The purpose of the Conflict Mapping Program, as outlined in the preface, is two-fold: to gather reliable information so as to put together an accurate picture of what happened in Sierra Leone and to make the process meaningful for Sierra Leoneans. Initially, on the basis of NPWJ’s experience in other situations, it was determined that there were four main ways in which a report such as this one could be produced, namely:

- Individuals recounting their own experiences;
- Individuals giving an overview of what happened in their area, through their own experience and what they have learnt from others;
- Groups recounting their experiences in a shared environment; and
- Open source materials.

The question facing the program during the conceptual phase was which method to select in order to maximise both the quality of the information gathered and the impact of information-gathering on Sierra Leoneans, given the resources and constraints. The main constraints were limited financial resources; a limited amount of time; the size of the country and lack of ease of movement, including the condition of the roads; and the fact that Sierra Leone experiences torrential rains for six months of the year, making many roads completely impassable.

In addition, each method listed above has its own pros and cons. For example, while the first method involves Sierra Leoneans to the greatest degree, every single person in the country would have to be given an opportunity to tell their story in order to gather enough information to be able to put together an accurate picture of what happened across the country. This would be difficult if not impossible to achieve at the national level for a ten-year conflict with limited resources and limited time. On the other hand, while the last method can also give a very comprehensive picture of what happened across the country, it would have limited to no impact on or involvement of the people of Sierra Leone.

Given these factors, it was considered that the most appropriate method for NPWJ to conduct a Conflict Mapping Program that focused on the whole of the country rather than a limited geographical area was to use information gathered from people in Sierra Leone with a good general overview of the conflict in their area (“key persons”), supplemented with open source materials. In order to maximise community participation, enhance the quality of the information and overcome potential cultural and linguistic barriers, it was considered that the best people to take records from people with an overview were Sierra Leoneans from the same geographical area as the key persons (“Conflict Mapping Recorders” or “CMRs”). In addition, it was considered that in order to enhance community “ownership” of the accountability mechanisms, the Conflict Mapping and Outreach Programs should as much as possible be conducted together. Marrying the sensitisation and

To enhance community “ownership” of accountability mechanisms, Conflict Mapping and Outreach Programs should as much as possible be conducted together.
the documentation processes ensures
that the perception of the communities
reached is not that of being “told” about
the accountability process as something
that happens elsewhere and is relevant to
others, but rather of truly taking part in
it.

While this method was the most
appropriate in the circumstances, it
comes with its own potential drawbacks,
which had to be addressed during the
conceptual phase so as to minimise their
possible impact during implementation.
There are seven major areas of concern
of such importance that failure to
recognise and address them would have
compromised the value of both the
process and outcomes of the program,
described here as “critical areas”. These
are addressed comprehensively in the
following sections, but are worth
discussing briefly here.

The first critical area is the quality of the
CMRs and their ability to draw out
relevant information from the key
person so as to compile a record that
could be used during the analysis phase.
This was addressed through a rigorous
two-fold selection process. In the first
instance, NPWJ outlined the program to
partner NGOs in the regions, often
members of the SCWG, who would
nominate persons they considered
suitable to be CMRs. Following that
initial nomination, NPWJ held a training
session for the potential CMRs,
including a practical exercise in record-
taking, and selected CMRs on the basis
of the results of that training. In
addition, CMRs were trained in
recognising their own potential biases
and how to overcome them and, at the
very least, to identify those biases for the
analysts.

The second critical area concerns the
quality and usability of the records,
which is distinct from the quality of the
person taking the record, although the
two often correlate. This was overcome
by rigorous training in how to take a
record and what information might be
relevant, which included practical
exercises in taking a record before
interviewing the first key person. In
addition, once the first record had been
taken, NPWJ personnel reviewed the
record with the CMR, to point out
potential problems and provide advice
on how to take a more comprehensive
record.\(^2\)

The third critical area is the type of the
key persons interviewed by the CMRs in
terms of the kind of information they
might provide. In order to overcome
this concern, CMRs were provided with
rigorous guidelines and criteria for ideal
candidates for key persons. Once CMRs
had made their initial selection of the key
persons they wished to interview, NPWJ
personnel went through the list with
them and discussed their choices,
suggesting alternatives where the initial
choices were inappropriate.

The fourth critical area is the accuracy of
the information provided by the key
persons. This was addressed by
providing CMRs with guidelines and
training in interviewing and how to take
a record, including the importance of
accuracy and not “making up”
information to fill in gaps, as well as
recognising potential bias in key persons.

The fifth critical area concerns the
accuracy of the information itself. Given
that the conflict ranged over the course
of a decade and many key persons were
either relatively young when events
happened or were relatively elderly at the
time they gave their record, not to
mention the potential effects of post
traumatic stress disorder, even with the
best intentions on the part of both the
CMRs and the key persons there is
always the possibility that people are
mistaken. This was addressed by
reviewing the first factual analysis with
well respected local human rights
activists who were not involved in the
Conflict Mapping Program and who themselves had a good general overview of what happened in a particular District. In addition, it was addressed by providing the factual analysis to other local and foreign experts and by cross-checking the information with open source materials.

The sixth critical area was geographical coverage. In its original conception, the Conflict Mapping Program was to have one CMR per chiefdom, in order to have saturation coverage across the whole country. However, time, financial and logistical restraints meant that this was not possible, as there are 149 chiefdoms across the country, plus the rural Western Area, not all of which are accessible at all times of the year. In order to avoid making arbitrary decisions about which chiefdoms to cut and with a view to minimising the damage to the report as a whole, NPWJ therefore discussed this issue with the Campaign for Good Governance (CGG), the leading human rights NGO in Sierra Leone with human rights monitors in every District, and the SCWG. NPWJ sought their advice on which chiefdoms could be covered by a CMR from a neighbouring chiefdom (termed “linked”) and which chiefdoms were not the scene of a great deal of activity during the conflict and could be cut altogether. In addition, NPWJ discussed with CGG the chiefdoms about which they would be able to provide information, on the basis of their regular human rights reporting work as well as a special human rights violations reporting project they undertook during 2001.

The final critical area related to processing the raw information generated by the project – in short, information management. Failure to secure, store and accurately break down the records into a practical format for analysis would undermine efforts to build an accurate reconstruction of the events described in them. In November 2002, NPWJ together with Sensible Data srl, an Italian IT company specialising in emergency situations, began developing a customised database that would allow the narratives in the records to be broken down into incidents, storing simple information about the incident alongside data about the exact location and date of its occurrence. As soon the first completed records began to be collected in mid May, they entered a process of digitisation. In late June, once all the records were collected, records were broken down into incidents by a team of specially trained database analysts. A thorough system of cross-checking was implemented throughout to maintain the accuracy of information from record through to database.

1. SELECTING AND TRAINING
CONFLICT MAPPING RECORDERS

The gathering of information in the field in Sierra Leone was conducted by national human rights workers or “Conflict Mapping Recorders”, trained and supervised by NPWJ personnel, in communities and villages throughout the country.

1.(a) Selection of CMRs

While the selection of the CMRs in the communities was one of the most important parts of the program, it also presented one of the greatest challenges from a quality control perspective. In this process, NPWJ was very heavily reliant on the judgment and expertise of its collaborating organisations and their representatives, with whom a relationship of trust had been built over the previous two years.

As a system of quality control, NPWJ tried to ensure the collaborating organisations selected their best people to nominate as CMRs, by discussing with the organisations the purpose of the program and providing the following checklist for indicators that people could make good CMRs:
They should have a good level of knowledge about the conflict in their chiefdoms.

- They should have a good level of written and spoken English.
- They should be able to overcome their bias as much as possible.
- They should show willingness and have time for the program, since much of its success lies in the quality of their records.

Following the initial selection stage by local partners, NPWJ held a training workshop at which the final selection was made (see below), based on how the CMR responded to the training and their performance in the practical exercise of taking a record. By the end of April 2003, the selection stage was complete and NPWJ had hired a total of 136 CMRs to cover 146 chiefdoms. Twenty-two CMRs were hired to cover the Western Area, which is a densely populated area to which many IDPs fled during the war. In each District, NPWJ appointed a focal point, who was the main contact person for that District and who assisted with logistical and other arrangements, including bringing the final records to Freetown for review purposes. These CMRs and the focal points represented a broad cross section of civil society and included human rights activists, teachers and others.

1.(b) Training of CMRs
NPWJ conducted training workshops in various locations in the Western Area and in the 12 headquarter towns throughout the country. In order to provide greater participation and information sharing, as well as due to time and logistical constraints, CMRs travelled from their chiefdoms to the headquarter town rather than NPWJ personnel travelling to each chiefdom. In addition, this allowed the focal point to meet every CMR selected and identify possible logistical obstacles. The training was divided into three distinct components: the introductory workshop, the training workshop and the review process.

The first visit, called an “introductory workshop”, was dedicated to meeting with community leaders and collaborative organisations to introduce the program. This session was the final part of the “Training the Trainers” seminar held by the NPWJ Outreach Program and the Special Court Working Group. This placed the Conflict Mapping Program in the context of the Special Court, accountability mechanisms and the difficulties faced in reconstructing accurately the events of the conflict in Sierra Leone. The introductory workshops laid the groundwork for the quality of the CMRs selected, following the considerations outlined above, as well as the relevance of the key persons identified. One of the main aims of this session was to engage the participants, so that over the following days they could identify potential CMRs for the training workshop and compile a list of potential key persons for reviewing at the end of that training workshop. This stage was completed for the whole country by mid April 2003.

The second visit was the “training workshop”, a one-day session composed of sensitisation on the Special Court to ensure that CMRs would be well versed in crimes under international law, in particular those within the jurisdiction of the Court, to enable them to take all the relevant details from their key persons. This sensitisation was followed by a workshop on the Conflict Mapping Program itself, concluding with the selection of Conflict Mapping Recorders to take records from key persons. The training focused on explaining the Conflict Mapping Program, how conflict mapping differs from human rights reporting, how to take a record, what type of information to focus on and discussed the fact that these interviews would be taxing and draining on both
the CMRs and the key persons. The session culminated in practical exercises in record taking. In addition, this stage included training in the crucial first step of selecting appropriate key persons who have a good general overview of the conflict in their area.

On the basis of performance during this training session, including perceived understanding of the process and principles and the quality of the practice record, NPWJ selected a limited number of individuals to work as CMRs. This stage was completed for the whole country in the first week of May 2003.

The third stage consisted of reviewing the first records collected by the CMRs for content and organisation before the final two records were taken from key persons selected by the conflict mapping recorders in consultation with NPWJ. This stage was essential to provide top up training (if necessary), to address problems the CMRs may have encountered, to ensure the quality of the records taken and to ensure that CMRs never felt abandoned. The fact that this process took place after the collection of each CMR’s first record and before the collection of subsequent records enabled NPWJ to undertake a thorough system of quality control on an ongoing basis. This stage was completed for the whole country in June 2003. Thus each location was visited at least three times by NPWJ according to a schedule worked out in advance with local partners, especially the SCWG, and the NPWJ Outreach Program.

The structure of the training was developed by NPWJ in consultation with local partners during October and November 2002 and was reviewed on an ongoing basis to incorporate lessons learnt during the training process. The first round of training commenced in December 2002 in Freetown, followed by further meetings and the training of conflict mapping recorders in the rural Western Area, near Freetown. Although this ran the risk of appearing there was a “Freetown bias”,4 NPWJ selected the Western Area as the first point of entry to enable NPWJ to perfect the conflict mapping training before taking it into the provinces, as logistically it is more difficult to perfect such processes in the provinces. Lessons learned from the training in the Western Area were incorporated into the planning process for the provincial training and in late March 2003, following preparatory work undertaken in consultation with the SCWG and the Outreach program, conflict mapping training began in the provinces.

Partly in consideration of the time frame and the impending rainy season, which starts in May and during which many roads become impassable, NPWJ hired a Sierra Leonean team comprised of the best CMRs from the Western Area to undertake the training workshops and the collection of the first records in some parts of the country. This enabled there to be two conflict mapping training teams working simultaneously in different locations around the country, allowing full coverage of the whole country by the conclusion of the time frame for the gathering of records.

2. KEY PERSONS

The Conflict Mapping Program was primarily based on the scrupulous selection and debriefing of selected individuals (“key persons”) whose profession, role in their community or in the forces involved in the conflict placed them in a position to follow events as they unfolded.

To facilitate proper identification and selection of key persons, CMRs were provided with the following guidelines for characteristics of people who would likely be best suited to being a key person:

- The widest possible overview of the conflict in their area.
They were present in their chiefdom for much of the conflict. Reliability. Trustworthiness. They have a good reputation in their community. They would usually be regarded in their community as a person that others can confide in. Honesty. They are able to pass on their knowledge to the Conflict Mapping Recorders accurately and fully. They are as free from bias as possible or at least are able to recognise their own bias. They will usually be recognised as local community leaders in some respect.

In addition, CMRs were provided with the following list of people who may make good key persons:
- Teachers.
- Doctors.
- Lawyers.
- Counsellors/Social workers.
- Youth Leaders.
- Women’s Movement Leaders.
- Senior Police from the local area.
- Local Magistrates.
- Chiefs.
- Section Leaders.
- Local Commanders from the different fighting factions.
- Any person in the local community who has been able to gain an overview of the conflict through a number of other persons talking to them or through holding some respected and trusted position in their community.

To facilitate and monitor the quality of the records and the key persons selected for interviews, the CMRs were asked to provide a report prior to conducting an interview, in order to maintain the focus of the process and the standard of the key persons selected. These reports covered the following matters:

- Why that key person was selected from their list of potential key persons.
- How the selected key person meets the criteria, for example how and why that key person has an overview of the conflict in that area.
- The nature of the information provided by that key person.
- The key person’s knowledge of the conflict.

Each CMR was to select three key persons in their chiefdom from whom to take a record, based on the time necessary to take a record and the time frame within which the record-taking phase had to be completed. Nevertheless, the main emphasis was on quality and not quantity when identifying key persons to be interviewed. It was therefore the case that fewer key persons were selected for interviewing in some chiefdoms where the scale of the conflict was minimal or where there was a smaller population.

Following these criteria, the Conflict Mapping Program gathered records from 401 key persons across the country, who ranged in age between 19 and 82. Of these, 6.7% were former members of one of the fighting factions; 6.7% were women; and 10.7% had been captured by one or more of the fighting factions and

The most common occupation of key persons was a farmer, most of whom had occupied some position of authority during the conflict (such as Town or Section Chief) and many of whom were members of a fighting faction, most commonly the Civil Defence Forces. Other occupations included Paramount Chiefs, Town Chiefs and other chiefdom authorities, teachers, fishermen, housewives, retired military personnel and civil servants.
3. DATABASE

The information gathered by CMRs from key persons comprised over 400 records, each containing an average of 30 pages, with a total of approximately 5,500 separate incidents, that is, instances of an alleged violation of international humanitarian law or key strategic or other information contained in a record. Given the amount and breadth of information, it had to be collated and stored in such a way as to enable easy search and retrieval in order for it to be used by analysts.

NPWJ therefore entered this information into a database designed specifically for the purposes of analysis according to order of battle and chain of command information. Prior to the completion of the design and programming of the database, typists entered the records in their entirety into digital format. The resulting files underwent rigorous proofreading to ensure they were exactly the same as the record provided by each CMR. These documents then formed the basis of the data entry process and were used extensively during the analysis phase.

For data entry purposes, each record was broken into incidents, which consist of discrete parts of information, usually chronological, containing examples of serious violations of international humanitarian law or other relevant information. Each incident was classified according to what crimes were allegedly committed, who allegedly committed them, what weapons they allegedly used and other pertinent information. To ensure accuracy and consistency in the classification of incidents, NPWJ personnel provided training to data entry operators in the basics of international humanitarian law as well as a manual outlining how different factual scenarios should be classified. To ensure accuracy of the database as a whole and to enhance its effectiveness for analysis purposes, each entry went through a thorough process of checking and cross-checking, to ensure that it was consistent, complete and correct.

4. THE ANALYSIS

4.(a) District level analysis

At the conclusion of the data entry stage, NPWJ’s analysts began piecing together what happened during the 10 years of war in Sierra Leone, using three tools: the database; detailed maps, mostly at District level; and the typed records. The result of this stage, which involved collating and cross-checking vast amounts of information, was a rough outline of what happened in each District during the conflict, highlighting troop movements, chains of command and events, including acts likely to constitute violations of international humanitarian law.

Following this stage, the rough drafts for each District were reviewed in Freetown with field monitors from the Campaign for Good Governance (CGG) responsible for that District. CGG’s field monitors are very experienced human rights activists with an in-depth knowledge about what happened during the conflict in the District for which they are responsible. NPWJ specifically did not hire any CGG field monitors as Conflict Mapping Recorders, so that their experience could be better utilised once the first analyses were done, to ensure that there were no major errors or inconsistencies in the District-level analyses, thus providing a crucial first level of cross-checking.

In addition, over a six month period, NPWJ debriefed a former high-level member of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF), who provided a great deal of information on the inner workings of the RUF and an overview of the conflict since it began in 1991. The hours spent working with this key person yielded a statement of over 100 pages, plus various documents and maps describing the
structure, procedures and geographical locations of the RUF, which were of immense benefit during the analysis phases. A senior Kamajor was also debriefed for the same purposes, although not as extensively.

The process as a whole enabled analysts to piece together the conflict as it happened across time and space and, in particular, to draw out patterns of conduct that may constitute crimes against humanity, namely those crimes committed in a widespread or systematic manner.

4.(b) The first draft factual analysis

Once these stages were complete, experienced analysts began the long process of putting all the information together, which consisted of three stages. First, a “first review” was conducted of the rough drafts, checking for internal sense and consistency. Second, each rough draft went through a more thorough review, addressing potential problems in the analysis, often going back to the original records and maps to clarify issues. Finally, the rough drafts for each District were put together and cross-referenced, which enabled the compilation of the general overview of the conflict. This first stage was based purely on the information gathered in the field and, as such, did not incorporate any information from open sources or other materials.

4.(c) The second draft factual analysis

The primary purpose for open source and other material was to provide background material, cross-check the information gathered from key persons and to fill in gaps where any existed. Nevertheless, it must be emphasised that the main source of information for the facts as analysed in this report was Sierra Leoneans themselves, through the records of key persons gathered by Conflict Mapping Recorders throughout the country. Wherever open sources provided information used in the report, that is noted in a footnote to the relevant portion of the text.

The result of this was the second draft factual analysis, which incorporated all verified information from the first draft, with the addition of open sources and other material that had not been gathered directly by NPWJ in the field, but which was useful for confirming or correcting the data. This second draft factual analysis was then sent to a selected number of “resource persons”, namely Sierra Leoneans and foreigners with expertise in the conflict in Sierra Leone who had agreed to review the information contained in the draft report and help clear up any lingering inconsistencies or unclear information.

4.(d) The legal analysis

While the factual analysis was being perfected with the assistance of resource persons, NPWJ put together a legal
The relevant principles of international humanitarian and criminal law were applied to the information contained in the factual analysis, so as to ascertain what crimes under international law and Sierra Leonean law were committed during the conflict.

The draft of the legal analysis was sent to NPWJ’s network of international law experts, many of whom have had experience working on similar projects, such as the Humanitarian Law Documentation Project in Kosovo, or practicing before international courts or tribunals. These people are to the legal sections what the CGG field monitors and the factual resource persons are to the factual sections.

5. NOTES ON THE REPORT
One difficulty in a country with limited resources is the availability of detailed, comprehensive and up-to-date maps. In Sierra Leone, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs has begun producing detailed maps, which were vital for the analysis of the information gathered during the Conflict Mapping Program. Difficulties were nevertheless encountered because a number of villages mentioned in the records – which span back to 1991 – were completely destroyed during the conflict and, as such, no longer exist. Wherever possible, this report tries to identify the location of such villages based on the information contained in the reports.

Due to the fact that OCHA maps were used in the analysis phase and specially-constructed maps were provided by OCHA as visual aids for the report itself, this report adopts the spelling of place names used on the OCHA maps. If that was not available, this report uses the spelling used in the records. Throughout, the report tries to be as specific as possible about the location of a particular place, adopting the formula of naming first the town or village, then the chiefdom and District, where it is different from the District under analysis. For example, if Peyema is being discussed as part of the factual analysis for Bo District, it will read: “Peyema (Lower Bambara Chiefdom)”; however, it is being discussed as part of the factual analysis for Pejuhun District, it will read “Peyema (Lower Bambara Chiefdom, Bo District)”.

In addition to avoid any possible confusion, the word “Town” was used to distinguish a town from a District, for example, “Pujehun Town”, although “Town” is not an official part of the place name.

Finally, while it may appear counter-intuitive in a report on a conflict in which many victims and perpetrators were named in the media, this reports does not “name names” of either victims or perpetrators. While the case for not naming victims is clear, it was decided also not to name perpetrators, even where they might be considered to be “notorious”. This decision was taken because the allegations made are often extremely serious and would require further investigation before public disclosure could be considered. It must be borne in mind that the information analysed in this report has not been tested to the level required for sustaining a conviction, for example through cross-examination in court, nor have the alleged perpetrators had the opportunity to tell their side of the story or answer the allegations made in this report. Therefore, although some names are well known and the decision not to include them may seem artificial, it was decided that the best approach would be to omit the names of people identified as perpetrators. This does not preclude the naming of notorious figures in the discussion of political events, as they are named as historical figures rather than as people identified as perpetrators.
6. **Partners**

NPWJ would have been unable to complete the Conflict Mapping Program without the support and assistance of a number of partners. First and foremost, the Special Court Working Group, both in Freetown and across the country, was invaluable at every stage of the process from the initial design of the training seminars, to planning the up country trips, to providing us with CMR candidates. They also assisted us in undertaking training on the Special Court, together with the Outreach Program, during the first phases of training of the CMRs.

Another crucial partner was the Campaign for Good Governance (CGG), who provided assistance both as a member of the SCWG and independently. In particular, the CGG field monitors provided vital assistance by going through the preliminary District-level analyses for their District to verify the accuracy of the information and fill in any gaps. CGG field monitors are particularly well placed to undertake this task, as they are based in the District and have been gathering information on human rights abuses for CGG, one of Sierra Leone’s leading and most reputable organisations.

A proper understanding of the movement of forces and how events interplayed would not have been possible without the use of maps provided by OCHA. The illustrative maps contained in the report were produced with the generous assistance of OCHA personnel, who put together District-level maps that contain as many of the places mentioned in the report whose location could be identified.

Special recognition should go to the European Commission, who financed the bulk of our 2002 and 2003 activities in Sierra Leone, including the Conflict Mapping Program.

Finally, the Special Court for Sierra Leone provided much needed co-financing during the analysis stage of the Conflict Mapping Program. It must be emphasised, however, that this assistance was limited to financial assistance only and in no way implies endorsement by the Special Court of any of the material or conclusions, factual or legal, contained in this report.

Indeed, the content and conclusions drawn in this report are the sole responsibility of No Peace Without Justice and cannot be attributed to any of our partners.

*****

The present report does not and cannot mention or even truly reflect the varied range of tasks carried out by all NPWJ personnel in the Conflict Mapping Program or other programs in the project. Nor can it acknowledge fully or exhaustively the wide range of assistance and support given to us by our partners, friends and people we met throughout the country. Rather, the purpose of this report is to provide as comprehensive as possible a picture of what happened during the decade-long conflict in Sierra Leone, analysed over time and space according to chains of command and order of battle information. With this picture, we hope to demonstrate that what happened to the people of Sierra Leone over the course of more than 10 years was a crime – the result of deliberate policies to commit systematic and massive violations of the laws of war.

What happened to the people of Sierra Leone over the course of more than 10 years was a crime – the result of deliberate policies to commit systematic and massive violations of the laws of war.