) and security pistols (GC27 and GC54). In addition, from August 2009 onwards, the UN Group documented the sale of lethal weapons and associated ammunition. For instance, the UN Group alleges that Mr. Lafont participated in the sale to Côte d’Ivoire of thousands of H.Gr 84 fragmentation grenades and a large amount of lethal materiel from 2009 to late 2010.

The Group says it also documented the sale from Mr. Montoya’s network to the gendarmerie of a set of 54 units of 73 mm ammunition, contained in nine boxes, and that Mr. Montoya organized the arrival and the stay of a group of seven technicians charged with the repair and maintenance of a Mi-24 attack helicopter. The crew operated in Côte d’Ivoire between January and March 2011, and received logistical support from the Republican Guard.

The UN Group stated that it documented the fact that the Dakar-based Etablissements Fakih served as an intermediary for exporting the following weapons and related materiel to Côte d’Ivoire, in violation of the UN arms embargo: tear gas ammunition, sold by Nobel Sport and SAE Alsetex (both based in France); launchers for less-than-lethal ammunition and associated ammunition, sold by SAE Alsetex (GC27 and GC54 pistols); 9 mm calibre pistols and 357 magnum calibre revolvers manufactured by Taurus (based in Brazil) and associated ammunition; and rifles and 12-gauge shotguns manufactured by Hatsan (based in Turkey), also with associated ammunition.

According to the Group’s information, Sophia Airlines transported crowd control equipment. The airplane utilized was type Let-410, registered TU-TCV. According to the UN Group, members of the network travelled frequently to Tunisia to deposit large amounts of cash into local bank institutions collected during activities connected to Côte d’Ivoire.

The Group noted with concern that immediately after the Ivorian presidential elections of 2010, a large amount of ammunition for assault rifles, fragmentation grenades, 120 mm mortar shells and pistols was delivered to CECOS in flagrant violation of the sanctions regime, as described in an official CECOS delivery verification document dated 1 November 2010. The UN Group documented the import, in violation of the sanctions regime, of two types of fragmentation grenades: M26A9 (manufactured by Denel in South Africa) and counterfeit copies of H.Gr 84 grenades (so not made in Austria but suspected to be made in Serbia).

Numerous sources informed the Group that these two types of fragmentation grenades were widely distributed to pro-Gbagbo militias during the 2010-11 post-electoral crisis. CECOS and Republican Guard units used the grenades against civilians in Abidjan during the crisis.

According to the UN peacekeeping mission, UNOCI, 154 people wounded by grenades were treated at the mission’s medical facilities from 15 December 2010 to 15 May 2011, of whom five died.

Moreover, according to documents obtained by the UN investigators from Transit interarmées, the customs agency of the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of the Interior of Côte d’Ivoire,
Mr. Lafont, has, since 2004, repeatedly violated the sanctions regime by providing the Ivorian security forces with communications equipment, which was delivered by Soicex Electronique based in France. The UN investigators reported that the companies Motorola based in the United States, Barret Communication based in Australia and Danimex based in Denmark had manufactured the delivered equipment. However, Amnesty International has no reason to suspect these above-mentioned companies were aware of the equipment being supplied in contravention of the UN arms embargo.
V. USE OF WEAPONS BY GROUPS OPPOSED TO LAURENT GBAGBO DURING 2010-2011

There is also growing documentary evidence of unlawful killings perpetrated by the different groups opposed to Laurent Gbagbo, including the New Forces until their integration into the FRCI, the FRCI themselves and the ‘Dozo’ during the 2010-2011 crisis. The Dozos are a militia of traditional hunters sponsored by the state and the army who were responsible for serious human rights abuses during and after the 2011 post-electoral crisis.

This section describes these attacks directed against the civilian population and discusses the weapons and munitions used by the parties responsible for those attacks.

A. UNLAWFUL KILLINGS AND OTHER CRIMES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW IN DUÉKOUÉ

When they took control of Duékoué and surrounding villages in the west of Côte d’Ivoire, the FRCI, created by Allassane Ouattara on 17 March 2011, and the Dozos (a militia composed of traditional hunters – see box below) massacred hundreds of men and women Guérés on essentially ethnic and political grounds, a population globally suspected of being pro-Gbagbo.

After they took control of Duékoué on the morning of 29 March 2011, the FRCI, supported by Dozos and armed elements in plain clothes, led a search operation in an area called Quartier Carrefour, where the population was mainly Guérés. They entered the compounds, demanded money and loot ed houses. Then they asked women and girls to leave and summarily executed hundreds of men of all ages. Before killing them, they asked their victims to give their names or show their identity card. Some of these identity cards were later found beside the bodies. 52

CLOSE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE DOZOS AND THE FRCI

The Dozos are an armed militia composed of traditional hunters, all of whom are men, mostly from the Dioula community. Since the armed uprising of 2002, the Dozos have regularly fought alongside the New Forces and have committed grave human rights abuses, including arbitrary and deliberate killings and acts of torture and other ill-treatment.

The Dozos had close connections with the New Forces, the armed opposition group that controlled the north of the country following the 2002 coup attempt. Those connections, and a close working relationship, have intensified considerably with the creation of the FRCI.

Amnesty International has received numerous eyewitness accounts of the FRCI and the Dozos working together in armed operations carried out in various villages in the west of the country. Amnesty International researchers also noted in April-May 2011 that the Dozos are increasingly taking on a role as an “unofficial” security force in the country. They encountered several Dozo checkpoints both on some of the principal roadways connecting towns in the west and on rough roads through the forest that reach more remote villages.

Amnesty International delegates interviewed a Dozo who was supervising a checkpoint in a neighbourhood on the outskirts of Duékoué. He described a close working relationship between the Dozos and the FRCI and said that the FRCI often provide them with instructions, such as where to operate checkpoints, and logistical support, including food, fuel for vehicles and ammunition.
In June 2011 Amnesty International also met with Dozo leaders in Duékoué, including the regional Dozo Chief and his son. They confirmed that they were working closely with the FRCI. They indicated that the FRCI has asked them to be responsible for nighttime security patrols throughout the region. They said that Dozo fighters frequently apprehended people in the course of these patrols, including when they did not have a “valid” identity card. In such circumstances they held the people for only a few hours and then turned them over to the FRCI. They were not aware of any law that gave the FRCI the authority to ask them to play that role. At the same time as describing the close working relationship the Dozo leaders were quick to emphasize that they remained a fiercely independent force and were not in any way controlled by or accountable to the FRCI.

Amnesty International believes that the close cooperation and coordination (including many joint operations) between the Dozos and the FRCI, the support Dozos receive from the authorities in the form of equipment and weapons, the long-standing relationship between the Dozos and those now in power, and the complete impunity the Dozos enjoy, strongly suggests that they are acting as an integral part of the state’s security apparatus. Therefore, Amnesty International considers that there are grounds to believe that the state authorities may be directly responsible for the violations being committed by the Dozos. The authorities should either disband and disarm the Dozos or incorporate them into the formal armed and security forces with proper vetting, accountability, training and a clear chain of command. Nevertheless, those suspected of criminal responsibility for crimes under international law or human rights violations must be brought to justice in fair trials.

Amnesty International has gathered more than 100 witness statements from women and men who survived this massacre in Duékoué and in the neighbouring villages. They all indicate the systematic and targeted nature of the killings committed by uniformed FRCI soldiers and Dozos against Guéré populations. Many people, mostly men, were also killed in their homes during systematic raids on compounds inhabited by Guéré communities. During its investigation in Duékoué in April 2011, the Amnesty International delegation visited several burnt houses and saw charred bodies not yet buried.

A woman who lived in Duékoué told Amnesty International: “On Monday [28 March 2011], the FRCI easily defeated the security forces and their allies, militias and Liberian mercenaries. The latter quickly deserted, abandoning civilians, leaving us without any protection. The next day, the FRCI and the Dozos entered Carrefour neighbourhood. They came into the yards and chased the women. Then they told the men to line up and asked them to state their first and second names and show their identity card. Then they executed them. I was present while they sorted out the men. Three young men, one of whom was about 15, were shot dead in front of me.”

Amnesty International learnt that armed fighters regularly came back during the following days to Duékoué Hospital to look for people wounded from gun shots and that, on one occasion, FRCI elements had fired a bullet inside the hospital to scare medical staff.

Several men were killed after they showed their identity cards. A protestant pastor told Amnesty International: “That Tuesday [29 March], I ran with people from my congregation to seek refuge at the Catholic Mission. When we arrived at the CP II area, they shot at us. My son and two other persons were killed. A few meters further, they arrested me and asked for my ethnic group. I told them that I was a pastor. They then asked me for my identity card, they did not check everything as they were arguing with another inhabitant who was running away. When that person said that he was from the Bété ethnic group,54 they asked him to lie down and they slit his throat. Then they arrested another young man. They looked at his identity card and shot him dead. I took this opportunity to run away.”

Other men belonging to religious congregations were killed and all the churches in the Carrefour neighbourhood were vandalized, looted and burned down.
A Guéré woman told Amnesty International: "On Monday and Tuesday [28 and 29 March 2011], we heard shots everywhere. We went to other houses, then we went to the house of our pastor. They surrounded the house. The pastor opened the door and told them he was a servant of God. They pushed him outside with his congregation and told him to leave because they were going to transform the neighbourhood into a vast cocoa plantation. Before we even left, they had begun to loot the house and the church, then they set fire to it."

A pastor called Jacquemin was killed in his church with one of his congregation. A witness told Amnesty International:

"On Tuesday 29 March, they [Dozos and FRCI armed men] came into our church, the pastor was praying with his congregation. One of them asked him what he was doing and what ethnic group he belonged to. He replied that he was praying and that he was a pastor. The man said: ‘Pastor is not an ethnic group’. Another asked him what party he supported. The pastor replied that his party was Jesus Christ. One of the attackers replied: Why is your party Jesus Christ?' And they killed him. One of his congregation, Arsène, who was with him, was also killed."

Another priest of the Celestial Church of Christ who was still wearing his sacerdotal clothes was killed, along with eight men of his congregation.

In their attempts to flee these massacres, thousands of people, mainly women, tried to enter the Duékoué Catholic Mission. Some of them, mainly men, were killed on their way there. A witness – a woman - told Amnesty International:

"On Tuesday afternoon [29 March 2011], there were a lot of us on the road running away from the rebels. We were on our way to the Catholic Mission when we were arrested. One of the armed men spoke to my uncle, who was retired, and said to him: ‘You, the man, stay here, we are going to kill all the men’. My uncle said to him: ‘Excuse me, my child, do not kill me, what have I done, my child?’ They shot him. I still tremble when I think about it. Many bodies were strewn across the road leading to the church."

Some men and women were killed in their homes after they had put their hands on their head to indicate they were surrendering. One witness said:

"On Tuesday morning, at least nine people, most of them in fatigues, came into our yard. People were afraid, they came out and put their hands on their head. It was just at that moment that they opened fire, killing seven people in our yard, including a woman, Temohin Suzanne, aged 52, and two men, Gbahounou Dominique Ouonmouegnon and Gbahounou Desiré."

Some individuals were killed in front of their parents, sometimes with a knife. The mother of one young man who had his throat cut in front of her told Amnesty International:

"On Monday morning, about 10am or 11am, they came into the yard and fired in the air. My son and I went out, with our hands on our heads. They said they wanted to kill the boy, I began to cry. One of them shouted out that he did not want to kill women: ‘We want the boy. As for the women, we’ll leave them to the dogs. (les femmes, ce sont nos chiens qui vont coucher avec vous)’, and they cut my son’s throat."

Amnesty International also gathered information on cases of rape and other forms of sexual violence committed against women and girls by the FRCI and other armed elements fighting with them. For example, on 31 March, in a village near Duékoué, a girl aged 14 was raped before being killed. A witness said:

"On 31 March, men in fatigues surrounded my ‘campement’ (a house surrounded by a plantation). First they shot me. I fell down, they thought I was dead. Then they surrounded other people. The daughter of a woman, [a girl] aged 14 and who also lived in the camp, was
raped and then killed. She struggled, she screamed, she called for help, to no avail, the other people could do nothing. One of the attackers ripped her skirt and raped her, then shot her and then shot other people."

In another village, several women were raped on 1 April 2011. A rape survivor told Amnesty International:

“When the rebels arrived at the village on Friday 1 April, they fired in the air and chased the men. Some were killed. They pushed the women into a house containing two rooms. They demanded money, one of them lifted my skirt up, stuck his fingers in my vagina and threw me to the ground. One of them put his foot on my hips so I couldn’t move, while a second one spread my legs and a third one raped me. They threatened to kill us if we screamed.”

B. WEAPONS USED IN THE MASSACRES IN WESTERN CÔTE D’IVOIRE

It is not possible with the available evidence for Amnesty International to attribute weapons used in the Duékoué massacre and associated violence to particular international arms shipments. This is for three reasons. First, as noted above, much less is known regarding the composition and origin of specific weapons used by the New Forces than about the arms in service with government forces. When the Duékoué massacre took place, the New Forces had been officially integrated in the FRCI government armed forces created two weeks before (see further below). Second, these forces did not deploy large-calibre easily recognisable weapons during 2011 operations. Third, and not least, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the precise identity of persons and groups responsible for massacres and other grave abuses of human rights during and after the conflict - i.e. the difficulty in differentiating between non-uniformed New Forces units, aligned civilian forces or armed civilian elements acting independently.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the New Forces acquired substantial volumes of weapons and ammunition from the territory of Burkina Faso. This materiel cannot be linked to any one act of violence directed at the civilian population. Moreover, there is some indication that the same types of ammunition in service with the New Forces also proliferated widely among conflicting communities before the resurgence of hostilities in 2011. For example, ammunition recovered from inter-communal violence in the Mont Peko area of western Côte d’Ivoire in 2010, mirrored the types and composition of ammunition in service with New Forces units at the time—despite the fact that the perpetrators were civilians.56

More can be said, however, of 12-gauge shotgun ammunition, which is in widespread service with Dozos and other civilians traditionally carrying shotguns in the region (see the images below). The Carma ammunition factory is situated in Bamako, Mali, but predominates in Côte d’Ivoire as the leading brand of shotgun ammunition.

Local traders based in various parts of the West African region visit Bamako to purchase cartridges. From there, the trade extends into rural Mali and neighbouring countries. One ammunition trader, for example, is based in Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso. His trade involves travel by car to Bamako and frequent visits to Côte d’Ivoire, where he sells cartridges to a number of hardware vendors in the towns of Ferkessédougou and Korhogo. Ivorian traders then transport relatively small quantities, usually of 20 or so boxes, of the cartridges to towns on the border with Guinea and Liberia.57
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It is clear that the supply of shotgun ammunition from Mali to civilians in Côte d’Ivoire is virtually unrestricted and that neighbouring states exercise few controls on the cross-border trade.
VI. ARMED VIOLENCE IN POST-CONFLICT CÔTE D’IVOIRE

One of the greatest challenges to human rights in Côte d’Ivoire remains a plethora of armed security forces with differing allegiances and little centralised command and control.

In March 2011, the new government of President Alassane Ouattara established the FRCI, with the aim of creating a unified army composed of the New Forces and the national army, Forces Armées Nationales de Côte d’Ivoire (FANCI), which supported Laurent Gbagbo. In fact, the new FRCI was mostly composed of personnel of the New Forces who retained the main positions of command.

Given that the New Forces military capacity had previously been split between ten semi-autonomous zones commanders or ‘Comzones,’ the task of establishing effective command and control has been daunting. Reports prior to the 2011 conflict note that the New Forces zone commanders effectively operated a ‘warlord economy’ in northern Côte d’Ivoire, established their own personalised militias and exercised near-complete economic and judicial control over their respective zones. Human rights violations, including summary execution and torture including rape, were frequent in these areas.58

Following success in the January-March 2011 conflict, many zone commanders simply extended their zones of control southwards, assuming responsibility for security in their respective sectors - including in the capital city of Abidjan. In essence, the newly formed FRCI was, at first, more of a loose alliance of semi-independent military commands rather than a coherent military force.

Some leaders of the former Gbagbo regime, numerous members of militia such as the Young Patriots and trained combatants and commanders from the former Forces de défense et de sécurité, have sought refuge in Benin, Ghana, Liberia and Togo following the post-electoral crisis. The UN Group of Experts investigating the arms embargo has repeatedly warned that these groups have been reported to organize and finance military operations that have taken place in Côte d’Ivoire with the recruitment of mercenaries and the purchase of arms and related material.59

Similar opposition groups have reportedly been organizing and planning military operations in Mali and on the border between Mauritania and Senegal, according to the UN Group of Experts.

It noted that armed groups composed mainly of Liberian mercenaries and Ivorian militia had increased the frequency, scope and impact of their attacks against Ivorian security forces and civilians since the end of the 2011 post-electoral crisis, under the direct guidance and with political and financial support and weapons supplied from pro-Gbagbo exiled groups. The UN Group of Experts is investigating whether these armed groups have been using illegal smuggling of natural resources such as cocoa, cashew nuts, gold and timber, as well as an illegal taxation system, for this purpose.60

Below is a partial list published in October 2012 by the UN Group of experts of armed attacks against civilians and security force personnel in various parts of Côte d’Ivoire during February-August 2012.
Annex 7

Chronology of the attacks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Details</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Casualty</th>
<th>Victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/02/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/02/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/06/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/09/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/09/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/09/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/09/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/2012</td>
<td>Attacks against a village</td>
<td>Abidjan</td>
<td>15 violence, 34 injured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There appears to have been something of a ‘free for all’ approach to arms acquisition in the immediate post-conflict period. Many zone commanders seized heavy weapons and ammunition from former government forces and, rather than stockpiling them in a centralised government location, redistributed them to their own militias. This has, arguably, reinforced the military capacity of certain zone commanders (and, potentially, their independence from command structures), which runs counter to the objectives of creating a centralised army under exclusive government control. The trend appears to be evidenced by tensions between former zone commanders and newly installed civilian authorities.61

Reports from March 2011 to-date suggest persistent high levels of armed crime and, notably, numerous incidents of economically motivated or retributive violence on the part of former New Forces units.62 The fact that, during the 2011 conflict, many individuals allied themselves with the New Forces, makes command responsibility a complicated subject.

The priority for the Government of Côte d’Ivoire should be to prevent further human rights violations and abuses, and thus to get effective command oversight of the various armed groups. The challenge is to convert a national armed force based on a series of largely independent units into a coherent body subject to effective, centralised command and oversight. Moreover, since the customs sector is the main institution of state in Côte d’Ivoire responsible for preventing the cross-border movement of weapons and munitions as well as other prohibited and restricted goods contravening international conventions or laws, it is vital that the international community through the UN and the World Customs Organization is encouraged to provide to customs the technical support, training, and appropriate capacity-building advice to rapidly strengthen border control consistent with UN standards for law enforcement officials, including respect for human rights.
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VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As this report and the work of the UN Panel of Experts show, irresponsible and illegal supply of weaponry, munitions and associated equipment reaching parties to conflict in Côte d’Ivoire has continued for over a decade, despite the 2004 UN arms embargo. These arms supplies have contributed to an escalation of the hostilities that has fuelled a pattern of serious violations of human rights and violent crime.

The severe threat to civilians posed by the proliferation and misuse of arms persists. The violence that followed the disputed Presidential election in November 2011 caused the most serious humanitarian and human rights crisis in Côte d’Ivoire since the de facto partition of the country in 2002. All sides to the conflict committed international crimes, including war crimes and crimes against humanity. Hundreds of people were unlawfully killed, women and children were subjected to rape and sexual violence, and people were forced to flee their homes. Yet the flow of conventional arms into the country has continued.

The dire situation in the Côte d’Ivoire underscores the urgency for UN Member States to finalize an effective Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) at the “Final UN Conference” in March 2013. Such a treaty could protect and save lives if the final text of the Treaty contains strong measures to implement a “Golden Rule” requiring all States Parties to stop any international transfer of arms when those arms carry a substantial risk of being used to facilitate grave abuses of human rights or serious violations of international humanitarian law.

If an effective ATT had been in place prior to the UN arms embargo, with wide support from states and containing a Golden Rule, and wide scope to cover all conventional arms including ammunition, parts and components, technology and lethal security equipment, then the irresponsible re-arming of all sides in Côte d’Ivoire could have been prevented or at least much reduced. Moreover, the UN arms embargo could have been better respected if such an ATT had been in place and implemented in most countries.

Moreover, if an ATT also included robust measures to control the activities of intermediaries, such as brokers and transport service providers, the transfers by exporting states and transactions by private arms dealers mentioned in this report would more likely have been properly assessed in advance by the authorities in the states where the dealers, brokers and transport firms reside, operate and hold citizenship. This would have enabled those states to consult the intended supply and receiving states before an export and related transactions were approved, and thus provide another means to help protect human rights and ensure the rule of law in countries such as Côte d’Ivoire.

As a result of the findings in this and its other reports on crimes under international law, including war crimes, and human rights violations and abuses in Côte d’Ivoire, Amnesty International is making the following recommendations:

To the Government of Côte d’Ivoire:

- Ensure that all those suspected of criminal responsibility for crimes under international law or human rights violations or abuses are brought to justice in fair trials before ordinary civilian courts.

- Guarantee that Ivorian authorities promptly execute the warrant of arrest issued by the International Criminal Court against Simone Gbagbo and, as a state party to the Rome Statute, cooperate fully with the Tribunal.

- Immediately suspend, pending investigation, any person in a position of authority suspected of committing violations of international humanitarian or human rights law
since November 2010, including those committed in the Duékoué region, so that they are not in a position to commit further abuses.

- Ensure in law and practice that any forces performing law enforcement functions operate in a manner that is consistent with relevant international standards, including the UN Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, adopted by General Assembly resolution 34/169 of 17 December 1979 and the UN Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement, adopted by the Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Havana, Cuba, 27 August to 7 September 1990.

- Issue clear public instructions to all security forces to comply with Ivorian law and international human rights law and make clear that anyone responsible for ordering, carrying out or failing to prevent human rights violations and abuses, especially those involving extrajudicial execution, unlawful killings, enforced disappearances, torture and sexual violence, will be held accountable for their actions.

- Exercise strict chain-of-command control over their armed forces and hold to account any member of those forces for their actions constituting human rights or international humanitarian law violations, or for allowing others to commit those violations.

- Take immediate action to stop the formal and informal law enforcement and security roles played by the Dozos and ensure that all allegations of human rights abuses committed by Dozo fighters are promptly, thoroughly, and impartially investigated by ordinary civilian courts.

- Continue the disarmament, demobilization and reintegation programme for militia members and other irregular forces; provide it with sufficient financial resources and prioritize the reintegration of fighters into society consistent with international human rights standards and the requirements of transitional justice.

**To the International Community:**

- The Security Council should uphold the existing arms embargo on Côte d’Ivoire and refrain from exempting from the embargo any transfers of military weapons, munitions and related equipment until persistent violations and abuses of human rights have ended.

- Ensure that a special programme based on international law and standards be established by the Government of Côte d’Ivoire with support from international donor governments to institute training and other practical measures amongst all members of the armed forces and law enforcement agencies to prevent and eradicate gender-based violence including sexual violence and violence against women and girls.

- Assist the United Nations Operation in Côte d’Ivoire to take all necessary steps to assist the Government of Côte d’Ivoire in disarming, demobilising and reintegrating combatants and associated armed elements—with an additional emphasis on civilian disarmament, while upholding human rights standards.

- Encourage international donor governments to prioritize security sector reform assistance to the Government of Côte d’Ivoire consistent with international standards, with an emphasis on re-establishing clear lines of command and control and reinstating civilian control over defence and security forces throughout the country.

- Support the World Customs Organization to provide effective technical support, training and appropriate capacity-building advice to rapidly strengthen the border controls of Côte d’Ivoire.
• Urge all Member States of the United Nations make every effort at the forthcoming Final UN Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty to agree a treaty text with strong rules to protect human rights consistent with states obligations under international law and also with robust and transparent control mechanisms to regulate all types of weapons, munitions and related equipment, including munitions, technology and parts and components; and specifically to ensure that the treaty incorporates the following elements:

  o No State shall authorise a transfer of conventional arms where such a transfer would aid or assist in the commission of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes or a consistent pattern of violations of international human rights law constituting crimes under international law;

  o No State shall authorise arms transfers to recipients where there is a real danger, or substantial risk, that those arms would be used to commit or facilitate serious violations of international human rights law or international humanitarian law;

  o All States must carry out rigorous risk assessments against the above legally binding criteria of each proposed arms transfer as part of their national export control system;

  o All States must be required to make risk assessments and if necessary take feasible measures to ensure that conventional arms are not used to commit or facilitate acts of gender based violence, violence against children, transnational organised crime or be diverted to the illicit market or for unauthorised end use;

  o All States must also be required to take feasible measures to ensure that conventional arms are not diverted to the illicit market or for unauthorised end use, including the establishment of systems for reliable end use documentation, control of arms brokering and transport activities, and regulation of the transit and transhipment of conventional arms;

  o Munitions, ammunition, parts and components, military technology and all activities of the international trade in conventional arms must be fully controlled under the treaty;

  o All States must under the treaty establish strong implementation mechanisms including licensing systems, criminal procedures and sanctions, as well as comprehensive and regular public reporting on all their international arms transfers so as to enable democratic scrutiny and help ensure compliance with the treaty;

  o The Conference of States Parties of the treaty must be allowed to review annual reports as well as make amendments to the treaty and if all efforts at consensus have been exhausted and no agreement has been reached, the amendment shall, as a last resort, require for its adoption a two-thirds majority vote;

  o An additional article in the treaty should specifically provide that participation in any protocol to the Treaty is open to all States Parties.
ENDNOTES


2 Paragraph 7 of UN Security Council Resolution 1572, 15 November 2004: Decides that all States shall, for a period of thirteen months from the date of adoption of this resolution, take the necessary measures to prevent the direct or indirect supply, sale or transfer to Côte d’Ivoire, from their territories or by their nationals, or using their flag vessels or aircraft, of arms or any related materiel, in particular military aircraft and equipment, whether or not originating in their territories, as well as the provision of any assistance, advice or training related to military activities. This embargo has since been extended by resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council.


6 France and Côte d’Ivoire have been bound by several bilateral military agreements since independence in 1960, including a general defence agreement signed in April 1961. Within the framework of this military cooperation, French troops were permanently based at Port Bouët, near Abidjan. For its implication during the Ivorian conflict, See Amnesty International, ‘Côte d’Ivoire: Clashes between peacekeeping forces and civilians: Lessons for the future’, AI Index: AFR 31/005/2006.


11 The voluntary nature and the lack of enforceable sanctions impaired the effectiveness of the Moratorium and so the Moratorium was superseded by the ECOWAS Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons, Their Ammunition and Other Related Materials signed on 14 June 2006.
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16 China reports that it did not export weapons, ammunition and related materiel to Côte d’Ivoire following the November 2004 arms embargo and there is no available evidence to suggest the presence of Chinese weapons and related materiel having been imported into the country in violation of the sanctions regime.

17 It is also important to consider the fact that the ammunition may have been manufactured in late 2002, because the cartridges bear only the year of production (2002), rather than the exact month of manufacture.


23 Confidential sources. Location and date withheld.


27 Confidential sources.


30 Confidential interviews with expert observers in Bouaké and analysis of ordnance.

32 The first two main peace accords were the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement signed on 23 January 2003 and under which all parties to the conflict agreed upon a cease-fire and the establishment of a Government of National Reconciliation (GNR) that would set forth the conditions for disarmament. On 30 July 2004 the Accra III Agreement was signed. It included a timetable and framework to re-activate the peace process with a view to ensuring the full implementation of the Linas-Marcoussis Agreement. The parties committed themselves to the commencement of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process, including all paramilitary and militia groups.

33 Confidential interviews with expert observers.

34 Ibid.

35 “The Invisible Commando” was led by a former Ivorian military commander, Ibrahim Coulibaly, nicknamed “IB”, who participated in the attempted coup in 2002.


38 Ibid, annex 6b.


40 Ibid, paragraph 32.

41 Ibid, paragraph 59.

42 For details of the list see ‘Blood at the Crossroads’, 2008, op cit.

43 Ibid, paragraph 40; details of the companies’ ownership and relationships are summarized in Section E of the UN report.


49 Ibid, paragraph 69 in which the details of the arms supplies are listed.

50 Ibid, paragraphs 71 to 74.

51 Ibid, section K of the UN report.

52 Confidential interviews with eye witnesses.

53 Heirs to a thousand-year-old tradition, the Dozos (or “doson”), which in Bambara means “the one who returns to the house after hunting in the forest” are a brotherhood of very powerful and tightly-knit hunters, widely spread around Mali, Guinea, Burkina Faso, Senegal, Niger and Côte d’Ivoire.

54 The Bétés are an ethnic group to which Laurent Gbagbo belongs.

55 For security reasons, the names of the villages where women were raped are not mentioned.

56 Confidential source.

57 Interview with a Bobo-Dioulasso-based trader in Korhogo, Côte d’Ivoire, in March 2010. Confidential source.
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COMMUNITIES SHATTERED BY ARMS PROLIFERATION AND ABUSE IN CÔTE D’IVOIRE

The irresponsible and illegal supply of weaponry and munitions to the warring parties in Côte d’Ivoire has continued for over a decade, despite the 2004 UN arms embargo. These arms have contributed to an escalation of hostilities that fuelled a pattern of serious violations of human rights and violent crime, in particular during the 2011 post-electoral crisis.

The violence that followed the disputed presidential election in November 2011 caused the most serious humanitarian and human rights crisis in Côte d’Ivoire since the de facto partition of the country in 2002. All sides to the conflict committed international crimes, including war crimes and crimes against humanity. Hundreds of people were unlawfully killed, women and children were subjected to rape and sexual violence, and people were forced to flee their homes. Yet the weapons kept flowing.

The dire situation in Côte d’Ivoire underscores the urgency for UN Member States to finalize an effective Arms Trade Treaty at the March 2013 UN conference. Such a treaty could protect and save lives by containing strong measures requiring all states parties to stop any international transfer of arms which carry a substantial risk of being used to facilitate atrocities or grave abuses of human rights. Preventing the international arms trade from repeatedly shattering such societies requires the application of a global treaty with robust rules based upon respect for international human rights and humanitarian law.

Even a strong Arms Trade Treaty is not the complete answer, but its achievement is an essential part of the global solution to achieve a much more secure world for billions of people.