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OVERVIEW
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Despite a marked improvement in the security situation in Burundi in recent years, some 100,000 internally displaced people (IDPs) remain in settlements throughout the country, in addition to an unknown number living with host families. Many IDPs seem to have to a large extent integrated into the communities of neighbouring towns and villages, but there is little information on their situation, their needs or their aspirations.

In the 1990s, hundreds of thousands of Burundians fled their homes to escape fighting between the government and Hutu rebel groups seeking to put an end to the political dominance of the Tutsi minority. Many others, predominantly Hutus, were forcibly displaced into camps by the government in the second half of the 1990s. Following the signing of a ceasefire between the government and a major rebel group in 2003, as well as the voting into power of a national unity government in 2005, hundreds of thousands of refugees and IDPs returned to their homes.

The last remaining rebel group, the Palipehutu-FNL, signed a ceasefire agreement with the government in 2006, but sporadic attacks continued. In April 2008, heavy fighting between the Palipehutu-FNL and the government occurred in and around the capital, causing the death of more than 30 people and the temporary displacement of many more.

Since 2006, the UN Peace Building Commission has been working with the Burundian government to support post-conflict recovery, including the recovery of people affected by the country’s internal armed conflicts. In a briefing to the Commission, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights said that peacebuilding success could be measured by the successful return and full integration of refugees and IDPs. So far however, the situation of long-term IDPs has not improved markedly. Success in responding to the needs of these people will depend on a coordinated approach as well as on more accurate information on IDPs’ needs and aspirations. OCHA is planning to leave the country in June 2008, and it is important for UNHCR or another agency to take the lead on IDPs.

Background of displacement and political developments

Since the independence of their country in 1962, hundreds of thousands of Hutu and Tutsi Burundians have been killed in massacres carried out by members of the Hutu majority or the Tutsi elite minority. Millions more have at various times fled their homes for fear of the killing. The violence has been fuelled by regional and ethnic tensions, as well as economic inequalities. In 1993, large-scale displacement followed the assassination of the first elected president, Melchior Ndadaye, and subsequent massacres. At first, the majority of IDPs were ethnic Tutsi, particularly in the northern and central provinces, who feared retaliation from neighbours following the assassination of the Hutu president. From 1996, as conflict escalated, both ethnic Tutsi and Hutu found refuge in settlements, especially in the south. The Tutsi-led government also ordered the relocation of hundreds of thousands of (mostly Hutu) civilians into “regroupment camps” twice in the late 1990s, as part of a military strategy against the rebel groups. The number of IDPs peaked in 1999, with over 800,000 displaced, or around 12 per cent of the population (UN CAP, November 1999, p.6).
While regroupment camps were dismantled in 2000 following international pressure, other IDP settlements remained. The same year, a peace agreement was signed in Arusha, Tanzania, by the government, opposition parties and opposition armed groups. Large-scale displacement continued, however, as the army continued to fight two rebel groups which had not joined the peace process. In 2003, the bigger of the two remaining groups, the Forces for the Defence of Democracy-National Coalition for the Defence of Democracy (Forces pour la défense de la démocratie-Coalition nationale pour la défense de la démocratie, FDD-CNDD), signed a ceasefire agreement with the Burundian government. Improved security allowed for the return of tens of thousands of IDPs to their homes (OCHA, 26 May 2005).

A national unity government headed by President Pierre Nkurunziza, a Hutu and former head of the rebel movement FDD, was elected in August 2005 in the first democratic election since the start of the conflict in 1993. The last remaining rebel group, the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People-National Liberation Forces (Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu-Forces nationales de libération, Palipehutu- FNL), fought on before finally signing a comprehensive ceasefire agreement with the government in September 2006. Security improved following the agreement, but worsened again in mid-2007, when the Palipehutu-FNL withdrew from the mechanism established to monitor the ceasefire, alleging bias on the part of the facilitator, a South African minister. In April 2008, the Palipehutu-FNL was brought back to the negotiating table after intense diplomatic pressure from the international community, but continued to fight against the government (ISS, 3 April 2008).

**New displacement**

Since the ceasefire agreement in 2006, several thousand people have been displaced, most of them temporarily, by fighting between government forces (FDN) and the Palipehutu-FNL. The Palipehutu-FNL has mostly caused insecurity in its strongholds of the provinces of Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura Rural. Early in 2008, at least 8,000 people were displaced in the north-western province of Bubanza (IRIN, 14 January 2008). In mid-April 2008, outside the capital, residents were spending the nights in the bush for fear of being caught in Palipehutu-FNL attacks on military positions in and around Bujumbura which killed more than 30 people (IRIN, 23 April 2008).

Several thousand people were temporarily displaced by natural disasters in 2006 and 2007, in particular due to drought leading to food shortages, and floods. In addition, at least 20,000 Burundians who had been living in Tanzania for years without being recognised as refugees have been expelled to Burundi, many of them without a home to go back to (OCHA, 3 October 2007).

**Long-term IDPs**

Some 100,000 people remained displaced as of the end of April 2008. This estimate is based on the last comprehensive IDP survey undertaken by the UN in 2005 (OCHA, 23 June 2005). According to the survey, some 117,000 IDPs were in settlements, many of which had grown to become like villages. This number did not take into account people living with host families, particularly in urban centres and in Bujumbura Rural and Bubanza Provinces. The majority of IDPs were living in the northern and central provinces.

According to a survey on IDPs in southern provinces released by UNHCR in January 2008, the majority of people still in settlements fled armed clashes between 1993 and 2000. Others include those who fled due to natural disasters (floods and drought), returnees from Tanzania, as well as Batwa communities who found better living conditions and access to land in the settlements (UNHCR, 1 January 2008). Except for this recent survey, current information on IDPs in Burundi is only anecdotal. In order to devise durable solutions, the conditions facing IDPs in the
settlements and dispersed in the countryside need to re-evaluated, focusing on their current needs and aspirations.

At least 389,000 Burundian refugees had returned to Burundi by March 2008 (UNHCR, 1 April 2008). Many of them are landless and do not have a home to return to (UNHCR, 31 March 2008). Meanwhile, according to local observers, few long-term IDPs have returned home over the past two years. Many of them have reportedly integrated into communities in neighbouring towns and villages to a large extent, and their living conditions may now be better than prior to displacement. The major exception is women-headed households, which are generally still extremely vulnerable. Remaining obstacles to return or to resettlement include the reported impunity of many who have killed civilians and still allegedly live in the IDPs’ places of origin; continued insecurity and difficult economic conditions in areas of origin; and the high population density of the country (UNHCR, 1 January 2008; OCHA, 26 May 2005, 3 October 2007).

Testimony of Colleta Cimpaye, 54, displaced from her home since 1993, following the assassination of President Ndadaye (ActionAid, 17 March 2008)

“Someone looked out and saw people running towards us with machetes, knives and guns,” Fourteen years later she still lives with her five children in a camp for internally displaced people (IDPs).

“I’ve lost so many people I can hardly count,” says Colleta. “My husband. My brother. His wife. Their children. My sister. Her eight children. We once were 12 brothers and sisters. Now we are only two.”

Physical security

Overall, the physical security of IDPs has improved significantly since the height of the conflict. But IDPs, like other people, remain subject to high level of violence by both armed men in uniform and civilian gangs. Some 80 per cent of households in the capital and in other large towns possess small arms, a significant factor in the continuing high level of violence (UNSC, 27 October 2006; UNDP, November 2004).

The UN estimates that 19 per cent of Burundian adolescent girls and women have been victims of sexual violence (OCHA, 2006, p13). Minors are particularly at risk. In December 2006, 60 per cent of reported rapes were committed against children (AI, 9 October 2007). Both rebel groups and the government have recruited child soldiers, many of them displaced children. Some 3,000 child soldiers were demobilised from 2003 to 2006, but according to a UN report to the UN Security Council, reports of rape, sexual violence, abduction and detention of children and child recruitment by the Palipehutu-FNL increased in 2006/2007 (UNSC, 28 November 2007).

Humanitarian conditions

The humanitarian needs of IDPs are now very similar to those of other vulnerable Burundians. Limitations to their access to basic services are due to financial constraints rather than the fact of having been displaced. Some 600,000 Burundians remain in need of food aid in 2008 (IRIN, 7 March 2008). The first cause of mortality in Burundi is malaria, while respiratory infections and diarrhoea also claim the lives of many children under five. Another leading killer among IDPs and others is HIV/AIDS. In 2006, a new policy of free medical care for all Burundian mothers and children caused existing medical structures to be overwhelmed by a wave of demand. Thanks to significant donor support to this initiative, however, crude mortality indicators then showed some improvement (Burundian MoH, December 2006).
Primary school fees were abolished in 2005, resulting in a 50 per cent increase in enrolment for first graders in all provinces compared to the previous school year. Some 150,000 first graders were left out, as classes were too crowded to accommodate them (OCHA, 2006; UN, 30 November 2006). In 2007, the lack of space in classes and distances to reach schools still limited access to education for many displaced and other children (UNHCR, 1 January 2008).

**Land issues**

Land for most Burundians is not only essential economically – it is the first national economic resource – but also culturally, as the family plot is generally viewed as the symbol of ethnic and family identity. The return of IDPs and refugees to their land is made difficult by existing problems such as the high density of the population, the division of land plots into smaller lots and their poor productivity, and the exploitation of land by new occupants.

While the vast majority of IDPs in Burundi continue to access and cultivate their original land plots, unsolved land issues still complicate the return process of refugees and, to a lesser extent, of IDPs. The value of land has gone up following the improvement of insecurity, and rich individuals have bought more land, while the land available to returning IDPs and refugees has become more scarce (Mbura Kamungi et al., June 2005). IDPs also often face the theft of their crops, due to the distance between the settlements and their fields (UNSC, 18 December 2006).

Land ownership in displacement areas is especially complicated. The majority of IDPs live on state-owned, private or church-owned property, and the status of the IDPs on these properties remains unclear (UNHCR, 1 January 2008). This has led to disputes with the original owners, for example when repatriated refugees find IDPs settled on their land. In order to deal with land and property issues resulting from years of conflict, the Burundian government set up a National Land Commission in July 2006. According to local accounts, the Commission has started to deal with individual complaints, but so far it has solved very few cases.

**National and international response**

A Directorate General for Repatriation, Resettlement and Reintegration of Displaced and Repatriated Persons was created at the Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender in March 2006 (IDD, 3 June 2006). The Ministry also supervises PARESI, a UNHCR-financed project which provides basic housing and infrastructure to returning IDPs and refugees, as well as to Burundians expelled from Tanzania. According to local observers however, the government is aware of the situation of long-term IDPs, but does not seem to have made the issue a priority.

The UN Resident Coordinator / Humanitarian Coordinator for Burundi is responsible for ensuring a strategic and coordinated response to internal displacement in the country. He also heads the UN Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB), which was established in January 2007, after the mandate of the peacekeeping mission in the country ended. OCHA is currently the focal point on IDP issues, but it is expected to leave Burundi in June 2008. It is not clear at this point whether UNHCR or any other agency will then take the lead on IDPs. In practice, most IDP-related activities undertaken by UN agencies and NGOs are integrated into general humanitarian programmes addressing food security, health, psycho-social assistance, housing and education.

In July 2007, a Steering Commission for the Repatriation and Reintegration of Returnees was established in Burundi. The Commission comprises representatives of four ministries, donors, BINUB, UNHCR, WFP and UNICEF, with OCHA and UNDP providing its secretariat. The Commission aims to provide a coherent and integrated response to the basic needs of the returnees and displaced and expelled persons, as well as the needs of the host communities, including the promotion of cohesion and reconciliation (UNSC, 23 November 2007).
NGOs including Ligue ITEKA, Search for Common Ground, Global Rights, Accord and NRC provide legal support and conflict mediation for IDPs and returning refugees to solve land issues in a peaceful way.

Having assessed that Burundi no longer faced an acute humanitarian crisis, the government and the UN agreed not to launch a Consolidated Appeal Process for Burundi in 2008 (UNSC, 23 November 2007). The main source of funding to improve the situation of IDPs and returnees is now the UN Peace Building Commission (PBC), created in 2006. The UN Secretary-General approved the allocation of $35 million for Burundi, based on the “Strategic Framework for Burundi” endorsed in June 2007 (UNSC, 17 May 2007; PBC, 22 July 2007). In a briefing to the PBC, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Louise Arbour, said that peacebuilding success could be measured by the successful return and full integration of refugees and internally displaced persons (UNGA, 30 May 2007). One of the key objectives of the Strategic Framework is to find “sustainable solutions to the land issue and to socioeconomic recovery of populations affected by the war and conflicts,” and the Peacebuilding fund will contribute $2 million to projects for their recovery (Government of Burundi/UN, 31 December 2007). Whether these projects will make a difference in IDPs’ lives remains to be seen.

(May 2008)

IDP estimates 1999 – 2004

- UN OCHA IDP estimated that 281,600 IDPs were living in camps in 2003
- An additional 100,000 or more were estimated to live with host families, public buildings or in the bush
- Decrease of IDP population in sites from 281,628 in 2002 to 145,034 in 2004
- An additional 30,000 to 40,000 were temporarily displaced every month as of late 2004


OCHA 15 August 2003, p6:
“Further IDPs have been temporarily displaced from their homes for short periods of time and are not included above. IDP figures exclude a possible further 100,000 IDPs, and possibly more, dispersed following the closure of some regroupement camps in 2002 and who may not have been able to return to their homes.’

SCF 16 August 2001:
"According to the NGO Save the Children Fund (SCF), the bulk of dispersed IDPs live in Bujumbura Rural."

UNICEF 29 May 2002
"UNICEF reported in May 2002 that there were 180,000 IDP children in camps."

UN estimated that 100,000 people are affected every month by temporary displacement (Nov 02)

OCHA 19 November 2002:
"The intensification of conflict, particularly in Bujumbura Rural and the border provinces, has led to increased temporary displacement affecting up to 100,000 people every month.

Over 109,720 people are displaced in Bujumbura Rural alone, while a further 20,000 have been forced from their homes in Ruyigi and Makamba. Such temporary displacement, sometimes forced by military action, has in some cases lasted months, severely disrupting all aspects of life for the population, diminishing or destroying their small reserves and placing additional strains upon already vulnerable host populations."

**2003**

*In September 2002, UNFPA did a socio-economic survey on IDPs in Burundi. Preliminary results available in January 2003 stated that the total number of IDPs in camps was now 281,052, down more than a hundred thousand from July 2002.*

*OCHA, 14 March 2003: In March 2003, UN OCHA reported a total of over 525,000 IDPs in the country, of whom 387,499 were registered in 226 sites (and more than 800,000 Burundians living as refugees in the region).*

*OCHA, 3 June 2003: In June 2003, UN OCHA adopted the same IDP figure reported by UNFPA in January 2003: 281,000 IDPs in permanent sites, and another 100,000 temporarily displaced every month.*

According to UNFPA's draft survey,

*UNFPA Draft, 2003, p11: "Parmi les 106.417 individus que OCHA-UNICEF-PCAC ont de plus que nous, 26.553 personnes (soit ¼) constituent la population des sites des déplacés que nous avons exclus du recensement du fait qu’ils étaient soit démantelés, soit des sites de nuit, soit des sites de rapatriés ou d’une autre nature comme celui de Buterere. Le reste (79.868 individus,soit ¾) pourrait s’expliquer par la surestimation éventuelle des chiffres par certains responsables administratifs et chefs de site pour la raison évoquée plus haut."*

**2004**

*OCHA August 2004:*

"The IDP population has decreased dramatically from 281,628 displaced persons living in 230 sites in 2002 to 145,034 persons in 170 sites in 2004. In other words, half of the IDP population returned to their zones of origin within this two-year period, with the most accelerated rate of return taking place between late 2003 and early 2004 following significant improvements in the political and security situation in the country."

**RÉSUMÉ DU PROFIL EN FRANÇAIS**
CAUSES AND BACKGROUND

Conflict and displacement: background and development

Ethnic background and pre-colonial times

- Total population: 7.1 million
- Composite population comprising Hutu (85%), Tutsi (14%) and Batwa (1%)(colonial census)
- Numerous interrelations between the ethnic groups (marriage, language, common monarchy)
- The Batwa are most likely the most ancient ethnic group in Burundi but they are marginalized in Burundi society

AFP 25 February 2005:
“GEOGRAPHY: Landlocked in central Africa, bounded by Rwanda in the north, Tanzania to the east and south, and the vast Democratic Republic of Congo to the west. One of the smallest states on the African continent, Burundi covers 27,834 square kilometers (10,747 square miles).

- POPULATION: 7.1 million, of which around 85 percent are Hutu and 14 percent Tutsi. The remaining one percent of the population are pygmies called Twas. One of the most densely populated African countries.

- CAPITAL: Bujumbura (population 300,000)

- LANGUAGES: Kirundi (national), French (administrative), Swahili (local)

- RELIGION: Christian (70 percent); Animist (15 percent); Muslim (15 percent).”

UN Commission on Human Rights 28 November 1994, paras. 15-17:
“Burundi is situated in Central Africa, along Lake Tanganyika and shares borders with Rwanda, Tanzania and Zaire. […] According to statistics dating back to the 1930s, 85 per cent of the population are Hutu, 14 per cent Tutsi and 1 per cent Batwa. The Hutu are considered to originate from Chad and the Niger, while the Tutsi, of Nilo-ethiopian origin, are thought to come from eastern Africa. The Batwa originate from the Congo Basin (Pygmies). This breakdown does not take into account the Ganwa (those of princely origin), nor a handful of other immigrant communities, nor those of mixed origins (mixed marriages having been common in the past). […] It also does not take into account the fact that within both groups there existed historically rankings of status nor that passage from one group to another, for instance becoming Tutsi from Hutu or Ganwa, was also possible. The Burundians all speak the same language, Kirundi, which is both the national and the official language. Other languages, as provided for in the Constitution, are also spoken. […] Despite ethnic differences, the Burundians live intermingled on the thousands of hills of the country without distinction on account of ethnicity. They are therefore inextricably bound to one another and cannot contemplate any notions of separation.

Although settlements have always been mixed, society in Burundi […] was built along a ‘class’ and ‘caste’ system. […] While their distinctions were not rigidly determined along ‘ethnic’ or ‘tribal’ lines, […] there was significant correlation between class and ethnicity, with the Tutsis associated with the upper class and the Hutus with the lower class. This did not mean that all Tutsis were
upper class nor all Hutus lower class. Both class and the ethnic correlations were also dynamic. A Hutu could rise economically and socially and become a 'Tutsi'.

Hutu and Tutsi relationships were in the past cemented by their shared loyalty to common institutions. Kingship was such an institution; patron-client ties constituted another powerful socio-political institution. Patrons were expected to offer protection and gifts in exchange for services and offerings in kind. As social and political roles that once gave meaning and cohesion to membership in the community vanished, the use of the terms 'Hutu' and 'Tutsi' with ethnic connotations became more rigid. [...] Today the use of the term 'Hutu' describes an ethnic group which is poorer and powerless, whereas the Tutsi, especially the Hima (a Tutsi subgroup), are the pre-eminent power holders. [...] Nevertheless, the impression should not be created that the terms 'Hutu' and 'Tutsi' are figments as the "official truth" during the Bagaza period (1976-1987) would have it. This stance restricted discussion on the underlying problems of ethnicity and expression of ethnic differences without solving them."

CHR 19 March 2001, para. 100:
"La situation de la minorité twa mérite une attention particulière que malheureusement elle ne reçoit pas toujours. Les Twas sont sans doute le noyau le plus ancien de la population burundaise, comme dans d'autres pays des Grands Lacs; ils constituent aujourd'hui environ 1 % de la population."

Colonial rule and military regimes (1899-1992)

- 1962: Burundi becomes independent
- 25 years of a Tutsi dominated military dictatorship
- The roots of the conflict lie in unequal distribution of economic resources and political power
- 1980: creation of the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People (Palipehutu) by activists from the Burundian Hutu refugee community in refugee camps in Tanzania

UN Commission on Human Rights 28 November 1994, paras. 19-24:
"The transition from traditional power structures to 'modern' politics has by no means been an easy one. Two Ganwa (princely) dynasties continued fighting for control during the era of the colonial Powers, (first Germany from 1889 to 1918, then Belgium until 1962) as they had done during the pre-colonial era. The Party of Unity and National Progress (Uprona) was dominated by the Ganwa Bezi, while the Christian Democratic Party (PDC) was led by the Ganwa Batare. In the legislative elections of September 1961 Uprona won, with Prince Rwagasoré as Prime Minister designate. A month later, however, Rwagasoré was assassinated. The political game switched from Ganwa to Hutu and Tutsi hands for the first time.

Burundi gained its independence from Belgium in July 1962. Until 1966 the crown continued to stabilize the situation. Violent incidents erupted after the elections in 1966, following which the Prime Minister, Michel Micombero, a Tutsi of the Hima group from Bururi, [...] overthrew the monarchy and declared a republic, concentrating power in the army. The National Assembly was dissolved and later replaced with a committee of officers, which, by 1971, was made up of 24 Tutsi and 3 Hutu, and Uprona was declared the sole party. Serious intra-Tutsi rivalries for power emerged. At this time Hutu were already being systematically purged from the army. The transition from a Ganwa-run kingdom to a Tutsi-dominated military dictatorship to the exclusion of Hutus caused more violence. For the next 25 years Tutsi factions fought over control, turning the Hutu into scapegoats whenever the Hutu would rise up and demand more equitable power-
sharing. On the other hand, whenever efforts towards power-sharing were made, extremists from both groups would resort to violence, to delay or cancel them.

Massacres had taken place in 1965 and 1967, but the most serious ones took place in 1972 triggered by Hutu militants from the Burundian refugee community in Tanzania. Hundreds if not thousands of Tutsi were killed and there is widespread fear that what had happened to Rwanda’s Tutsi, namely, systematic subjection and extermination, would happen to them too. The Tutsi retaliation and repression that followed were instant. The first victims were Hutus with education: secondary school and university students, teachers, nurses, doctors, priests, pastors, drivers, headmasters, businessmen, shopkeepers, civil servants, bank clerks, professors. Most Hutu families lost members. Hutu widows moved to the city outskirts when their houses were seized by Tutsi. Many Tutsis also fled. Many left the interior, where they felt frightened among Hutu neighbours, and moved to Bujumbura to fill the many jobs now vacant. Others rushed to occupy the flat, fertile, palm-oil-producing strip of lake shore south of Bujumbura, after the flight of very many Hutu who had been living there. Reports have spoken of genocidal acts and of hundreds of thousands of Hutus killed. […]

These events had great reverberations in Burundi; yet, nothing was ever done about the massacres. There has never been an official inquiry into them, an accounting, or any effort to bring to justice those responsible for the killings. Thereafter there was no question of Hutus entering the army, and many refused to send their children to school, fearing they were exposing them to a future massacre. Those at school had no role models. The educated, competent, urbane were all Tutsi. That there was a "lost" Hutu generation is still evident today in the political life of the country.

There was little power-sharing following the massacres, even after Micombero was overthrown by his deputy chief of staff, Colonel Jean Baptiste Bagaza, also a Hima (Tutsi subgroup). There were no massacres during Bagaza’s 11-year rule and many refugees returned home. Bagaza reportedly hoped development would push his country through the ethnic deadlock. Observers note that he engaged in a series of reforms, without, however, addressing the ethnic issue. […] All provincial governors were Tutsi and most judges, university and school teachers, magistrates and heads of hospitals were Tutsi too. Upronca remained a Tutsi party and its members were the ones to benefit mostly from Bagaza’s management of the economy. In the last years of the Bagaza regime corruption and nepotism reportedly flourished. […] In the meantime, in 1980 activists from the Burundian Hutu refugee community formed the Palipehutu, or the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People, in refugee camps in Tanzania. Bagaza was himself deposed in 1987 by a group of army officers and a cousin of his and nephew of Micombero, Major Pierre Buyoya, became President.

In August 1988 frustrated Hutu hopes for an improvement were at the root of hundreds of ethnic killings. Thousands were killed. This time the regions most affected were Ntega commune in Kirundo province and Marangara commune in Ngozi province, both bordering Rwanda. Palipehutu members from Rwanda had been infiltrating into Burundi and sporadic fights were taking place until Hutus turned against the Tutsi community, many of them Rwandan refugees. The army pursued those assumed responsible (although it is unclear how much resistance these people who had no guns put up against the soldiers) […] and in the next eight days it reportedly killed large numbers of civilians, including women and children. More than 60,000 people poured into Rwanda across the swamps and the Akanyaru river. Others took refuge within Burundi in swamp areas. The massacres were surprising even to the Burundians. Hutu had to face the fact that the army was still prepared to use maximum force and Tutsi that Hutu could still massacre many Tutsi before soldiers reached the scene.”

ACTS 30 September 2004:
“Despite the popular conception of the conflict as a Hutu-Tutsi struggle, most scholars agree that the protracted conflict is structural in nature, though articulated in ethnic terms. The roots of the conflict lie in unequal distribution of economic resources and political power.’ Governance practices by successive regimes galvanized political power and state control in the hands of a small elite group within the Tutsi community from particular parts of the country, who have since sustained their hold on power through repressive policies. Efforts by the Tutsi elite to retain political control and associated patronage networks, and violent counter-strategies of the Hutu political and armed groups have precipitated ethnic massacres and retaliatory radicalism marked by acts of genocide.”

Civil war and Peace Process in Burundi (1993-2008)

- 1993: Assassination of elected President Ndadaye triggers large-scale inter-ethnic violence
- 1996: Coup installs President Buyoya; sanctions imposed by neighbouring countries
- Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi signed in August 2000
- 2005: signing of ceasefire agreement between FNL and government; adoption of new constitution
- Local, legislative and presidential elections was held in various phases in 2005
- Security sector was profoundly restructured and the army is now ethnically balanced (2006)
- Old tensions between Hutu and Tutsi parties were eclipsed by new ones between predominantly Hutu parties – CNDDFDD and FRODEBU – whose bitter campaign rivalry was marred by violence (2006)As of April 2008: the FNL had withdrawn
- from the 2007 Joint Verification and Monitoring Mechanism established to implement the 2006 Comprehensive Ceasefire Agreement

AFP 1 June 2005, factfile:
“The civil war begun in 1993 has killed an estimated 300,000 people.[...]

Melchior Ndadaye, the first Hutu president, elected in June 1993, was assassinated on October 21 of the same year during a failed coup organized by Tutsi military officers.

His successor, Cyprien Ntaryamira -- another Hutu -- was killed in April 1994 at the same time as then Rwandan president Juvenal Habyarimana died under suspicious circumstances when his plane was shot down over Kigali, sparking the genocide of up to a million Tutsis and Hutu moderates in Rwanda.

Ntaryamira's successor, Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, also a Hutu, was overthrown in a non-violent coup in July 1996, and [Pierre " Buyoya returned to power.

In 1998, Buyoya reformed the constitution to create a transition government and began peace talks with Hutu and Tutsi opposition groups.

In August 2000 a peace agreement including a power-sharing deal was signed in Arusha, Tanzania, but the two main armed rebel groups refused to participate in the talks. Civil war continued to rage.

In November 2001, Buyoya took over as transitional leader for a period of 18 months, seconded by a Hutu vice-president whose signature is required on all presidential texts pertaining to security and the armed forces.
A 26-member power-sharing government was also sworn in to oversee the three-year transition. Buyoya was succeeded at the head of the transition government in May 2003 by his vice president Domitien Ndayizeye, who is seconded by a Tutsi, Alphonse Marie Kadage.

A ceasefire agreement was signed in December 2002 by the government and the main Hutu rebel movement, the Forces for the Defense of Democracy (FDD), which finally entered government in November 2003.

A second Hutu armed group, the National Liberation Forces (FNL), finally signed a ceasefire agreement with the government on May 15, but the details of how this be implemented have still not yet been resolved.

A new constitution was adopted at the end of February, aimed at bringing about a peaceful democracy and ending the reign of the Tutsie tribe in power. Opposition has been voiced only by Tutsis concerned at losing too much power."

**HRW 4 November 2005:**
“Elections in 2005 were the final chapter in the transitional process established by the Arusha Accords of 2000. In the intervening period a government including the Hutudominated Front for Democracy in Burundi (Frodebu), the Tutsi-dominated National Unity and Progress Party (Uprona), and a number of smaller parties ruled the country. In late 2003 this government signed the Pretoria Protocol making peace with the CNDDFDD and starting the process of integrating the former rebels into the army and the administration."

For more detailed information on 1993 events, see "Profile in displacement" (Report of the Representative of the Secretary General, Mr. Francis M. Deng, 28 November 1994), paras. 29-36) [External link]

**ICG 30 November 2006:**
“In elections held between June and August 2005, the voters of Burundi elected their first democratic government since 1993. This marked an end to the transitional government established by the Arusha Agreement in 2001. The mainly Hutu former rebels of the National Council for the Defense of Democracy-Forces for the Defense of Democracy (CNDD-FDD), led by Pierre Nkurunziza, won a resounding victory and hold 58 per cent of the seats in parliament and 57 per cent in the communal councils, as well as twelve of the twenty government ministries. Nkurunziza was inaugurated as president on 26 August 2005.

The elections radically reconfigured politics. Old tensions between Hutu and Tutsi parties were eclipsed by new ones between predominantly Hutu parties – CNDDFDD and Front for Democracy in Burundi (FRODEBU) – whose bitter campaign rivalry was marred by violence. In the run-up to the elections, rebel forces were integrated into the national army, police and intelligence service. For the fist time in Burundian history, these forces were ethnically balanced. Nkurunziza’s government faced considerable challenges. Foremost was the process of transforming the CNDDFDD from a rebel movement into a democratic political party in power – one whose members had little civil administration experience. The government had to reconstruct an economy devastated by more than a decade of civil war and economic embargo, during which per capita income fell by 35 per cent and the number of people living below the poverty line doubled. During its first year it also had to deal with security problems in the capital and surrounding provinces caused by the remaining rebel group, the Palipehutu-FNL. Unfortunately, the government’s response to these challenges has increasingly manifested itself in disregard for the rule of law."

**UNSC 28 November 2007:**
“The signing of the Comprehensive Ceasefire Agreement between the Government of Burundi and the armed group Palipehutu-Forces nationales de libération (FNL) led by Agathon Rwasa on 7 September 2006 was a decisive step in the peace process in Burundi. However, its implementation remains difficult owing to persisting disagreements among the parties. The Agreement, which was the outcome of determined efforts of regional States united under the auspices of the Regional Initiative for Peace in Burundi, addresses a number of issues including the integration of FNL ex-combatants into the Burundian National Defence Forces (FDN) and security forces, the participation of FNL elements in the institutions of the country and the rapid demobilization and reintegration of children associated with this armed group into their respective families and communities. Under the Comprehensive Ceasefire Agreement, the Joint Verification and Monitoring Mechanism was established to oversee the demobilization of FNL combatants. The signing of the Agreement was followed at first by a significant improvement in the security situation, characterized notably by a decrease both in the number of abuses perpetrated by armed groups and in the number of alleged FNL militants arrested by the National Defence Forces and the National Police of Burundi.”

PBC, 19 March 2008:
“[T]he Palipehutu-FNL had withdrawn from the 2007 Joint Verification and Monitoring Mechanism established to implement the 2006 Comprehensive Ceasefire Agreement. In response, a Political Directorate had been established to assist the Mechanism in efforts to regain FNL's participation.”

IRIN, 14 January 2008:
“The FNL, the last rebel movement still active in Burundi, has resumed fighting government forces, especially in the provinces of Bujumbura Rural and Bubanza, where it is most active.

Though the movement signed a ceasefire accord with the government in September 2006, it has not been fully implemented. The joint verification and monitoring mechanism, which oversees its implementation, suspended activities in July 2007 after the FNL delegates walked out of talks over security concerns. They have since been accusing the facilitator, South African safety minister Charles Nqakula, of bias.”

ISS 3 April 2008:
“After intense diplomatic pressure from regional governments and the international community Burundi’s last rebel group, the Palipehutu-FNL, has been brought back to the negotiating table that drew up a new roadmap designed to end the standoff by the end of June 2008. This breakthrough was reached in a February 23 meeting in Cape Town, South Africa. The meeting was attended by special envoys to Burundi from Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa, as well as representatives of the African Union, the European Union, the United States of America and the United Nations.

The Cape Town meeting had been called to save the Burundi peace process after the FNL withdrew from its implementation, alleging bias on the part of the facilitator, South Africa’s Security Minister Charles Nqakula. To help address this challenge Minister Nqakula has followed the example of other peace processes by establishing a Group of Special Envoys for Burundi (GSEB), representatives of the African Union, the European Union, the United States of America and the United Nations.”

Delrue August 2006:
“The success of Burundi’s transition to peace hinges on how its new government (elected in August 2005 and headed by former rebel leader Pierre Nkurunziza) and the international community deal with such post- displacement issues as land and property claims, reconciliation and transitional justice.
The link between displacement, return, reconciliation and successful transition towards a consolidated peace is frequently either underestimated or neglected by the international community.

For a comprehensive analysis of the political situation in Burundi, see

HRW, 12 March 2008:
“Several opposition politicians have been threatened and targeted for violence during the last 18 months. Nzomukunda, then second vice-president of the republic, fled Burundi in September 2006 after issuing a letter critical of the government; she returned in March 2007. Five parliamentarians from the opposition party Front for Democracy in Burundi (Front pour la Démocratie au Burundi, Frodebu) and from a dissident wing of the CNDD-FDD, including Mpawenayo, were targeted in a set of grenade attacks in August 2007 that injured several bystanders. Pancrace Cimpaye, Frodebu spokesperson, was detained after suggesting the ruling party bore responsibility for the August attacks; after being released, he briefly left the country. In February 2008, a local Frodebu official was killed, while another was seriously injured in a grenade attack which killed his wife and child.”

See also:
IRIN, BURUNDI: Government of consensus formed, 15 November 2007 [Internet]

ICG, 28 August 2007, Burundi: Finalising peace with the FNL [Internet]


Secretary-General welcomes signing of Burundi ceasefire agreement, United Nations Secretary General, 8 September 2006 [Internet]

Progress in regard to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme (2005-2008)

- Reform of the security sector – particularly the military and the police – has been central to the conflict and its resolution because the security institutions have been historically responsible for large scale human rights abuses and widespread political repression
- About 5,000 UN peacekeepers were in Burundi from June 2004 to the end of 2006, to monitor the country's transition to democracy, with South Africa contributing the majority of troops.
- The new Burundian government saw the peacekeepers as an occupation force, one that should leave the country as soon as possible (2006)
- A new UN Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB) continued the process of peace consolidation and of coordinating the UN system's activities in Burundi from 2007

ISS 13 October 2006:
“In Burundi, reform of the security sector – particularly the military and the police – has been central to the conflict and its resolution because the security institutions have been historically responsible for large scale human rights abuses and widespread political repression. The Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement, signed in August 2000 by 17 political parties, the National
Assembly and the government and the 2003 ceasefire agreement between the Government of Burundi and the principal rebel group, the Conseil national pour la défense de la démocratie – Forces de défense de la démocratie (CNDD-FDD), do include important provisions on the organization, structure, mandates and composition of postconflict security forces that will act professionally and apolitically, adhere to human rights norms, and provide defence and security to all Burundians.[…]

Although the Arusha Accords were signed in August 2000, the implementation of the security sector reform process they articulate was largely delayed until 2003, mainly because of continued warfare throughout most of Burundi. Indeed, the most active rebel movements in the field were marginalized throughout the Arusha negotiations and were thus not signatories to the Accord. Accordingly, it was not until the signing of a ceasefire between the government and the main rebel group – the CNDD-FDD – in 2003 that the reform process was set in motion. By July 2006, however, the reform of the defence and security forces had reached an advanced stage and had achieved most of its structural objectives (i.e. the integration of several armed groups into a single military and single police force), despite various financial- and material-related challenges.

The process of integrating the former rebel groups and the FAB into a new national defence force, the Forces de Défense Nationale (FDN), has been completed – largely to the satisfaction of the government and international donors – despite its late start due to disagreements on the definition of combatant and on the harmonization of rank between the rebel movements and the regular army.[…]

Despite this progress, a preliminary assessment of the reform of the FDN and the PNB and progress in the domain of social and economic reintegration and re-insertion of former combatants suggests that serious challenges remain in these critical areas. The local media frequently report human rights violations perpetrated by on-duty military or police or by demobilized combatants."

Tufts University 30 July 2006:
“The new Burundian government saw ONUB as an occupation force, one that should leave the country as soon as possible. This perception was aggravated by two unfortunate choices made by leaders of the UN mission: to support Frodebu and former President Ndayizeye during the electoral campaign and proposing to coordinate the transition from humanitarian aid to development through a “Partners Council” deliberating without the government.”

UNSC 18 December 2006:
“Meanwhile, as delays in the start of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of FNL combatants have continued, criminal activities against the population, reportedly committed by FNL combatants, have increased since late October. Skirmishes between the national security forces and alleged FNL combatants and detentions of FNL elements and supporters have reportedly resumed in the north-western provinces. FNL recruitment, including of youths, has also been reported, particularly in Bubanza and Bujumbura Rural provinces.[…]

Once deployed, the AU special task force would therefore be expected to assume the responsibilities that were allocated to ONUB under the ceasefire agreement, namely: (a) protection of designated assembly areas for FNL combatants; (b) provision of engineering, logistical and administrative support for the establishment of the assembly areas; (c) disarmament of combatants; (d) storage of weapons collected from the disarmament process and their subsequent destruction; (e) transportation of disarmed FNL combatants from assembly areas to the designated demobilization centre or integration facilities of the National Defence Forces; and (f) protection of the demobilization centres. […]
Further delays in the agreement’s implementation, in particular the disarmament, demobilization and reintegation of FNL combatants, are likely to lead to more friction between these combatants and the population and the national security services. In addition, there was an increase in localized conflicts involving the small FNL faction led by Jean Bosco Sindayigaya, which did not sign the ceasefire agreement.

DPKO 20 December 2006:
“A new United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB), authorized by Security Council resolution 1719 earlier this year, will continue the process of peace consolidation and be in charge of coordinating the United Nations system’s activities in Burundi for an initial period of one year.”

The mandate of BINUB is extended until 31 December 2008 (UNSC, 19 December 2007).

See also:
Institute for Security Studies (ISS), 31 Aug 2006
A technical analysis of disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration - a case study from Burundi [Internet]


- Peace Building Commission approved in December 2007 a jointly developed monitoring mechanism to regularly review progress in its implementation

UNSC 18 December 2006, para.22:
“Significant progress has been made in the establishment of peacebuilding coordination mechanisms between the Government and the United Nations. On 7 November, the Government created an Inter-Ministerial Peacebuilding Steering Committee, which will work with the United Nations, within the framework of an initial joint mechanism, in preparing the December meeting of the Peacebuilding Commission and the peacebuilding priority plan to be submitted to the Peacebuilding Fund. The inaugural meeting of the Government-United Nations joint mechanism was held on 16 November [2006], followed by several sessions at the policy and working levels. As a result, a common understanding was reached on the steps to be taken by the Government, with United Nations support, to secure resources from the Peacebuilding Fund. Progress was also made in developing the Government's presentation to the December meeting of the Peacebuilding Commission. The mission of the Peacebuilding Support Office to Burundi in mid-November [2006] and the meetings it had with the United Nations and the Government's Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee contributed significantly to this process.”

UNGA 5 December 2007:
“With a long-awaited conflict-recovery and development strategy for Burundi now in place, the Peacebuilding Commission today approved a jointly developed monitoring mechanism to regularly review progress in its implementation -- both locally and in New York -- in priority areas
such as justice and security sector reform, generating jobs and making radical improvements to governance.

Meeting in its special “Burundi Configuration”, the Commission adopted the Monitoring and Tracking Mechanism (MTM) of the Strategic Framework for Peacebuilding in Burundi. That Framework -- in place since June -- is the country-led integrated peacebuilding strategy now guiding the engagement and dialogue between Bujumbura, the United Nations and other international partners.

The Framework identified key objectives, major challenges and threats to peace, especially the implementation of a stagnant ceasefire agreement between Burundi and the National Liberation Forces (Palipehutu-FNL). Promoting inclusive growth, employment, transparency and human rights were among its other top priorities.”

See also:
Brookings Institution, 13 March 2008, The Role of Civil Society in Ending Displacement and Peacebuilding, by Elizabeth Ferris [Internet]

United Nations Department of Public Information (DPI), 12 Dec 2006 [Link below]

Peacebuilding Commission holds day-long discussion on Burundi, agrees on fund’s use to bolster government’s priority plan [Internet]

Challenges facing Burundi, requiring international help, indicated at country-specific meetings of Peacebuilding Commission [Internet]

**Burundi government signs Nairobi pact including protocol on IDPs (December 2006)**

MONUC 18 December 2006:

“With the signing of the Nairobi pact this Friday December 15 2006 by DRC, Angola, Burundi, Central African Republic, Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia, it paves the way for security, stability and development in the region, after years of conflict.

Many African state leaders, including DRC president Joseph Kabila were in Nairobi Kenya for the two day summit that will go a long way to bringing the region out of the vicious cycle of humanitarian disaster, poverty, and repeated conflict.[…]

The Great Lakes pact includes a $225 million security action plan to disarm rebel groups in Eastern DRC, and along border areas in Sudan, Kenya and Uganda.[…]

Ms. Besida Tonwe, the Head of United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), in Central and East Africa, said that the conference was a long process of consultations in helping the Great Lakes Region to reconcile, rehabilitate, and reconstruct their societies in a politically delicate process.

‘It is also a process which in the future will continue to require financial support from the donor community and coherent assistance from the humanitarian community. It is now of utmost importance that there is a follow-up on the national implementation of the legal protocols adopted with the pact,’ she said.
'The three protocols on humanitarian and social issues addressing sexual violence against women and children, property rights of returning persons, and the protection of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), are of the utmost importance,’ she concluded.”

IDMC 14 December 2006:  
“The Pact is a culmination of more than four years of regional negotiations among States. It contains a package of measures which promises to enhance the lives of the forcibly displaced, including a regional protocol on protection and assistance for internally displaced, which when signed, will be the first legally binding regional instrument specifically dealing with IDPs anywhere in the world. A regional protocol on property rights of returning populations, and protocols which address some of the root causes of flight in the Great Lakes are also key elements of the Pact.”


- Protocol IV is divided into three chapters that focus on the rehabilitation and resettlement of sinistrés, physical and political reconstruction and, finally, economic and social development

ISS 27 May 2005:

“Aside from calling for a cessation to violent conflict, the Arusha Accords [Arusha Peace and Reconciliation Agreement for Burundi, 28 August 2000]. provide comprehensive recommendations for stabilising and rehabilitating a highly polarised Burundian nation. The agreement is composed of five protocols each dedicated to a particular theme intended to move the process from peace-making to peace-building. These themes consist of an outline of the nature of the conflict; democracy and good governance; peace and security; reconstruction and development; and guarantees on the implementation of the agreement.

Importantly, the accords acknowledge that the Burundian ‘conflict is fundamentally political, with extremely important ethnic dimensions… and stems from a struggle by the political class to accede to and/or remain in power.’

Protocol IV is divided into three chapters that focus on the rehabilitation and resettlement of sinistrés, physical and political reconstruction and, finally, economic and social development. It is therefore the ‘litmus test’ against which the performance of the transitional government (and other actors) as it relates to Arusha’s recommendations can be assessed.

Rehabilitation and Resettlement of Refugees and Sinistrés
The main conclusion and recommendations of Protocol IV states that:

“Through the Burundi Peace Negotiations at Arusha it has been possible to assess how seriously the political and ethnic crisis that has torn Burundi apart since independence has affected Burundian society. Hundreds of thousands of Burundians are refugees, some of them for more than 25 years.

Hundreds of thousands more are forced to live in camps where conditions are appalling…. All Burundians are aware that a lasting peace is impossible so long as a definitive solution is not found to the problem of refugees and sinistrés. Likewise, peace is impossible so long as the country’s wealth is not shared equitably. Burundi cannot help the sinistrés rebuild destroyed property and restore its economy without the assistance of the international community.”
The UN concluded that there was a strong indication that the FLN had not acted alone in the massacre of Congolese refugees (2004-2005)

- One year of after the Gatumba massacre, those responsible remain free

IRIN 5 Jan 2005:
“The FNL claimed responsibility for a massacre in August of 160 Congolese Tutsi refugees at Gatumba transit camp on the Burundi side of the border with the DRC. The UN is continuing to investigate whether armed groups on the DRC side of the border, which are aligned to FNL, also took part.”

UNSC 15 November 2004:
“As requested by the Security Council by its presidential statement of 15 August 2004 (S/PRST/2004/30), ONUB, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights conducted a joint investigation into the massacre on 13 August of 152 Congolese refugees at the Gatumba refugee camp, located close to the border with the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The results of the investigation were transmitted to the Council by my letter to the President of the Council dated 15 October (S/2004/821). Despite extensive investigation, there is no clear evidence of who organized, carried out and financed that gross atrocity. The FNL (Rwasa) claim of responsibility has been supported by witness statements and led United Nations investigators to believe that the group did, indeed, participate in the attack. There is however, a strong indication that FNL (Rwasa) did not act alone. Unfortunately, the dearth of verifiable information and limited cooperation by the Burundian authorities hampered the formulation of a definitive report. A national investigation is still ongoing.”

AI 18 August 2005:
“On the anniversary of the Gatumba massacre, which took place in August 2004, Amnesty International calls on the forthcoming government of Burundi and the international community to ensure that those responsible are brought to justice.

‘The new government should undertake to set up an independent and impartial body to investigate this and other massacres and those found to be responsible should be held to account,’ Amnesty International said today.

During the night of 13 August 2004, the refugee camp of Gatumba, located near the Congolese border, was attacked by an armed group. More than 160 Congolese refugees, predominantly children and women members of the Banyamulenge ethnic group from South Kivu in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, (DRC), were deliberately and systematically killed. On 14 August, the Palipehutu-FNL (Parti pour la libération du peuple hutu -- Forces nationales de libération) claimed responsibility for the killings. The same day, the governments of Burundi and Rwanda and delegates of the Banyamulenge communities accused Congolese and Rwandese armed political groups based in the DRC of involvement in the massacre. According to UN investigators, evidence of the presence of ‘other groups’ was credible, but they were not able to categorically identify them.

Human rights organizations and the United Nations have strongly condemned this massacre and called for an independent, impartial and comprehensive investigation. Given the alleged involvement of armed political groups based in the DRC, there was concern that the killing could lead to a military intervention in the DRC by Burundi and Rwanda. Such an intervention could have led to further human rights abuses in the DRC.
Since then, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the Burundian authorities have moved a few refugees to the Mwaro province, farther away from the border, others have returned to the DRC, while many others have moved to Bujumbura. So far, despite the indication from the Burundian Minister of Justice that the national investigation into the Gatumba massacre was completed, the United Nations Operations in Burundi stressed in a recent statement that, 'no investigation report has been issued by the government [of Burundi] and the authors of the attack remain free.'

See also United Nations Operation in Burundi (ONUB), 13 Aug 2005
Burundi: Statement on the anniversary of the Gatumba massacre [Internet]

Causes of displacement


United Nations Resident Coordinator System for Burundi 1998, p. 5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronology of Population Movements</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>An estimated 200,000 Burundians flee from progroms and communal violence; many seek refuge in Tanzania, where most remain to this day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>To escape the violence that broke out following the assassination of President Ndadaye, nearly 200,000 people leave the hills to seek protection in sites grouped around military posts. A vast majority are still there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1996</td>
<td>The escalation of the civil conflict sparks massive population movements; the northwestern province of Cibitoke, sandwiched between the rebel bases in the mountainous Kibira forest and in neighboring Kivu, is particularly unstable. Large numbers seek refuge in neighboring Zaire (150,000) and Tanzania (250,000). Up to 400,000 congregate in sites inside the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>In the wake of the conquest of Zaire by the Kabila-led alliance, most of the refugees in Kivu return to Burundi, where they swell the numbers living in the displaced camps on the north-western provinces, particularly Cibitoke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>As a military strategy to regain control of rebel-held territory, the authorities forcibly regroup 250,000 civilians in Karuzi, Kanyanza and Muramvya provinces. Nearly all of them return home by the end of 1997, but the policy of controlled population movements continues to be implemented in other, more short-term forms elsewhere in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>Following the loss of their bases in the Kivu, the rebels regroup in Tanzania, and the main theatre of operations shifts to the southwest, along the ridge of the Nile-Congo watershed that is the main conduit into and out of the country for guerrilla groups. The ensuing destabilization leads to large scale displacement to new sites, again mainly along the main tarmac roads of the western plain, not only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Causes of internal displacement: an analysis by the U.S. Committee for Refugees (1998)

- Pervasive psychology of "flee or be killed" is a lasting legacy of the 1972 massacres and the 1993 upheavals
- Displacement has also been used as a deliberate goal of violence since 1993
- Massive retaliation by the armed forces
- Suspicion towards the displaced population creates more displacement
- Use of violence and displacement as a way to achieve political or economical objectives

USCR 1998a, pp. 32-33:
“A history of massacres has taught the people of Burundi, regardless of their ethnicity, that their personal survival hinges on their ability to flee and seek a safer place temporarily. For many peasant Burundians, the lesson of the past is that violence can erupt suddenly and can rapidly become all-encompassing. It is a lesson handed down from generation to generation. Some of the underlying causes of internal displacement in Burundi follow:

First, a pervasive psychology of 'flee or be killed' has become the lasting legacy of the 1972 slaughter and the 1993 upheaval. The 1994 genocide in neighboring Rwanda has reinforced the psychology of flight in Burundi.

Second, the smaller massacres that have occurred almost daily since 1994 serve to validate the historical lessons of fear and mistrust. Fear is also ingrained that large number of Burundians have learned to flee their homes not only in reaction to danger but also in anticipation of it.

Third, much of Burundi’s displacement since 1993 has been caused by «ethnic cleansing.» Displacement is no longer merely as accidental by-product of violence; it has become a deliberate goal of violence.

Fourth, both ethnic groups of Burundi regard themselves as vulnerable. The sense of vulnerability has become an important part of the self-identity. Hutu are demographically dominant but see themselves as vulnerable to the political and military power of Tutsi. Tutsi are politically and militarily powerful but view themselves as vulnerable to the demographic dominance of Hutu. Members of both ethnic groups regard themselves as victims, despite the fact that many massacres in Burundian history have been largely one-sided.

Fifth, a pattern is evident in many violent eruptions over the decades: regardless of how violence begins, there is almost always massive retaliation against the Hutu by the Tutsi-dominated
military. As a result, many Hutu instinctively flee at the mere sight of soldiers or at the distant sound of their vehicles. The country's forces of order, unfortunately, create new disorder and displacement – deliberately in some cases, inadvertently in others.

Sixth, population displacement in Burundi often exacerbates rather than alleviates the conflict. Uprooted Burundians of one ethnic group are often regarded as dangerous by members of the other ethnic group. The military suspects that many internally displaced Hutu are rebels. Many Hutu suspect that camps of displaced Tutsi are bases for militia activity. There is some truth to these mutual suspicions. The result is that displacement at times begets more violence, causing still more people to flee. In short – at least in Burundi – displacement causes more displacement.

These are only partial explanations of the population displacement in Burundi, of course. This review of Burundi’s history indicates that some actors create violence and displacement as a way to achieve political control by force that they are unable to achieve or maintain through nonviolent means. Some elements in Burundi create violence and displacement for the economic rewards it brings them through banditry, confiscation of property, and skimming of relief aid. Still other Burundians commits violence and force displacement based on pure fear or hate, reinforced by decades of grievances, real or imagined.”


- 1996: government policy to move civilian populations into "regroupment" camps
- 1997: end of the large-scale, long-term "regroupment" policy
- 1998: short-term forced movement of populations continues, particularly in unstable western provinces
- Since September 1999, over 350,000 people were forcibly moved by government forces to 53 regroupment camps to deprive insurgent groups of local support
- Government explained that regroupment camps were established to protect civilians from the rebels
- Dismantlement of regroupment camps was precondition to peace negotiations and camps were dismantled by mid-2000

**USCR 2000 "regroupment"**

“Burundian authorities have pursued two waves of forced population relocation, or regroupment. The first regroupment wave occurred during 1996-98 when the government moved at least a quarter-million Hutu into 50 camps scattered throughout the country. Some observers estimated that up to 800,000 persons lived in the regroupment camps at that time. Most regroupment sites closed during 1998, allowing occupants to return home.”

**HRW June 2000, "Regrouping":**


“In July and August 1999, the rebels launched increasingly frequent and damaging raids in and around Bujumbura, killing dozens of civilians as well as some soldiers. The army retaliated with attacks that killed more than one hundred civilians as well as combatants and the government tightened an existing curfew. These measures failed to satisfy Tutsi extremists in Bujumbura who demanded more drastic action to protect the city and to repress the rebellion. With rumors circulating of a possible coup and of violence being organized by extremists, the government decided to impose a policy of regroupment on most of Bujumbura-rural, particularly on areas inhabited largely by Hutu and near the city.”

**HRW June 2000, "Regrouping":**
"In mid-1999, it [the government] had revived the regroupment policy in parts of southeastern Burundi before deciding to extend it to the area of the capital in September."

HRW June 2000, "Summary":
"The Tutsi-dominated government of Burundi, combating rebellions among the Hutu majority, began forcing civilians in the area around the capital into so-called "protection sites" or "regroupment camps" beginning in late September 1999. Burundian authorities claimed the measure was intended to protect the civilians, most of them Hutu, from attack by the rebel National Liberation Forces (Forces Nationales pour la Libération, FNL) who were becoming increasingly well-entrenched in the area. In fact, they meant to deprive the FNL of support from local people who helped them, sometimes willingly, sometimes under duress. By removing civilian support, the authorities hoped to isolate the FNL and thus reduce its increasingly frequent attacks on the capital. They hoped also to quiet Tutsi extremists who accused them of weakness in confronting the rebel threat."

HRW June 2000, "Summary":
"By the end of 1999, authorities had obliged some 80 percent of the population of the province of Bujumbura-rural-some 350,000 people-to live in fifty-three camps. Although regroupment helped reduce attacks on the capital city, rebels remained firmly established in rural areas. They simply shifted from one place to another when attacked by the army, which had insufficient troops available to control the whole region at the same time. Rebels continued to live off the crops of local people and even to inhabit the houses of those forced to live in the camps.

USCR 2000, "Regroupment":
"The country included at least three types of internal displacement: up to 200,000 people, primarily rural Tutsi, who have lived for six years in designated camps protected by government soldiers and thousands, who have become displaced in the countryside or at makeshift sites for varying lengths of time; and nearly 350,000 Hutu whom the government required to live in so-called 'regroupment' camps."

Dismantlement of regroupment camps (2000)

USCR 2000, "Regroupment":
"Government authorities argued that the camps were a temporary measure to protect civilians from attack and deprive rebel groups of food and lodging in rural areas. Burundian officials urged international humanitarian organizations to provide food, water, sanitation, and medical care to the sites. Burundian President Pierre Buyoya visited several sites in October [1999] and stated that conditions there were better than portrayed by aid agencies. The regroupment camps were 'no dramatic situation,' he assured."

HRW June 2000, "Summary":
"The international community severely criticized the policy of regroupment. In January 2000, the Burundian government promised to begin closing the camps but it made little progress in doing so until early June. At that time, rebel leaders made closing the camps a precondition for peace negotiations and former South African President Nelson Mandela, facilitator for the negotiations, condemned the regroupment sites as 'concentration camps.' Under this pressure, President Pierre Buyoya agreed that everyone in the camps would be allowed to return home by the end of July."

For an analysis on how forced displacement in 2000 of 350,000 civilians was carried out in violation of international law, including the Un Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, see HRW June 2000 "Violation of international law & Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement" [link below]
Fighting between FNL and army displaced thousands in Bujumbura Rural (2004-2008)

- Combatants of FNL fought so called FNL “dissidents”, causing displacement in October 2007
- FNL is the only rebel group which has not made peace with the government
- Population displacement reduced in 2005 compared to 2003-2004
- Little population displacement in 2006, but the populations of Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura Rural, have suffered armed attacks, looting and destruction of homes, property and livestock at the hands of FNL

IRIN 23 April 2008:
“The resumption of violence in and around Bujumbura is causing panic in the country. Outside the capital, residents spend their nights in the bush for fear of being attacked, as the death toll rose to 33.
A bomb destroyed part of the Vatican embassy compound and a dining hall in the Kiriri University campus on 22 April [2008].

“We call on the army to remove its heavy arms from our campus,” a student said, reacting to the installation of rocket launchers aimed at rebuffing attacks by the rebel FNL.
On 18 April, attacks were launched on military positions in Gihosha, Kanyosha, Kamenge and Musaga areas.”

NRC, May 2008:
In April 2008 serious violations of the 6 September 2006 ceasefire between the Burundian Army (FDN) and the rebel group Palipehutu-FNL (FNL) occurred. The most reported events took place in the capital city, Bujumbura, where three attacks took place on April 17, 18 and 22. Violence sprung in several provinces around the country (Bujumbura Rurale, Bubanza, Cibitoke and Kayanza), but Bujumbura Rurale province has been the most affected province, witnessing displacements of population.[...]

At the peak of displacement it was reported that there were:
- 4,050 households displaced in Isale commune or 20,100 people out of 83,000 inhabitants concentrated mostly in 6 sites in the centre of the commune, Rushubi on May 2 (data Burundian Red Cross).
- 5,102 households displaced in Muyira and Kirombwe, both at Kanyosha commune on May 2 (data Burundian Red Cross).
- 4,305 households displaced in Kabezi centre in three different sites on May 7 (data Kabezi local administration).
- 3,166 households displaced in Gitaza centre and 1,100 in Rutongo, both at Muhuta commune (data Muhuta local administration).
- And fewer numbers of IDPs registered in Bugarama, Mutambu and Nyabiraba communes (several hundreds of households)."

IRIN, 25 October 2007:
“Fighters of Burundi’s last active rebel group have for the second time in one week attacked a position occupied by a break-away faction, forcing villagers to flee their homes, a senior military official said.”
The evening raid by combatants of the Front National de Liberation (FNL), led by Agathon Rwasa, took place on 24 October [2007] evening on a site where the so-called FNL "dissidents" have gathered in Gakungwe village of Kabezi commune in Bujumbura Rural province.

It forced hundreds of people from surrounding villages to run away as the army sent reinforcements to the area to guard the splinter faction's settlement, residents said.

"There has indeed been such an attack and the heavy exchange of gunfire was heard," deputy army chief of staff Major General Godefroid Niyuhire told IRIN on 25 October. There were, however, no casualties during the attack, he said.

The "dissidents" say they fought with Rwasa for the FNL, but Rwasa's supporters have denied their claims and accused the government of creating a faction within the FNL. Rwasa has said these men, who intend to join the country's peace process, are not even party to a 2006 ceasefire agreement signed between the government and the FNL."

OCHA 23 June 2005:
“Population displacement due to insecurity and armed conflict reduced markedly in the first months of the year [2005] and as compared to the period 2003-2004. Populations in the province of Bujumbura rural, where recurrent waves of displacement had taken place throughout 2004, are gradually resettling and returning to zones of origin and no sizeable population movements were registered in the first semester of the year.”

IRIN 4 January 2005:
“Thousands of civilians have been displaced following fierce fighting on Saturday in Burundi's western province of Bujumbura Rural. The internally displaced persons (IDPs) have not received aid, the governor of the province, Ignace Ntawembarira, said.

Fighting was reported in the communes of Isale, Nyabiraba and Kanyosha, east of the capital, Bujumbura, between the rebel faction Forces nationales de libération (FNL) of Agathon Rwasa, and a coalition of the Burundian army and troops loyal to Pierre Nkurunziza, leader of the former largest rebel faction in the country, the Conseil national pour la defense de la democratie-Forces de defense pour la democratie (CNDD-FDD).”

UNSC 27 October 2006:
“In the period under review [August 2005-September 2006], the security situation was characterized by renewed clashes between FDN and FNL, mainly in the north-western provinces of Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura Rural. The populations of these provinces have suffered armed attacks, looting and destruction of homes, property and livestock at the hands of FNL. In 2006, 107 cases of attacks and looting by FNL were reported.”

Fighting between government and FLN troops causes the displacement of thousands in Bubanza Province (2008)

- FNL - the only rebel group which has not made peace with the government – caused displacement at the end of 2007

IRIN 14 January 2008:
“About 1,400 families (8,400 people) displaced in Musigati commune in the northwestern province of Bubanza, following fighting between government forces and the Forces Nationales de Libération (FNL), desperately need help, according to local officials.

Laurent Kagamba, adviser to the Musigati administrator, said that since the simultaneous attacks on three military positions on 28 December [2007] and another on 9 January [2008] in the same commune, residents had fled their homes. Some sought refuge in Musigati parish, others at Musigati and Kabere trade centres, as well as Busiga coffee factory, he said.”

IRIN 10 September 2007:
“Residents of 700 households, or about 4,000 people, have fled their homes in the northwest Burundi province of Bubanza following raids by suspected members of the country's last active rebel group, a government official said.

'For the time being, security is not good at all. Some residents have been beaten, while others have had their property looted,' the governor of Bubanza, Pascal Nyabenda, told IRIN.'

He said Forces nationales de libération (FNL) fighters had raided homes in Bubanza from their hideouts in the nearby Kibira and Rukoko forests. Those displaced were spending the nights in the compound of a local parish, venturing out for a few hours during the day to work in their fields, Nyabenda said.”

For information on displacement by fighting between government and FNL troops in Bubanza Province in previous years, see:
ITEKA, 9 August 2006, Burundi: Des personnes armées et des combattants du Palipehutu_Fnl mènent des attaques répétées dans certaines communes de Bubanza
ITEKA, 24 August 2005, Burundi: Des déplacés de guerre en commune Musigati sans assistance [Link below]
IRIN, 14 June 2005, Burundi: Thousands displaced in Bubanza [Link below]

Some of the Burundian refugees expelled from Tanzania have no house or land (2006)

UN 30 November 2006:
Over 3,000 Burundians who had found refuge in Tanzania were forced to return in 2006: “Many new arrivals report others being forced to leave and the 3,000 who have come back so far, only seem to be the tip of the iceberg. Nobody knows for sure how many Burundians live in Tanzania without having regularized their stay, but most estimate around 150,000 persons. This will remain a key challenge in 2007, especially since the new arrivals need assistance and in particular so-called sans addresses like Elias, who hopes that “the Burundian Government can find us a plot of land where I can build a house and send my children to school.”"

NRC November 2006:
“Since June 2006, Tanzania has been implementing a national plan for the repatriation of refugees from Tanzania. In this framework, persons without refugee status or any other legal status in Tanzania have been forcibly removed from Tanzania. This year, more than 4000 Burundians have been expelled from Tanzania, mainly from Ngara district towards Muyinga province.”

See also:
UNHCR, 23 Oct 2006, Growing numbers of Burundians return home from the DRC [Internet]
Other causes of displacement

Tens of thousands were displaced due to floods (2007)

- Since November 2006, close to 300,000 people were affected by the heavy floods

IRIN 9 February 2007:
« Près de 300 000 Burundais, victimes des inondations qui touchent le pays depuis novembre 2006, vont recevoir une aide alimentaire du Programme alimentaire mondial (PAM) des Nations Unies et des semences de l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (FAO), a indiqué un responsable du PAM. […]

Les pluies diluviennes qui tombent depuis novembre 2006 ont détruit les cultures et infrastructures de plusieurs régions, obligeant le gouvernement à mettre en place un fonds de solidarité pour venir en aide aux déplacés victimes des inondations dans les provinces de Muyinga, Kirundo, Cankuzo, Karuzi, Kayanza, Ngozi et Muyinga. »

IRIN 15 January 2007:
"Thousands of people in northwestern Burundi, displaced after days of heavy rainfall, urgently need relief aid, officials said on Monday.

"The rains have rendered more than 3,000 residents homeless," said Prosper Banzambe, the chief of Gatumba Zone, one of the affected areas in Mitumbuzi Commune, Bujumbura Rural Province.

He said the displaced, some of whom had sought shelter in a local church, needed food and other non-food aid such as blankets, jerry cans, soap and mosquito nets.

The rains, which pounded the area at the weekend, destroyed at least 500 homes. The flooding of the nearby River Kiziba contributed to the houses' collapse.

Banzambe expressed concern that the continuing rains could cause more damage in Gatumba and appealed for a temporary shelter for the displaced.

He urged humanitarian organisations to help the displaced, saying the local administration was unable to "adequately meet their needs".[…]

On 4 January [2007], the government set up a national solidarity fund to support people affected by floods in seven provinces. In a decree, President Pierre Nkurunziza declared the provinces of Kayanza in the north, Muramvya and Karuzi in the central part of the country, Ruyigi in the east, and Bubanza and Cibitoke in the northwest, as "hunger-stricken following floods".

He also announced the establishment of the solidarity fund, to which every Burundian must contribute for four months from the end of January."

AFP 16 January 2007:
"Heavy rains pounding Burundi's capital and outlying areas have killed at least four people and left about 23,000 homeless since the downpours began last month, officials said Tuesday."
They said the situation was "catastrophic" after the floods destroyed farmlands, sparking fears of food shortages and disease outbreaks in the tiny central African nation emerging from more than a decade of civil strife."

Famine in north and east causes internal displacement (2005-2006)

- Many of the people who flee due to food insecurity are newly repatriated refugees

OCHA 16 January 2005:
"[R]esidents of Northern provinces continue to flee inside and outside Burundi due to food insecurity. As of 14 January [2005], a joint visit conducted by OCHA Ruyigi sub office and the provincial administration authorities confirmed the presence in Kabuyenge IDP site, in Gisuru Commune, of 63 families who fled Busoni and Bugabira communes (Kirundo Province) in search of food. OCHA, in collaboration with the administration authorities convened a meeting with humanitarian actors in the province to discuss an emergency response."

OCHA 23 June 2005:
"Cycles of drought periods, loss of staple crops, poor yields during three consecutive agriculture seasons and fragile nutritional conditions were particularly important in the northern Burundian provinces, which were also affected by waves of population movements both internal and across the border into Rwanda."

OCHA 5 March 2005:
"Despite food aid distributed by WFP and partners, the food security situation remains disconcerting mainly in Northern and Eastern provinces. Continuous internal and cross-border displacement of the population continues to be part of the coping strategies. Around 7,900 Burundian asylum seekers were reported in Tanzania. Meanwhile, 131 internally displaced persons were registered in Cankuzo coming from Kirundo. However, many more internal movements remain unrecorded."

ITEKA 21 February 2006:
"La plupart de ces migrants sont de nouveaux rapatriés qui n'ont pas eu où s'installer. Ils sont en train de migrer à la quête de quoi manger. Malheureusement, la population de la province de Cankuzo a également faim et ne peut pas les aider. Les prix des vivres montent chaque jour."
POPULATION FIGURES AND PROFILE

Global figures

Some 100,000 IDPs in Burundi (2007)

OCHA, 18 July 2006, p11; OCHA, 30 November 2006, p1:
*Both in mid-2006 and at the end of the year, OCHA estimated that there were some 100,000 IDPs in sites (camps) in Burundi. These estimates are based on the 2005 internally displaced persons (IDP) survey and visits to IDP sites.*

In mid-2007, OCHA estimated that there were some 100,000 IDPs in sites (camps) in Burundi. These estimates are based on the 2005 internally displaced persons (IDP) survey and visits to IDP sites (OCHA, 3 October 2007).

*To view the 2005 IDP survey, see reference below*

Latest survey say that 117,000 IDPs remain in camps (2005)

- About 58% of the total IDP population in Burundi concentrates in the northern and central provinces of Gitega, Muyinga, Ngozi, Kayanza and Kirundo
- Half of households in the North and Center are headed by women, many of whom are over 60 years old
- 30 camps have been dismantled since 2004

OCHA 23 June 2005, p7:
"The national IDP Survey conducted by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in February-May 2005 showed that the total population of IDPs living in sites has decreased from 145,034 in mid 2004 to 116,799 people in 2005. The total number of IDP sites also from 170 to 160 during the same period. These overall results confirm the trends of return to zones of origin that had started in early 2004.

Survey findings also pointed to a continuous trend of return in southern and southeastern Burundi, while IDPs living in sites in the northern and central provinces prefer to stay at the displacement site.

At present, about 58% of the total IDP population in Burundi concentrates in the northern and central provinces of Gitega, Muyinga, Ngozi, Kayanza and Kirundo. In these cases, the influence of the conflict and the 1993 crisis in Burundi combined with a general feeling of uncertainty and insecurity regarding the ongoing political transition in the country appears to be important factors influencing families’ decision to remain at the IDP site. Moreover, some of these families have lived for more than 10 years under conditions of displacement, thus developing new social, family and economic ties in the areas/sites for the displaced. On the other hand, the different conditions under which most of the people were displaced in the southern regions, as a result of the 1998 crisis, and the more ready access to land in these areas has facilitated a more rapid return to zones of origin."
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OCHA 26 May 2005, pp3, 8:
« Partant des données statistiques issues de l’enquête 2005 sur l’ensemble des ménages déplacés sur site, il ressort que le nombre total est de 116.799 personnes, réparties sur 160 sites à travers tout le territoire. D’importantes disparités régionales s’observent en ce qui concerne les proportions de femmes chefs de ménage. En effet la moitié des ménages vivant dans les provinces du Centre et du Nord sont dirigés par des femmes. Et sur l’ensemble de la tranche d’âge des plus de 60 ans, les femmes chefs de ménage représentent à elles seules les 2/3, ce qui révèle un profil de vulnérabilité particulier.

Les indicateurs socio-économiques tels la profession du déplacé par son activité principale et l’accès à la terre dégagent que la population des déplacés sur site est essentiellement agricole (91%). Les déplacés ont accès à leurs anciennes propriétés (74%) et continuent de les exploiter à partir des sites.

Les résultats des travaux d’entretiens corroborent les données statistiques 2005 quant à la perception des causes d’insécurité. Malgré l’accalmie consécutive à la signature des accords de cessez-le-feu, les déplacés du Nord et du Centre restent méfiants, et manifestent la peur de leurs anciens voisins. Par contre, dans les régions du Sud et Est, depuis que les groupes armés ont cessé les combats, les problèmes d’insécurité ne se posent pas avec la même acuité. La situation de maintien sur site témoigne en effet du climat de méfiance et d’incertitude des déplacés. Elle est aussi motivée dans certains endroits par des opportunités économiques offertes par l’emplacement ainsi que par un meilleur accès aux services sociaux de base et aux infrastructures.[…]

30 des sites qui existaient au moment de l’enquête 2004 ont depuis lors été démantelés, particulièrement sur la province de Makamba (17 sites sur les 28 que compte la province). Parallèlement, 21 sites additionnels ont été recensés cette année. Ces derniers n’avaient pas fait l’objet de l’enquête de 2004 en raison des contraintes de sécurité (accès) et par le fait que certains sites de déplacés n’étaient pas reconnus comme tels par l’administration en 2004. »

IDP estimates 1999 – 2004

- UN OCHA IDP estimated that 281,600 IDPs were living in camps in 2003
- An additional 100,000 or more were estimated to live with host families, public buildings or in the bush
- Decrease of IDP population in sites from 281,628 in 2002 to 145,034 in 2004
- An additional 30,000 to 40,000 were temporarily displaced every month as of late 2004


OCHA 15 August 2003, p.6:
"Further IDPs have been temporarily displaced from their homes for short periods of time and are not included above. IDP figures exclude a possible further 100,000 IDPs, and possibly more, dispersed following the closure of some regroupement camps in 2002 and who may not have been able to return to their homes."

According to the NGO Save the Children Fund (SCF), the bulk of dispersed IDPs live in Bujumbura Rural (SCF 16 Aug 2001).

UNICEF reported in May 2002 that there were 180,000 IDP children in camps (UNICEF 29 May 2002).
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UN estimated that 100,000 people are affected every month by temporary displacement (Nov 02):

OCHA 19 November 2002:
"The intensification of conflict, particularly in Bujumbura Rural and the border provinces, has led to increased temporary displacement affecting up to 100,000 people every month.

Over 109,720 people are displaced in Bujumbura Rural alone, while a further 20,000 have been forced from their homes in Ruyigi and Makamba. Such temporary displacement, sometimes forced by military action, has in some cases lasted months, severely disrupting all aspects of life for the population, diminishing or destroying their small reserves and placing additional strains upon already vulnerable host populations."

2003
In September 2002, UNFPA did a socio-economic survey on IDPs in Burundi. Preliminary results available in January 2003 stated that the total number of IDPs in camps was now 281,052, down more than a hundred thousand from July 2002.

OCHA 14 March 2003:
In March 2003, UN OCHA reported a total of over 525,000 IDPs in the country, of whom 387,499 were registered in 226 sites (and more than 800,000 Burundians living as refugees in the region).

OCHA 3 June 2003:
In June 2003, UN OCHA adopted the same IDP figure reported by UNFPA in January 2003: 281,000 IDPs in permanent sites, and another 100,000 temporarily displaced every month.

According to UNFPA’s draft survey:
UNFPA Draft, 2003, p11:
"Parmi les 106,417 individus que OCHA-UNICEF-PCAC ont de plus que nous, 26,553 personnes (soit ¼) constituent la population des sites des déplacés que nous avons exclus du recensement du fait qu’ils étaient soit démantelés, soit des sites de nuit, soit des sites de rapatriés ou d’une autre nature comme celui de Buterere. Le reste (79,868 individus, soit ¾) pourrait s’expliquer par la surestimation éventuelle des chiffres par certains responsables administratifs et chefs de site pour la raison évoquée plus haut."

2004
OCHA August 2004:
"The IDP population has decreased dramatically from 281,628 displaced persons living in 230 sites in 2002 to 145,034 persons in 170 sites in 2004. In other words, half of the IDP population returned to their zones of origin within this two-year period, with the most accelerated rate of return taking place between late 2003 and early 2004 following significant improvements in the political and security situation in the country."

IDP estimates: 1993-1999

- An estimated 500,000 to 700,000 persons were internally displaced in late 1993 by the violence that erupted in October of that year; there were still an estimated 400,000 internally displaced at the end of 1996
- Return movements as a result of the closure of large-scale regroupment camps were registered in 1997 and 1998 but the total displaced population increased again in 1999
USCR 1998, pp. 34-35:
"The precise number of persons internally displaced by the violence of 1993-96 is difficult to determine. Security concerns at times have limited the access of international relief agencies and hampered their ability to make sophisticated estimates. Many displaced Hutu have dispersed into the hills and swamps to hide and do not reside in designated camps because they consider camps vulnerable to attack. Local leaders of both ethnic groups routinely inflate the number of uprooted families in an effort to attract more aid and gain more sympathy for their political cause. ‘In some camps,’ noted one relief worker, ‘those in charge are so hostile that it becomes dangerous even to ask about numbers or need. They will bluntly say that it's none of your business.'"


| IDPs end 1993 | 500,000 to 700,000 |
| IDPs end 1994 | 400,000 |
| IDPs end 1995 | 300,000 |
| IDPs end 1996 | 400,000 |
| IDPs July 1997 | 577,142 |
| IDPs Nov 1998 | 558,506 |
| IDPs Sept 1999 | 801,438 |


UN November 1999, p. 6:

| IDPs July 1997 | 577,142 |
| IDPs November 1998 | 558,506 |
| IDPs September 1999 | 801,438 |
| % Population | 12 |

Geographical distribution

UNHCR survey in 3 southern provinces (January 2008)

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
« Beaucoup de choses ont déjà été dites, et bien dites, sur les IDP au Burundi. […]

L’objectif poursuivi, beaucoup plus modeste, consisterait plutôt à décrire un panorama sommaire de la situation des IDP dans les provinces couvertes par la représentation de terrain du HCR à Makamba, de manière à disposer d’un outil interne pouvant servir de base à une réflexion sur l’assistance à déployer en faveur de cette catégorie de population intégrée de plus en plus dans le mandat de l’Organisation. […]"
Conscience prise de ce contexte, l’envergure de cette étude a des limites avouées : limites géographiques tout d’abord, puisque elle ne vaut que pour les provinces de Bururi, Makamba et Rutana ; limites structurelles ensuite, en ce sens qu’il ne s’agit que d’une évaluation sommaire des sites et non d’une enquête approfondie sur les IDP. La méthode choisie pour ce faire a consisté en une série de missions de terrain à la rencontre des autorités administratives locales et des personnes déplacées elles-mêmes, devant permettre de remplir un questionnaire simplifié constitutif de la fiche élaborée pour chacun des sites visités. Les conclusions qui peuvent être déduites de cette étude ont finalement été articulées en quatre chapitres : Constat général, Evaluation statistique de la fréquentation des sites, Synthèse thématique et Conclusion / Proposition. »

For a detailed account of the various sites in the three provinces, see the annex of the survey (link below).

IDP distribution per province (2001-2005)

The table below is compiled from the following sources: OCHA 26 November 2001, OCHA 28 Feb 2002; OCHA 31 July 2002, UNFPA Sept 02, OCHA 15 Aug 2003, OCHA 23 June 2005:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>June 01</th>
<th>Feb 02</th>
<th>July 02</th>
<th>Sept 02</th>
<th>Aug 03</th>
<th>May 05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bubanza</td>
<td>14,652</td>
<td>14,202</td>
<td>8573</td>
<td>4057</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>7,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura mairie</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>12,643</td>
<td>7395</td>
<td>7,391</td>
<td>8,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura rural</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>18,363</td>
<td>7842</td>
<td>7,842</td>
<td>4,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bururi</td>
<td>104,986</td>
<td>87,581</td>
<td>89,307</td>
<td>66412</td>
<td>68,735</td>
<td>2,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cankuzo</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>4,495</td>
<td>13,989</td>
<td>7816</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>2,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibitoke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitega</td>
<td>28,026</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td>24,940</td>
<td>22050</td>
<td>22,106</td>
<td>17,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karuzi</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>7183</td>
<td>7,183</td>
<td>7,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayanza</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>23,838</td>
<td>19540</td>
<td>19,539</td>
<td>12,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirundo</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>15,165</td>
<td>11746</td>
<td>11,765</td>
<td>9,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makamba</td>
<td>106,540</td>
<td>99,558</td>
<td>105,558</td>
<td>71170</td>
<td>71,270</td>
<td>13,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muramvya</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>17,514</td>
<td>17596</td>
<td>17,597</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyinga</td>
<td>17,481</td>
<td>8,945</td>
<td>15,954</td>
<td>9625</td>
<td>9,609</td>
<td>9,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaro</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngozi</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>21,328</td>
<td>19927</td>
<td>19,926</td>
<td>12,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutana</td>
<td>78,840</td>
<td>77,901</td>
<td>9,094</td>
<td>5278</td>
<td>5,278</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruyigi</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>3,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>432,809</td>
<td>375,509</td>
<td>387,469</td>
<td>281,052</td>
<td>281,628</td>
<td>116,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To see the number of IDPs per commune in 2005, please see OCHA, 26 May 2005, Enquête sur les populations déplacées au Burundi, pp.43-57 [Reference below]
Comparison 2005/2004 of IDPs and returning refugees per Province (2005)

NRC, p10:

Internal displacement per province 1997-2001

OCHA 26 November 2001, pp6-7:

Internal displacement 1997-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total pop.</th>
<th>IDPs Sept 97</th>
<th>IDPs Aug 98</th>
<th>IDPs Oct 99</th>
<th>IDPs Sept 00</th>
<th>IDPs Oct 01</th>
<th>% pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bubanza</td>
<td>309,127</td>
<td>73,087</td>
<td>132,641</td>
<td>172,408</td>
<td>14,588</td>
<td>14,652</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura mairie</td>
<td>341,494</td>
<td>40,734</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>14,902</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bujumbura rural*</td>
<td>456,891</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,637</td>
<td>317,384</td>
<td>30,899</td>
<td>28,420</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bururi</td>
<td>454,939</td>
<td>58,099</td>
<td>85,737</td>
<td>85,781</td>
<td>87,581</td>
<td>104,986</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cankuzo</td>
<td>181,686</td>
<td>3,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cibitoke</td>
<td>417,131</td>
<td>49,620</td>
<td>13,565</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitega</td>
<td>649,854</td>
<td>20,997</td>
<td>18,316</td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>28,026</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karuzi</td>
<td>377,186</td>
<td>134,540</td>
<td>34,360</td>
<td>12,106</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayanza</td>
<td>491,171</td>
<td>70,164</td>
<td>28,879</td>
<td>26,269</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirundo</td>
<td>533,132</td>
<td>20,072</td>
<td>27,852</td>
<td>5,886</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>5,024</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makamba</td>
<td>397,001</td>
<td>45,314</td>
<td>36,710</td>
<td>85,680</td>
<td>121,360</td>
<td>106,540</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muramvya</td>
<td>259,993</td>
<td>40,436</td>
<td>27,063</td>
<td>22,508</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyinga</td>
<td>519,313</td>
<td>22,855</td>
<td>32,081</td>
<td>16,473</td>
<td>8,945</td>
<td>17,481</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwaro**</td>
<td>235,496</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngozi</td>
<td>637,923</td>
<td>19,184</td>
<td>25,712</td>
<td>20,485</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutana</td>
<td>59,987</td>
<td>3,875</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>16,279</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>78,840</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruyigi</td>
<td>323,677</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>6,846,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>608,366</strong></td>
<td><strong>534,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>818,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>324,055</strong></td>
<td><strong>432,809</strong></td>
<td><strong>6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remarks: total figures indicate IDPs on sites only; an additional 150,000 to 200,000 individuals (most of them from Bujumbura Rural) are considered as dispersed people, who neither live in camps nor in their homes, due to security constraints.  
* The province Bujumbura Rural was separated from Bujumbura Mairie 1999  
** Mwaro province was included in Muramvya province until 1999  
*** As forced relocation sites in Bujumbura Rural were set up in September 1999, the number of IDPs in those sites was assessed accurately in October 1999.

Disaggregated figures

Number of women in IDP sites higher than the ones of men (2003-2004)

- As of mid-2004, more than one-third of all displaced households were headed by women and by children
- IDP per gender/site in Bubanza, Bururi, Bujumbura Mairie, Bujumbura Rurale (2003)

OCHA August 2004, p4:
“According to the 2004 survey on IDPs, “More than one-third of all displaced households are headed by females (mostly widows) and children (mostly orphans). The highest percentages of female- and child-headed households are found in northern and central provinces. These households are among the most vulnerable, and among the most likely to remain definitively in the sites where they currently reside.”

OCHA August 2004, p9:
“Of the current IDP total population of 145,034 persons, 53% are female and 49% are children under the age of 15. These percentages correspond to the national norm for the global population in Burundi. However, if gender and age data are compared across provinces, communes and sites, some deviations from the national norm emerge. For example, the IDP population in Ruyigi province is comprised of a relatively high percentage of children (58%), which may indicate that the displacement phenomenon impacts this group disproportionately. Conversely, in some areas there is a relatively low percentage of children (43% in Gitega province), which should be investigated and analysed further when designing assistance strategies and activities.

The total number of 145,034 IDPs is comprised of 29,881 households. Of these, 32% (9,650 households) are headed by females, 97% of whom are widows. On average, the highest percentages of female-headed households are located in the northern and central provinces of Karuzi (52%), Kayanza (49%), Mwaro (49%) and Gitega (47%). The lowest percentages of female-headed households are located in the southern and eastern provinces of Cankuzo (17%), Makamba (19%), Rutana (19%) and Bururi (22%). An analysis of these results reveals a close relationship between the percentage of female-headed households and willingness to return. In those sites where most households want to remain definitively in the sites, high percentages of female-headed households tend to be found. At the same time, low percentages of female-headed households are found in sites where the desire to return to the place of origin is the strongest.

The same tendencies appear with regard to child-headed households, which comprise 6% (1,808 households) of the total IDP population; almost all children heading households are orphans. The highest percentages of child headed-households tend to be in sites where the desire to remain in the site is the strongest: Mwaro (15%), Muyinga (11%), Gitega (10%) and Karuzi (10%).
lowest percentages are found in sites where the desire to return to place of origin is the strongest: Cankuzo (3%) and Makamba (3%).

Female- and child-headed households together comprise over one-third of all displaced households in Burundi at the present time. Many of these households have lost the legal and traditional right to access family land and have no where else to go but to remain in the site where they currently reside, depending largely on the goodwill of others living in the site or charity groups / NGOs. These households are among the most vulnerable – and among the most likely to remain in the sites – and may be in need of special assistance."

See also UNFPA, draft, 2003, annex 1 and 4 [Link below]
PATTERNS OF DISPLACEMENT

General


- Population in Bubanza fled in 1993 following massacres
- Creation of IDP camps in Bubanza, followed by renewed displacements in 1996
- In Cibitoke, most of the displaced returned homes in 2002, but some IDPs continued to live in camps as of 2005

OCHA 26 May 2005, p11:
“(i) Bubanza
Il est ressorti à travers les entretiens de groupes que la province de Bubanza a été sérieusement touchée par la crise qui avait débuté en octobre 1993. C’est une crise qui s’est produite en plusieurs étapes:

D’abord des massacres à grande échelle d’une partie de la population ont été opérés ;
Les rescapés ont fui les collines d’origine et se rassemblèrent au centre des communes et aux chefs-lieux de la province sous la protection des forces de l’ordre et de l’administration ;
La population restée sur place connaîtra des actions de représailles et fut obligée à son tour de fuir les collines pour se retrouver éparpillée dans les marais, collines et communes environnantes;
A partir de Novembre-Décembre 1995, un phénomène nouveau s’est produit : les dispersés ont rejoint les déplacés sur sites;
Depuis 1996, les affrontements armés entre les bandes armées et les troupes gouvernementales ont conduit à de nouveaux déplacements des collines vers les sites de déplacés. Le sud de la province de Bubanza (commune Mpanda) présente des caractéristiques semblables à celles de Bujumbura rural en raison des affrontements réguliers entre le FNL et les Forces de Défense Nationale.

(ii) Cibitoke
La province de Cibitoke a connu la crise de 1993 et beaucoup de sites de déplacés avaient été recensé à cette époque. Les effectifs s’étaient accrus suite aux affrontements militaires entre les bandes armées et les troupes gouvernementales depuis 1994. Cependant, avec la signature des accords de cessez-le-feu en 2002, beaucoup de sites ont été démantelés du fait que la plupart des populations sont retournées sur les collines d’origine.

Les rapports de l’administration territoriale ne mentionnent pas l’existence de sites de déplacés, bien que des centaines de ménages ne vivent plus sur leurs propriétés : il s’agit d’une erreur de perception des normes et principes internationalement reconnus relatifs aux personnes déplacées. A cet effet, il a été remarqué qu’en 2004, la province de Cibitoke n’avait pas été reconnue comme possédant des déplacés par les autorités administratives locales. Cependant, l’enquête de 2005 a révélé l’existence des sites des déplacés dans les communes de Rugombo et Buganda. Ceux-ci sont installés le long de la route RN3 reliant Bujumbura à la province de Cibitoke sur les sites de Ndava et Buganda.”

- Gitega, Muramvya and Karuzi were particularly affected by the 1993 crisis
- Many people, particularly women and children, fled, while many men were massacred

OCHA 26 May 2005, pp11-12:

Les événements ont touché une bonne partie des populations masculines ; il s’en est suivi des mouvements de déplacement des survivants vers les lieux susceptibles de constituer des abris contre les massacres.

À cette époque, les femmes et les enfants déplacés totalisaient un pourcentage relativement élevé dans les provinces de cette région. »


- In Kayanza, people fled massacres in 1993 and 1994 and found refuge in camps which still exist today
- IDPs in Kayanza then took revenge against host communities by burning their properties, which caused the displacement of the host population
- In Kirundo, people fled massacres in 1993 to safer areas of the province, either in camps or with host families
- Following further attacks, people in Kirundo fled to neighbouring Rwanda and Tanzania, or to Muyinga and Karuzi provinces
- After the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, those who had fled there returned to Burundi and became internally displaced
- Most of the displaced in camps in Ngozi and Muyinga fled in 1993

OCHA 26 May 2005, p12:

(i) Kayanza
Les événements à Kayanza se sont déroulés en trois phases entre octobre 1993 et fin 1994 : Massacres touchant une bonne partie de la population et suivis de l'exode des survivants ; ceux-ci sont en grande partie encore regroupés sur sites à travers toutes les communes de la province ;

Les déplacés sur sites ont réagi en chassant la population restée en place, en incendiant et en détruisant leurs biens. Cette population a fui à son tour en se dispersant partout où elle pouvait se mettre en sécurité et à l’abri des violences ; En 1995, il a été constaté que les déplacés sont restés sur les sites et les dispersés sont rentrés chez eux.
Depuis 1995 jusqu’à maintenant la situation n’a pas beaucoup évolué.

(ii) Kirundo

43
En province Kirundo, la crise de 1993 a été marquée par des massacres qui touchèrent l'ensemble de la province. Les populations visées se sont déplacées sur sites en majorité à l'intérieur même de la province.

Il y eut ensuite une réaction de vengeance qui provoqua un exode des populations, les unes vers le Rwanda, les autres vers la Tanzanie, et d'autres encore se sont dispersées à l'intérieur des provinces voisines comme Muyinga et Karuzi. Lors du déclenchement du génocide au Rwanda, le 6 avril 1994, ceux qui avaient fui la province vers le Rwanda ont regagné leur province en se rassemblant sur de nouveaux sites de déplacés. La plupart de ceux qui avaient fui leurs collines tout en restant sur le territoire de la province ont opté pour le statu quo : ils sont restés dispersés dans les familles d’accueil en se rassemblant parfois de nouveau sur des emplacements délimités comme les écoles et les bâtiments administratifs sans pour autant être de véritables sites de déplacés.

(iii) Ngozi et Muyinga
En provinces de Ngozi et de Muyinga, la dynamique de déplacement s'est limitée aux événements de 1993 avec des regroupements sur sites. Cependant, des déplacements circonstanciels au passage des bandes armées ont été observés depuis 1996 jusqu’en 2003. »


- Displacement in 1993, followed by return due to relative stability in those regions
- Major displacement starting in 1996, due to armed incursions from armed groups based in Tanzania
- Dismantlement of many camps starting end 2003

OCHA 26 May 2005, p13:
« Exceptionnellement, dans les premières années qui ont suivi la crise de 1993, les régions du Sud et de l’Est avaient recouvré une stabilité quelque peu relative. La tension avait été vite désamorcée à tel enseigne que les déplacés ont regagné les collines d’origine. Nous citerons à ce titre les provinces de Bururi, Rutana, Cankuzo, Makamba et dans une moindre mesure la province de Ruyigi exceptée les communes de Butezi et de Butaganzwa.

A partir de 1996, la dynamique de déplacement des populations de la région fut influencée par sa position géographique frontalière. Les bandes armées en provenance de la Tanzanie ont régulièrement commis des incursions qui ont contraint les populations à fuir encore une fois leur foyer pour gagner les sites des déplacés existants ou en constituer d'autres.

Il va donc sans dire que, dans la région, les différents affrontements entre les groupes armés ont provoqué un déplacement de populations sur les anciens et nouveaux sites. On notera à ce sujet qu’en 2004, les 2/3 de la population dans les sites des déplacés étaient concentrés dans les provinces du Sud et de l’Est du pays en particulier en provinces de Makamba, Bururi, Ruyigi et Cankuzo.

Dès fin 2003, le démantèlement des sites des déplacés s’est opéré à un rythme accéléré essentiellement dans les provinces de Makamba, Cankuzo, Rutana et Bururi à la fin de 2003 et en 2004. Enfin, on a observé la coexistence des déplacés et des rapatriés sur des sites notamment en commune de Kayogoro dans la province de Makamba et en commune de Gisuru de la province de Ruyigi. »

- Displacement in 1993, following the looting and destruction of housing
- Revenge actions caused additional displacement
- Many IDPs remain in camps today due to the high cost of housing in the capital

**OCHA 26 May 2005, pp13-14:**

« La Mairie de Bujumbura a connu des troubles pendant le premier trimestre de 1994, après l’intérieur du pays. Ils ont éclaté d’abord dans les zones de Kinama et Kamenge. Les rescapés ont fui vers les autres zones de la capitale pendant que leurs logements étaient détruits et leurs biens pillés.

En représailles, une action a été enclenchée dans les autres zones de la capitale visant à chasser une partie de la population, à détruire les maisons et à piller les biens des victimes. Au cours de ces opérations, les populations de Kinama et de Cibitoke, deux zones limitrophes, se sont affrontées violemment durant l’année 1994.

Vers la fin de 1994, après plusieurs péripéties, la zone Kinama fut quasiment vidée de sa population en direction de Gatumba.

Quant à la zone Cibitoke, elle a connu deux phénomènes significatifs. D’une part, une partie de ses habitants l’ont fui ; d’autre part une autre partie essentiellement constituée par des réfugiés d’origine Rwandaise est rentrée au Rwanda après la victoire du Front Patriotique Rwandais en juillet 1994.

En définitive, les déplacés de la province de Bujumbura Mairie se sont retrouvés dans les sites de Carama, Kiyange et Buterere.

Aujourd’hui, la Bujumbura mairie accueille des déplacés de l’ensemble du pays. Néanmoins, les sites de déplacés y abritent beaucoup de ménages qui occupent ces lieux pour des raisons purement économiques, en raison du prix élevé de l’immobilier en capitale. »


- Major displacement in the province due to its strategic geographic position to protect the city for the Burundian military
- Serves as a base for the rebel group FNL, which continues to cause short term displacement both to camps and to host families

**OCHA 26 May 2005, p14:**

“La province est meurtrie par dix ans de guerre du fait qu’elle a constitué par sa position géographique le point stratégique de la protection de la ville pour les militaires des FAB. Elle est aussi caractérisée par un relief montagneux qui facilite les affrontements et les replis pour les mouvements armés, provoquant ainsi de grands mouvements de déplacement des populations de courte durée et parfois l’établissement de camps de regroupements forcés. On y observe beaucoup de mouvements de dispersions et de déplacements sur site en raison de l’instabilité de la sécurité.

La province de Bujumbura rural a connu une crise profonde en raison de trois faits majeurs : D’abord, la crise de 1993 qui s’est produite dans la capitale s’est répercutée directement sur la population de la province. Celle-ci en effet se ravitaille et ravitaille la capitale ou y travaille. Un
incident, comme « la ville morte » à Bujumbura a provoqué d’autres incidents dans les communes de la province qui ont été à l’origine de déplacements. Les fréquentes confrontations entre mouvements armés et forces armées burundaises ont entretenu un climat d’insécurité dans plusieurs communes.

Aujourd’hui, la province reste le fief du mouvement rebelle FNL dont les hostilités avec les nouvelles forces de défense nationale perpétuent le phénomène de déplacements et de dispersions de courte durée. On ne remarque plus actuellement des camps de regroupements forcés des populations du fait qu’ils ont été démantelés par le gouvernement en 1998 sous la pression de la communauté internationale. Des sites de déplacés de 1993 existent encore, à Isale et Mukike notamment. »

Several types of IDP sites described by UNFPA (2003)

- Site for the night: people find shelter in the site during the night
- Dismantled site: population returns home following improvement of security and rehabilitation of infrastructure
- Site transformed into village: former IDPs have settled for good and do not want to be called IDPs anymore
- Other sites: made of very poor people who have not fled the conflict; are not considered as IDPs

UNFPA, Draft 2003: "Site de nuit :"

Dans les zones à insécurité momentanée, certaines populations craignent les assauts nocturnes des bandes armées et se rassemblent le soir sur un site convenu avec les forces de l’ordre et l’administration locale pour se faire protéger. C’est le site de nuit. C’est ce que OCHA-UNICEF-PCAC/PNUD appellent dans leur publication « Identification des problèmes humanitaires et des besoins socio-économiques des ménages dans les sites de déplacés, mai 2002 », au point 2.6. Limites de la recherche, Site dortoir.

Ce type de site a été exclu du champ du recensement d’autant plus que ces populations sont chez eux au cours de la journée et ce site n’a pas la structure administrative qu’on rencontre dans les autres sites de déplacés (les organes de l’administration à la base : chef de site et les « NYUMBKUMI »).

Site démantelé :

Un site de déplacés peut se vider à la suite du retour de la sécurité dans une région donnée et si les infrastructures socio-économiques des ménages des déplacés ont été réhabilitées sur les collines d’origine. Le site démantelé est donc le site de déplacés dont la population est déjà rentrée chez soi.

Site transformé en village :

Il s’agit du site de GAKONI dans la Commune de GITERANYI, Province MUYINGA. Les habitants de ce site dont les anciens déplacés vivent dans des parcelles achetées à la commune. Ils ont même exhibé au supervis de recensement la quittance communale. Ils ont refusé de se faire recenser comme « déplacés ».
Sites d’une autre nature:

Il s’agit des sites de Buterere, Nyamugari et Kabondo. Le Département de la Population ne les a pas recensés.

Le site de Buterere appelé aussi Nyarumanga a été constitué au départ par quelques familles de gens très pauvres qui fréquentaient le centre nutritionnel de Maramvya malheureusement fermé en 1998. D’autres personnes les ont rejoints progressivement jusqu’à atteindre aujourd’hui près de 341 ménages à la recherche de meilleurs conditions de vie. Ils fuyaient la misère mais pas l’insécurité due à la guerre comme les déplacés, d’après le chef de la zone Buterere contacté.

Certes, ces personnes ont besoin de l’aide humanitaire. Ce sont des indigents en réalité. Toutefois, ces personnes ont été exclues du monde des déplacés eu égard à la définition donnée à un déplacé dans le contexte du recensement.

Les sites de Nyamugari, Commune Cendajuru, Province Cankuzo et de Kabondo, Commune Nyanza-lac, Province Makamba, qui figurent sur la liste de référence ont été exclus des statistiques du Département de la Population. En effet, d’après les renseignements recueillis sur le terrain, les populations de ces sites sont normalement des populations dispersées qui se logent chez des amis et connaissances ou dans des maisons louées généralement dans les villes, centres urbains ou à vocation urbaine et dans les centres de négoce en attendant le rétablissement de la sécurité dans leurs collines.


- The displaced: ethnic Tutsi who have fled to camps or villages (end 1998: approximately 200,000)
- The regrouped: ethnic Hutu who the Government required to move into regroupment camps (end 1998: approximately 200,000)
- The dispersed: unknown number of mostly ethnic Hutu who have fled from their homes to remote areas scattered throughout the countryside;
- Above categories of displacement no longer used by the humanitarian community as criteria for assistance

Inter-Agency Standing Committee-Working Group February 1999, pp. 69-70:
"Displacement in Burundi is not a static phenomenon, population movements occur in several parts of the country and for number of reasons. Some of these movements are the result of military operations in which people are forced to move, others are organised by local authorities in order to protect specific populations or to bring them nearer to their lands and others are spontaneous, people fleeing from real or perceived dangers. While some displaced have remained uprooted since 1993 others have repeatedly fled as security conditions changed.

Different terms are used to describe the country's uprooted population:
The displaced, indicating ethnic Tutsi who have fled to camps or villages. By the end of 1998 they amount to an approximate 200,000;
The regrouped, indicating ethnic Hutu who the Government required to move into regroupment camps. By the end of 1998 they amount to an approximate 200,000;
The dispersed, indicating an unknown number of mostly ethnic Hutu who have fled from their homes to remote areas scattered throughout the countryside;
These different labels were adopted by the humanitarian community and to some extent reflected the different humanitarian needs of the uprooted populations. In 1998 the humanitarian community called for an abandonment of the practice of calibrating assistance to affected populations on the basis of a series of semantic categories, in favour of more objective criteria for assistance such as vulnerability and capacity for sustainable reinstallation.

United Nations Resident Coordinator System in Burundi 1998, pp. 6-7:
“Conditions in the sites are wretched but things are even worse for an unknown but significant number of so-called dispersed population hiding in the forest and marshes. Terrified of emerging from their hiding places lest they become even easier targets, these people are forced to play a macabre game of hide-and-seek with rival factions that deny them access even to the basic assistance available in the sites. Surviving solely on what they can scavenge, the dispersed are clearly the most vulnerable of all, but also the most difficult for relief workers to locate and to reach. Sometimes, those who manage to break out, end up dying from exhaustion when they finally reach a feeding centre. […]

Like almost all aspects of the Burundian conflict, population movements are a complex, multifaceted phenomenon. Up to mid-1998, it was the practice of the humanitarian community to classify different groups on the basis of the circumstances that obliged them to leave their homes and/or the environment to which they have moved. A whole new lexicon of categories emerged: the old- and new-caseload displaced; short- and long term regrouped […] dispersed; and newly liberated, to mention just a few. Over the course of the past year, however, humanitarian agencies and their partners have begun to question this practice. In light of the evolution of Government policy as well as of other developments, it is now appropriate to focus on current vulnerability and a continuous objective assessment of needs. However they are described, all affected populations are caught up in a vicious cycle of insecurity, flight, poverty and disease. Assistance should be provided with the view to long-term, viable resettlement, for as many families as possible, as soon as conditions permit.”
PHYSICAL SECURITY & FREEDOM OF MOVEMENT

Right to life and personal security

Human rights abuses in several provinces (2006-2008)

- Abuses against the civilian population are committed especially in Bujumbura Mairie, Bujumbura Rural and Bubanza Provinces (2008)
- Despite the signature of a ceasefire agreement between the government of Burundi and the FNL, the FNL continues to ransom the civil population in Bujumbura Rural (2007)

BINUB 3 March 2008:
« La situation sécuritaire a été fortement perturbée surtout dans les provinces de l’Ouest (Bujumbura Mairie, Bujumbura Rural et Bubanza) où des assassinats, parfois ciblés, ont été rapportés, qu’il s’agisse de l’assassinat, en commune urbaine de Kinama, d’un membre du parti CNDD-FDD ou de celui, toujours en commune de Kinama, d’un infirmier prétendument proche du FNL. En outre, plusieurs cas de coups et blessures et de vols à main armée ont été également signalés dans ces provinces et celles du Centre. »

Ligue ITEKA 11 January 2007:
« In spite of the signature of an agreement of cease-fire between the government of Burundi and Palipehutu-FNL movement, the latter continue to demand a ransom from the civil population in province of Bujumbura-Rural.

The inhabitants of the Kabezi commune deplore to pay each one an amount of BiF 500 to this movement which, in its turn, distributes receipts to the "debtor".»

Swisspeace Foundation December 2007:
“During the reporting period [October-November 2007] insecurity remains a concern. In addition to a number of unrelated incidents (such as several holdups which led to road closure for night traffic around Bujumbura), the FNL-PALIPEHUTU rebel movement and its dissidents are responsible for the prevailing insecurity in the rebel’s strongholds of Cibitoke, Bubanza and Bujumbura rural province, which affects the population the most.”

UNSC 27 October 2006:
“While there has been some improvement in the security situation, the proliferation of arms among civilians continues to be of great concern. According to a study by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), about 100,000 households in the country have small arms and light weapons for self-defence, resulting in a high crime rate, accidents (for example in July, a child was seriously wounded after stepping on a grenade) and more wanton acts of violence by civilians.”

See also:
FIDH, 14 February 2008, Burundi : Dégradation continue de la situation des droits de l’homme [Internet]

UNGA, 8 August 2007, Situation of human rights in Burundi: Note by the Secretary-General (A/62/213) [Internet]
Displaced women and children face specific protection problems (2005-2007)

- The UN estimates that 19 per cent of Burundian adolescents and women have been victims of sexual violence
- In 2006-2007, reported increase in sexual violence nationwide, the brunt of which is borne by children, especially girls
- The capital and the 17 provinces of Burundi are fraught with sexual violence (2006)
- Majority of attacks are committed by members of the victims’ extended family, teachers and household domestic staff, and not by rebels and military personnel (2007)

**UNGA 21 December 2007:**
According to the UN SG report on children and armed conflict: “In the Great Lakes region, especially in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Burundi, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights indicated appalling levels of sexual and gender-based violence.”

**AI 9 October 2007:**
“The most commonly reported form of sexual violence in Burundi is rape, and is committed by both state and non-state actors, including law enforcement officials and military officers. Rape of women and girls is prevalent in the home and in the community and the problem is widespread throughout Burundi. Between 2004 and 2006 an average of 1,346 women a year reported their cases to Médecins sans Frontières (MSF). Minors are also particularly at risk: in December 2006, 60 per cent of reported rapes were committed against minors. The Burundian authorities are failing to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate and punish rape and other sexual violence and the perpetrators escape prosecution and punishment by the state. These systemic failures have engendered a climate where rape victims are less willing or able to pursue criminal proceedings. The rate of successful prosecutions for sexual offences is still very low. A clear message must be delivered by the government now: violence against women is a violation of human rights which cannot be tolerated, rape is a crime, perpetrators must be brought to justice and victims must be offered compensation.

It is difficult to determine current levels of sexual violence with any accuracy in the absence of reliable official statistics. The government does not have an independent monitoring system which would allow it to publicly report on the prevalence of rape and other forms of sexual violence and the effectiveness of the responses by the relevant authorities.”

**Zicherman January 2007:**
“Reliable statistics on sexual violence in Burundi do not exist. Médecins Sans Frontières’ clinic in the capital city, Bujumbura, sees an average of 124 new cases a month and a CARE-supported clinic 40 cases. In 2004 Ligue Iteka, a local human rights organisation,1 recorded 1,664 cases of survivors of sexual violence seeking judicial assistance. Anecdotal evidence suggests that sexual violence is continuing to grow. Over 90% of women interviewed by CARE in Bujumbura Rurale province affirmed either having experienced sexual violence themselves or knowing someone who had.
Rebels and military personnel are no longer the primary perpetrators. In communities where CARE works, survivors of sexual violence report that the majority of attacks are committed by members of their extended family, teachers and household domestic staff. This reflects a general breakdown in social norms, withering of traditional conflict resolution and community sanction mechanisms and absence of functioning state law enforcement and judicial institutions. While the war might have been the trigger for an increase in sexual violence, only when there is genuine peace and increased livelihood security – not just absence of armed conflict – will the level of sexual violence fall significantly.

Their declining socio-economic status also puts women at risk, particularly for female-headed households. Poor women without a husband or older son in the household are perceived as unprotected – and therefore likely targets for sexual violence with little fear of retribution. Local officials have demanded sexual favours in return for food aid and other assistance. Poor families are often driven by circumstance to push daughters into early marriages where they are at a high risk of conjugal sexual violence.3

OCHA 2006, p13:
“Recent statistics show that 19% of Burundian adolescents and women have been victims of sexual violence.”

UNSC 28 November 2007:
“During the period under review [2006-2007] 31 cases of rape and grave sexual violence against children were reported, as opposed to 16 cases reported during the previous reporting period. This trend seems to echo the increase in sexual violence nationwide, the brunt of which is borne by children, especially girls. Particularly alarming is the fact that the perpetrators of most of the reported abuses were affiliated with the national security forces, including the Burundi National Police, the Internal Security Police, the National Defence Forces and the National Intelligence Service. Although FNL elements were also responsible for similar violations, the number of reported cases of rape and grave sexual violence perpetrated by national security forces has increased in comparison with the previous reporting period, while that of FNL has not.

Despite some efforts made by the Burundian authorities to arrest and prosecute the perpetrators of sexual violence, impunity continues to prevail and victims seldom take legal action for fear of reprisal, especially when the aggressor is affiliated with the national security forces. Thus, informal settlements are often concluded either directly between the victims’ families and those responsible for rape and grave sexual violence, or sometimes with the mediation of traditional community institutions such as the Bashingantahe.”

UNICEF 2006:
“Abuses of human rights and violations of international law by all parties in the conflict remain widespread and of serious concern. Children and women, in particular, are victims of sexual and gender-based violence. Non-governmental sources indicate that less than 5 per cent of rapes are reported to police or judicial authorities. In remote areas, rape cases are often resolved by community elders without referral to courts.”

Information on previous years:


RI 28 April 2004, Refugee Voices: Burundian internally displaced women vulnerable to sexual exploitation [link below]

AI 24 February 2004, Burundi: Rape - the hidden human rights abuse [link below]
Burundi is among the world’s five worst conflict zones in which to be a woman or child, according to a report of May 2003 by the international NGO Save the Children. Click here to see the report, ‘State of the World’s Mothers.’

UNSC 18 December 2006:
“Sexual violence continued to be widespread and minors, including very young children, constituted some 60 per cent of reported rape cases.”

Displaced children have been recruited and used in the civil war (2001-2007)

- According UN report to the UNSC, reports of rape, sexual violence, abduction and detention of children and child recruitment by the FNL increased in 2006/2007
- Up to 14,000 children took part in the war in Burundi

UNSC 28 November 2007:
“The present report, prepared pursuant to the provisions of Security Council resolution 1612 (2005), is presented to the Council as the second country report on the situation of children and armed conflict in Burundi. It covers the period from September 2006 to August 2007, and illustrates the situation of children affected by the armed conflict in Burundi since my previous report (S/2006/851 and Corr.1) and the subsequent conclusions and recommendations of the Working Group on children and armed conflict (S/2007/92).[…]

The report notes that reports of cases of rape and sexual violence, abduction and detention of children, and child recruitment by the Forces nationales de libération increased during the period. The report emphasizes that, despite improvements in security, a climate of impunity for violators of the rights of children persists in Burundi.[…]

In 1990, Burundi signed and ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict was signed on 13 November 2001 and ratified on 28 January 2005. However, national legislation on the criminalization of recruitment and use of children in armed conflict has yet to be adopted.”

OCHA 29 June 2001:
"Up to 14,000 children have taken part in the eight-year civil war in Burundi, according to a report from the 'Coalition to stop the use of child soldiers'. "

OCHA August 2004, p17:
“Protection against Recruitment of Children into Armed Groups (Principle 13)
Responses are mixed to the question of whether there has been recruitment of children into armed groups. Many IDPs respond ‘yes’ (by both FAB and rebel groups) but explain that most children who join the armed groups do so voluntarily, in search of a means of income or subsistence. Most replies indicate that forcible child recruitment was a problem in the past but no
longer or rarely takes place now. Interestingly, the response among child heads of household is also mixed, with some saying 'yes' there is recruitment and some saying 'no'."

See also:

UNICEF, 27 March 2007, UN Special Representative commends demobilization of child soldiers in Burundi [Internet]

Human Rights Watch (HRW), 16 June 2006, A long way from home: FNL child soldiers in Burundi [link below]

A long way from home: FNL child soldiers in Burundi [Internet]
SUBSISTENCE NEEDS

General

UNICEF Indicators point to difficult situation of Burundian children (January 2008)

UNICEF 1 January 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE COUNTRY DATA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population under 18 (thousands)</td>
<td>3969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5 mortality rate</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school enrolment ratio, 2000-2005, net (male/female)</td>
<td>60/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U1 fully immunized (DPT3)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population using improved drinking water sources</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated no. of people (all ages) living with HIV, 2005 (thousands)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% U5 suffering from moderate and severe underweight</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The situation of children and women remains precarious as Burundi grapples with a fragile peace and heightened expectations of democracy dividends. The 12-year-long conflict and continuing political tensions have greatly hampered the Government’s capacity to deliver basic services or address human rights violations of children and women. The infrastructural decay and lack of capacity to pull out of the emergency phase was clearly illustrated during the implementation of the Government’s declaration of Free Birth Delivery Services and Medical Care for Children Under Five, aimed at reducing the high maternal and infant mortality rates, as well as of Free Primary Education.

The latest Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey indicated a rise in maternal and infant mortality rates, as well as an increase in acute malnutrition among children, especially those aged under five.”

Food and nutrition

600,000 Burundians need food aid (2008)
With a population growth of 33 percent from six million to more than eight million since 1988, the average annual food production per capita has dropped by 41 percent.

However, significant improvement in the rate of chronic malnutrition and underweight children.

According to 2007 survey, nutrition situation is generally under control and has improved since the last countrywide survey in 2005.

IRIN 7 March 2008:
“Burundi’s food security remains precarious, despite a slight improvement in production during the latest harvest season, with an estimated 600,000 people needing food aid, according to a recent assessment. [...]”

“With a population growth of 33 percent from six million to more than eight million since 1988, the average annual [food] production per capita has dropped by 41 percent,” stated the report, which was released on 5 March [2008]. “Analysed by type of crop, the decline was 28 percent for cereals, 74 percent for pulses, 29 percent for roots and tubers, and 15 percent for bananas and plantains.”

The decline in food output meant that 34 percent of the population consumed only 1,400 kilocalories per day, and half of all households had inadequate consumption in terms of quality, quantity and diversity.

Even at harvest times, household dependence on bought food remained as high as 40 percent. Although an estimated 90 percent of the population derived its livelihood from agriculture, the rate of chronic malnutrition was still high compared with other sub-Saharan African countries, according to the report.

The report noted that preliminary results of a study by UNICEF and the Ministry of Health in August 2007 had shown a significant improvement in the rate of chronic malnutrition and underweight children, which was 46.0 percent and 35.2 percent respectively in 2007, down from 52.5 percent and 39.2 percent in 2005.”

UN System Standing Committee on Nutrition, 31 December 2007:
“A UNICEF/GoB national nutrition survey was carried out in August 2007. Preliminary results indicate that the nutrition situation is generally under control and has improved since the last countrywide survey in 2005 (UNICEF, 10/07) (figure 6). Comparisons, however, should be made with caution as the two surveys were carried out at different periods of the year. Acute malnutrition rates ranged from 2.4% in Mwaro to 11.5% in Rutana.”

Health

Main obstacle to health care for IDPs is financial (January 2008)

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
« Santé
Ce chapitre ouvre sur une conclusion valable également pour le suivant, c’est-à-dire qu’aucune discrimination ne grève la faculté qu’ont les IDP de se faire soigner. La seule limite est financière et non statutaire. Argenté, on est soigné, que l’on soit IDP ou pas. Sinon, en cas de maladie, IDP ou pas toujours, autant se recommander directement à la nature, ses herbes, ses feuilles, ses racines, et à la science de ceux qui s’y entendent pour en tirer quelques vertus thérapeutiques, réelles ou supposées.
Quant aux attestations d’indigence, elles ne sont délivrées aux IDP qu’autant qu’ils entrent dans l’une des catégories de vulnérables nécessitant cette assistance. Mais ils ne représentent que l’une de ces catégories. De ce fait, tous n’en ont pas. Par ailleurs, tous les centres de santé ne les acceptent pas, préférant au système de recouvrement rétroactif, un paiement immédiat en numéraire. »

Survey says that IDPs in the South have similar access to water than resident population (January 2008)

- Some of the IDPs and of the resident population both have to walk long distances to reach drinkable water, or can only access water of poor quality

UNHCR, 1 January 2008

« Si le standard consiste en une adduction d’eau potable et courante dans chaque domicile de IDP, alors aucun foyer n’atteint la norme. Si maintenant le standard consiste à se satisfaire de ce que les IDP disposent du même accès à l’eau que les populations résidentes, alors partout la norme est atteinte. Seulement, dans certains endroits, cette norme se situe très en dessous des principes sanitaires les plus bas. En effet, il se rencontre quelques circonstances où IDP et résidents se partagent le même approvisionnement en une eau qui, si elle n’est pas impropre à la consommation, se situe à une distance si éloignée des habitations qu’elle peut être qualifiée d’inaccessible eu égard aux critères d’évaluation.

Pourant, il est fréquent de constater que des aménagements ont été entrepris ici et là, pour permettre une meilleure disponibilité de l’eau. Mais, que ces structures aient été conçues à la hâte, ou qu’elles n’aient pas reçu l’entretien adéquat pour perdurer, toujours est-il qu’en bien des lieux ces systèmes hydrauliques présentent des défectuosités qui priment les populations des services pour lesquels ils avaient été élaborés. »

Precarious Health conditions in Burundi (2006)

- Burundi is one of the countries where health indicators continue to feature as among the worst in the world
- Mortality rate remains as high as 47% for children under 5 years
- Free medical care for Burundian mothers and children was intended to improve their lives; instead it has cripple the nation’s health system

UN 30 November 2006:

“Burundi is one of the countries where health indicators continue to feature as among the worst in the world. Malaria remains a primary public health concern. Despite the significant drop in costs further to the implementation of the National Protocol, the mortality rate remains as high as 47% for children under 5 years. Moreover, localised cholera and meningitis epidemics are certain to occur at the known intervals with a couple of thousand cases to be tested and possibly treated. Infections often are fatal because medical staff is inadequately trained, due to the absence of efficient control systems, poor performance of epidemiological surveillance systems, or under-equipped laboratories.”

IRIN 9 June 2006:
“A new policy of free medical care for Burundian mothers and children was intended to improve their lives; instead it has cripple the nation’s health system.

Public hospitals in Burundi have recorded double, sometimes triple, the number of patients since a presidential directive for free paediatric and maternal health services was implemented on 1 May [2006]. Overcrowded wards, a shortage of doctors and other medical staff, as well as patients’ inability to afford prescribed medications are some of the challenges health officials are now facing.”

OCHA, 2006, p7:
“In the area of primary healthcare, the major concerns during the year were related to the continuous limited access to services, the poor quality of service delivery and the government’s reduced capacities for surveillance and early warning.”

NRC 1 September 2005, p32:
“According to survey conducted in Makamba province in 2005, The local population, IDPs, returning IDPs and repatriated refugees lack access to health care for the following reasons:
la rareté des centres de santé et des postes de soins,
- le coût élevé des services de soins pour des personnes majoritairement sans moyens financiers,
- la distance trop importante à parcourir pour arriver au centre de santé le plus proche
Cette situation découle de l’organisation structurelle de tout le secteur santé burundais. La réalité est que la capacité de réponses aux attentes d’ordre médicales ou autres, est très limitée.
La distance à parcourir pour arriver au centre de santé et le pourcentage de ménages éloignés de plus de 5 km des centres de santé, permettent et de façon déterminante d’expliciter pour certaines zones, l’importance du non accès aux soins de santé.”

See also:
ITEKA, 16 Oct 2006
Burundi : L’épidémie de choléra refait surface dans certains quartiers de la Mairie de Bujumbura [Internet]

MSF June 2006, Evaluation de l’accès financier aux soins pour les populations de la province de Karuzi : des résultats mitigés [Internet]

For health indicators in Burundi, please see
WHO, December 2005, Health Action in Crises, Burundi [Internet]

See also WHO, August 2005, Update on Health and Humanitarian Situation in Burundi [Internet]

Close to 70 percent of IDP camps have a health facility in or close to the camp (August 2004)

- Lowest access to health facilities for IDPs are in Cankuzo and Bururi Provinces
- On average, 91% of IDP sites have a water point located in or within close proximity of the site, with lowest rates in Ruyigi, Rutana and Karuzi
- 84% of IDP households report having a latrine in the site

OCHA August 2004, p16:
“On average, 68% of IDP sites have a health facility (hospital / health centre / dispensary) located in or within close proximity of the site. When results are disaggregated by province, wide variations emerge. The lowest coverage rate is in Cankuzo Province, where only 20% of the IDP sites have a health facility within close proximity; in Bururi Province, the rate is also low, at 33%. Conversely, in Bujumbura Mairie and the provinces of Mwaro, Ngozi, Rutana and Ruyigi, 100% of the IDP sites have a health facility within close proximity. Results of focus group discussions reveal the difficulties that IDPs face in accessing health services, primarily due to inability to pay for consultation fees and medicines, despite having a facility located nearby.

On average, 91% of IDP sites have a water point located in or within close proximity of the site. Again, differences are noted across provinces, with the lowest coverage rates found in the provinces of Ruyigi (60%), Rutana (67%) and Karuzi (78%). In many provinces, 100% of IDP sites are served by a water point.

On average, 84% of IDP households report having a latrine in the site. Little variation exists across provinces. The survey teams did not inspect the type / condition of individual latrines, but it was observed that many latrines in IDP sites are of the traditional type (simple hole in the ground, with superstructure made of straw / grass).

In general, the availability and level of basic services and infrastructure in the sites does not appear to be a major factor influencing the decision of IDP households to return to their place of origin or remain in the site. Half of the participants in the focus groups believe that the basic services in the site are better than in their place of origin, but there was no difference in response between households that want to return to their place of origin and households that want to remain definitively in the site. This response is not surprising, given the fact that most IDPs are displaced within close proximity to their place of origin and are in many cases accessing the same facilities and services as they were prior to their displacement. Most IDPs continue to complain that the level of basic services in the sites is not adequate, particularly health care. A notable exception is found among child heads of household, most of which believe that the basic services in the site are better than in their place of origin.”

Little information on whether IDPs are particularly vulnerable to HIV/AIDS (2001-2005)

- Burundi is among the 15 countries most affected by the disease (2005)
- Number of people infected with HIV/AIDS has tripled in the last decade with a significantly higher proportion of cases among women
- Over 18 percent of the urban population and 7.5 percent of the rural population are HIV positive
- According to the UNICEF 2004 State of the Worlds Children, 8.3% of adults between 15 and 49 years are infected with HIV
- Burundian NSP [National Strategic Plan] states, without providing evidence, that the promiscuity in IDP camps and agglomerations is one of the principle causes of HIV/AIDS in the country

ECOSOC 27 June 2005:
“According to the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), Burundi is among the 15 countries most affected by the disease, with 390,000 persons living with HIV/AIDS. A strategic HIV/AIDS plan is being implemented by the authorities with international support.”

OCHA 23 June 2005:
"The number of people infected with HIV/AIDS in Burundi has tripled in the last decade with a significantly higher proportion of cases among women."

**WFP September 2004:**
"According to the UNICEF 2004 State of the Worlds Children, 8.3% of adults between 15 and 49 years are infected with HIV. Burundi is estimated, as of 2003, to have the second highest prevalence rate in the central African region, and the 13th in sub Saharan Africa. A wide range of estimates exist for HIV/AIDS prevalence, but they agree that it is increasing over time."

**UNHCR/IDD January 2006, p23:**
"It is important to note that the Burundian NSP [National Strategic Plan] states, without providing evidence, that the promiscuity in IDP camps and agglomerations is one of the principle causes of HIV/AIDS in the country.

The Burundian Red Cross interviewed 731 persons for a BSS [Behavioral Surveillance Survey] in IDP sites located in the Makamba, Rutana and Bururi provinces in 2001-02. The study showed that IDPs could accurately at least one mode of transmission of HIV; 96.5% mentioned unprotected sex, 79.5% sharp objects with infected people, and 30.5% contaminated blood. Few IDPs knew about mother-to-child transmission. The BSS reported that radio (87.8%) and religious sermons (27.3%) were the most effective means of raising HIV awareness. In terms of prevention, 91.8% spoke of abstinence, 54.0% suggested not sharing sharp objects, 45.3% mentioned condoms, and only 10.3% knew about antiretroviral drugs reducing mother-to-child transmission. The fact that few people know of and use condoms is particularly worrying given that 53.6% of young people claimed to have sexual relations before 15 years of age."

**OCHA 19 Nov 2002, p15 & 26:**
"In 2001 alone, more than 40,000 Burundians are estimated to have died because of AIDS. HIV/AIDS is the highest cause of mortality among adults and a major cause of infant mortality. At the end of 1999 there were an estimated 240,000 HIV/AIDS orphans in Burundi. In addition, some 360,000 adults (aged between 15 and 49 years) and 19,000 under 15 years were living with HIV/AIDS, affecting people in their most economically productive years, and leading to a significant reduction in life expectancy. […]

Populations in displacement camps are particularly vulnerable, especially women. During the socio-behavioural survey, 9% of young people surveyed reported to have already been victims of rape. Young people from 15 to 24 years old surveyed in displaced sites assert that it is difficult to abstain. Moreover, some men in the camps pressure women into sexual intercourse in order to 'reconstruct' what the war has destroyed 'gusanura ivyasambutse'."

**IRIN-CEA 22 June 2001:**
"Concentration of internally-displaced people (IDPs) in camps and promiscuity are to blame for the increasing rate of HIV infection in Burundi's population, and the camps have become new centres of high infection rates in the countryside, the director of Burundi's national AIDS and sexually transmitted diseases control programme, Dr. Joseph Wakana, told the Pan-African news agency (PANA) on Monday. However, UN sources disputed Wakana's claim of "promiscuity" as a cause, noting that HIV rates are higher in IDP and refugee camps worldwide due largely to sexual violence by men against women and breakdown of family structure. "There is widespread rape - people are no longer bound by social conventions," Damien Rwegera, an adviser for conflict zones in West and Central Africa for the UN AIDS organisation, told Reuters on Tuesday. "The soldiers rape, the men rape - especially as up to 95 percent of people in a refugee camp can be women and children because the men are dispersed." A UN humanitarian source in Burundi added that seventy percent of households in the country's IDP camps are headed by women."

*See also: UNAIDS Burundi Country HIV and AIDS estimates, end 2003 [External link]*
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Most of IDP sites in the South were organised between 1996 and 2000 (2008)

- In southern provinces, people still in sites include those who fled armed clashes between 1993 and 2000; to a lesser extent those who fled due to natural disasters (floods and drought) in 2005-2006, returnees from Tanzania and Batwa communities who were then able to exploit land

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
« C’est ainsi qu’à quelques exceptions près datant de 1993, la plupart des sites encore fréquentés à l’heure actuelle se sont ouverts ou ont été organisés entre 1996 et 2000. Correspondant à cette époque où les rivalités entre bandes armées et gente militaire prenaient de l’ampleur, le climat d’insécurité chronique qui s’ensuivit provoqua de nombreux déplacements dans cette région. Et plutôt que de concerner une seule communauté, comme jadis ailleurs dans le pays, force est de constater que se furent bien toutes les composantes ethniques du Burundi qui cherchèrent dans ce mouvement migratoire une alternative à la menace que faisait peser ces affrontements.

Se regroupant alors spontanément autour de positions de sécurité, ces populations furent également l’objet de regroupements, ou de fragmentations, organisés par les autorités. Cette intervention administrative avait tantôt pour but de réunir les IDP de plusieurs sites spontanés sur un seul périmètre plus sécurisé, ou plus proche de leurs propriétés, tantôt à l’inverse, de fractionner certains sites trop importants en de plus modestes entités.

Occupant ainsi le domaine public, des propriétés privées ou le patrimoine foncier paroissial, ces sites proposèrent à leurs résidents des havres aux caractéristiques très variables.


En définitive, dans les sites encore fréquentés, se côtoient désormais :
- Les IDP de « 1ère génération », ceux qui ont fui leurs localités entre 1993 et 2000 pour éviter d’être pris à partie dans les affrontements armés qui ensanglantèrent le pays. Provenant des collines et des communes voisines, ou de toutes les autres provinces du Burundi, même des plus éloignées, cette composante de la population des IDP représente encore la frange la plus importante en termes numériques.
- Les IDP de « 2ème génération », ceux pour qui les conditions climatiques (sécheresse et inondations) observées en 2005 et 2006 eurent un impact si désastreux qu’elles ne leur laissèrent pas d’autre alternative que le déplacement.
- Des rapatriés revenus de Tanzanie ou d’ailleurs et qui, profitant du départ des IDP, s’installèrent dans les sites en attendant de retrouver la jouissance de leurs biens.
- Quelques communautés batwa qui profitèrent de ce même mouvement de recul de fréquentation des sites pour accéder à la possibilité d’exploiter un lopin de terre. »
Many IDPs live in small houses built with international assistance (January 2008)

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
« Concernant tout d’abord, la configuration architecturale des maisons, elle varie selon qu’une assistance a été déployée ou non en faveur des IDP. Ceux qui ont bénéficié d’un programme d’aide au logement résident souvent dans des maisons aux dimensions uniformes. Que les bâtisses aient été entièrement construites ou que les IDP n’aient perçu que le complément standard en matériel pour l’achever (clous, tôles, bois de charpente et huisserie), elles ont toutes les mêmes dimensions (5x7 mètres). A l’inverse, pour tous ceux qui ne durent qu’à leur seule capacité à se loger le fait de disposer d’un abri, les cas de figure varient beaucoup plus. Certains ont monté leur propre maison. Les dimensions de celles-ci évoluent alors en fonction de la manière dont a été résolue l’équation Taille familiale / Revenu du ménage. D’autres ont réhabilité des édifices menaçant ruine. D’autres encore ont opté pour le système de la location. Enfin, quelques derniers, qui ont goûté à cet esprit de solidarité qui anime ceux pour lesquels s’en désunir reviendrait à compromettre leur propre existence, ont pu bénéficier de la générosité communale ou familiale pour être hébergés. »

Pressing need of housing assistance for IDPs encouraged to return to their collines of origin (2006)

- Returning IDPs in Gitega Province and in Bujumbura Rural are reported to have pressing shelter needs

OCHA 17 September 2006:
“The Government project APRS supported by GTZ has completed identification of beneficiaries for its housing project which plans to build 512 houses in Gitega commune (Gitega province). Identified persons include returnees, displaced persons, former combatants and certain vulnerable persons. Further to the decision by the Government to undertake major construction work at Itankoma, displaced persons were encouraged to return to their collines of origin. Whilst all of the approximately 400 IDPs had adhered to the call, only 160 were considered and will be assisted. There is a pressing need of assistance for the remaining group of displaced persons in terms of housing since they have to leave the location.”

OCHA 23 April 2006:
“Internally displaced persons (IDPs) who had fled insecurity more than ten years ago and who returned to their homes in Nyabunyegeri, Tenga, Gahahe, Gatunguru and Gasenyi in Mutimbuzi commune (Bujumbura Rural) are facing difficulties with their housing. They are in urgent need of roofing material after having reconstructed the walls of their former houses which had been destroyed during the conflict. The same situation prevails in Isale commune where around 200 returning families are staying in the unfinished structures or their former homes.”

OCHA 12 December 2006:
“Many former IDP sites now host other categories of people, including returning refugees unable to immediately live on their land (house to be rebuilt).”

Women and children

• Access to food and water in camps is especially difficult for women and children
• Other problems affecting women include childbirth-related problems, abortions, anaemia, lack of vaccination coverage and access to health care, exposure to AIDS and other sexually transmissible diseases
• In Burundi, close to 1,000 out of every 100,000 women died from childbirth complications in 2004
• 16 per cent of pregnant girls aged 15-19 years are HIV positive
• IDP women are particularly at risk to be infected by HIV/AIDS (2002)
• Reports that displaced women and children suffer from severe depression
• Almost 18% of children die before their fifth birthday, equivalent to 48,000 children each year (2000)

UN GA 13 October 1998, paras. 51-54:
"According to the last census of August 1990, women make up 51.3 per cent of the population of Burundi, and they are essentially located in rural areas where 93.7 per cent of the total population live. The women work on average 18 hours a day for their families, half at home and half in the fields.[…]

Burundian women have been seriously affected by the crisis and the civil war. They constitute the majority of those found at the sites of displaced persons and regrouped populations and are the sole heads of their households. Before the crisis, women formed a large part of the workforce in rural areas which underwent a sharp decline during the war.

[…]

Women at the sites are also affected by other health problems, including those relating to childbirth, abortions, anaemia and the lack of vaccination coverage and access to health care, as well as exposure to AIDS and other sexually transmissible diseases. The living conditions of women and children have therefore become highly precarious. In Burundi, women represented 50.6 per cent of the registered cases of persons tested as seropositive during surveys in 1995. The number of orphans with AIDS was estimated at 94,000 in 1997."

ONUB 7 April 2005:
"In 2004, Burundi recorded a maternal mortality (death after childbirth) rate of 855 out of 100,000 live births; neonatal mortality stillbirths of 31.9 out of 1,000 childbirths; child mortality (below 1 year) rate of 129 out of 1,000; and infant-juvenile mortality (below 5 years) rate of 200 out of 1,000."

OCHA 19 November 2002, p26:
"With almost 80% of all women delivering their children in the home, and without qualified assistance, reproductive health (RH) remains in dire need of the most basic support nationwide. Privatisation, and cost-recovery measures within the health sector have led to a rise in the cost of health care, and act as a significant financial deterrent for families. Hygiene conditions, particularly in IDP sites are deplorable and lack basic material and technical equipment, almost entirely ill-equipped to handle minor complications or emergencies."

United Nations Resident Coordinator System in Burundi 1998, p. 6:
"[T]he experience of living in a crowded site is both disorienting and degrading for people accustomed to living in relative seclusion and to providing for their own needs. The utter lack of privacy is one of the most difficult and degrading aspects of site life. A UNFPA study carried out in 1998 emphasizes the humiliation women suffer when forced to sleep in the same small room
as the male members of their families. As one displaced woman commented, 'Sharing the room with your son or your son-in-law is simply not done. I am ashamed.'

**HRW June 2000, "Life in the camps":**
"As the primary care-givers responsible for the welfare of their children, some women have apparently suffered severe emotional and mental stress from watching them suffer. One medical worker with an international humanitarian agency assisting the malnourished in Bujumbura-rural has observed symptoms of severe depression in the women whom she treats or whose children she treats. These women appear to have given up caring about their own health or that of their children and sit for hours staring vacantly off into the distance."

**SCF 16 August 2001:**
"Burundi's child health statistics are dismal. Almost 18% of children die before their fifth birthday, equivalent to 48,000 children each year [UNICEF, Progress of Nations 2000]. While HIV/AIDS remains the main public health concern, malaria, upper respiratory tract infections (such as bronchitis) and dysentery are the most common causes of child death."

**CHR 7 March 2002, para.70:**
"The rise in the infection rates and the number of AIDS patients is due to the continuing war, poverty, and a shortage of training and information. Women, particularly those living among displaced groups and in highly unsafe areas, are the most at risk."
ACCESS TO EDUCATION

General

Since 2005 primary education is free for IDPs and other children (2006-2008)

- The lack of space in classes and distances to reach schools still limit access to education for displaced and other children (2008)
- 50 per cent increase of enrolment for 1st grade in all provinces
- Enormous challenges remain to make free primary education accessible to all
- In 2006, an estimated 150,000 children could not be integrated into the first year of school

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:

« Scolarité
A l’identique de ce qui prévalait pour le chapitre précédent, il n’a pas été rapporté d’incident qui se serait traduit par une mesure d’exclusion visant les enfants déplacés en raison du seul fait qu’ils soient déplacés. Tous les enfants sont acceptés à l’école sans aucune forme de discrimination autre que l’exiguïté des établissements d’enseignement. En effet, si avant l’année scolaire 2005-2006, les frais d’inscription pouvaient représenter un obstacle à l’admission des enfants issus des familles les plus défavorisées, la suppression du « minerval » pour le premier cycle d’études permit à nombre d’entre eux d’accéder à l’école. Mais alors, ce fut à une augmentation considérable du nombre d’élèves scolarisables auquel on assista, que le ministère public ne put gérer concomitamment en édifiant les structures d’accueil proportionnelles.

La situation des enfants déplacés correspond donc à celle des enfants résidents : le manque de place disponible dans les salles de classe et les distances qu’il convient parfois de parcourir pour s’y rendre restreignent quelque peu l’accès à l’école. Et, ce qui est valable pour l’enseignement de premier degré, l’est a fortiori pour le secondaire, pour lequel se compte un nombre d’établissement plus réduit encore. »

OCHA 2006:

“Current estimates indicate that approximately 550,000 children between 7-12 years of age do not attend school. While the decision of the newly elected Government to abolish primary school fees is both welcome and necessary, in the short to medium term it will place further strain on an already over-stretched education infrastructure. On a positive note, the 2005-2006 school year has seen a 50% increase of enrolment for 1st grade in all provinces, compared to the period 2004-2005. In the current school year, the most critical priorities are addressing the extremely limited school capacities and teachers’ shortages in all Burundian provinces, as well as maximising access for 1st graders.”

UNICEF 2006:

“The declaration of free primary education in Burundi has doubled enrolment, bringing with it the massive need for qualified teachers, desks, books, uniforms, teaching manuals, blackboards, classrooms, water supplies for schools and separate latrines for pupils. In addition, there are existing challenges in the retention of children in school, particularly girls, and in the reduction of geographical and cultural disparities in the access to education. The responsibilities for improving school infrastructure generally lie with the individual schools, communities and parents – in a
country where the GDP per capita is less than US$ 100 per annum. The critical priority is to ensure maximum access and retention of first graders.”

UN 30 November 2006:
“2006 also witnessed the end of the first school year after the implementation of the presidential decision to render primary education free of charge. Although UNICEF coordinated a response to absorb the massive increase in primary school children, an estimated 150,000 children could not be integrated into the first year of school. This had a knock-on effect in the new school year that started in late September 2006 when the remainder of these children had to be integrated into classes.”
Several factors explain why IDP’s self-reliance is undermined (2005)

- Theft of crops reinforces food insecurity and conflicts
- Large-scale destruction of livestock also causes food insecurity
- Poor access to credit
- Land is less and less fertile due to demographic pressure

OCHA 26 May 2005, pp31-32:
According to National IDP Survey in 2005, "Les besoins alimentaires
La distance entre les sites et les propriétés favorise les vols dans les champs ('vol sur pied'), en témoigne la fréquence de ces cas répertoriés aux chefs-lieux des communes. Cette situation a pour conséquence de renforcer la précarité alimentaire et l'entretien des rancœurs ou méfiances.

Il ressort des entretiens avec les déplacés qu'une part importante de leur cheptel a été détruite pendant la crise et que cette situation a eu pour conséquence un appauvrissement alimentaire en protéines animales et une dégradation de la fertilité de leurs sols. Ainsi, ils estiment que le développement de l'élevage, en particulier caprin ou bovin, intégré dans leurs exploitations agricoles permettrait de restaurer à la fois l'équilibre nutritionnel et la fertilité des sols par l'apport de fumier. Ce besoin est bien entendu général sur l'ensemble du territoire.

En général, les besoins des déplacés pour renforcer leur sécurité alimentaire s'expriment en termes d'intrants agricoles. Les déplacés pensent que l'augmentation de leur production alimentaire doit passer par l'utilisation d'intrants comme les engrais et les semences de variétés performantes.

Néanmoins une amélioration durable de la sécurité alimentaire des ménages doit passer soit un agrandissement des parcelles cultivées, soit par une diversification des sources de revenus.

L'accès à la monnaie ou au crédit
Dans l'ensemble, l'économie rurale est démonétisée. Néanmoins il a été constaté que dans les milieux de vie des déplacés, les taux usuraires sont courants et les contrats léonins. Par exemple, une mesure de haricot empruntée au début de la période de plantation, doit être remboursée avec deux mesures et demie lors de la récolte. Pour les crédits à montants élevés, la terre est hypothéquée. Pour rendre plus difficile le remboursement du prêt, le créancier refuse tout paiement partiel. À l’expiration d’une certaine période, le créancier est en droit de « racheter» la terre à un « prix » fixé d’avance. Dans tous les cas, il est extrêmement difficile pour les déplacés de se dégager d’une situation de surendettement.

Devant cet état de faits, un secteur financier intermédiaire, de type micro crédit, trouve toute sa justification. Le besoin de crédit se fait sentir pour lancer des activités génératrices de revenu.

Les activités extra agricoles
La terre devient de plus en plus rare suite à la pression démographique et de moins en moins fertile. Selon les déplacés sur sites, les microprojets artisanaux pourraient contribuer à
l’augmentation de leurs revenus et à la création d’emplois extra agricoles, indispensables pour alléger les pressions foncières."

*For study on coping strategies in regroupment camps, see Boutin & Nkurunziza, 2001, Burundi: Developing Strategies for Self-Reliance [Link below]*

**War and population expansion meant that poverty has doubled (2005)**

- Burundi’s average economic growth rate of 4% before 1993 turned negative over the rest of the decade, with per capita GDP reduced by half between 1993 and 2001.
- Population explosion led to the division of already scarce land into smaller sized plots and to further environmental degradation.
- Household poverty doubled during the war years.

*World Bank 15 June 2005:*

“Economic growth and inequalities. One of the poorest countries in the world at the time of its independence, in recent years Burundi’s agriculturally-based economy has been further impacted by chronic violence and massive displacements. Burundi’s average economic growth rate of 4% before 1993 turned negative over the rest of the decade, with per capita GDP reduced by half between 1993 and 2001.

At a rate of 2.4% over 1980-2000 (6% in urban areas). Burundi’s population has been expanding far more quickly than its economy, resulting in a declining GDP per capita.

The population explosion has also led to the division of already scarce land into smaller sized plots and to further environmental degradation. In addition, Burundi’s small, open economy was affected by a 66% decrease in international aid between 1996 and 2003; a sharp decline in the prices of coffee and tea, its two main exports; the embargo imposed by six neighboring countries (1996-99); substantial increases in military expenditures; higher costs associated with serving Burundi’s external debt; high inflation (40% in 1998); and by a 20% devaluation of the Burundian Franc in August 2002. All combined to shatter the economy. Of all the factors contributing to the depressed state of the Burundian economy, none was more important than the civil war—which was the direct consequence of a massive failure of governance. Burundi’s failing economy, the country’s rapid population growth, and the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a small sub-set of the Tutsi minority, have combined not only to severely limit socioeconomic aspirations for Tutsi and Hutu alike, but also to make Burundi’s ethnic and regional cleavages more acute. For the distinction between society’s “haves” and “have nots” has tended to coincide with these cleavages and make even more significant the link between dominant economic interests and the control of the state machinery. For Burundians the state has come to represent access to wealth and most opportunities for upward economic mobility have been centered in the public sector.

Access to public and private sector jobs, however, is conditioned by access to education, which in recent years has been highly biased in ethnic and regional terms. Moreover, Burundians understand quite well that the economic mismanagement of the country has contributed both to the depressed state of the economy and to the country’s severe economic and social inequities. While national income was declining, military outlays were expanding—to the severe detriment of urgently required social expenditures. Household poverty doubled during the war years.”
Agriculture is principal source of revenue for close to 90 percent of IDPs in camps (August 2004)

- Although most IDPs continue to engage in agricultural activity on their native land, the yields are low and do not meet daily food needs

OCHA August 2004, p.14:

"Not surprisingly, the survey [on IDPs undertaken by OCHA and the Burundian Government] results indicate that 89% of the IDP population cites agriculture as the principal source of revenue. Very few households respond that commerce or another activity generates additional household income. In the focus group discussions, almost all participants replied that their own harvest was the primary (or only) source of their daily food.

As explained above, although most IDPs continue to engage in agricultural activity on their native land, the yields are low and do not meet daily food needs. Many households supplement their subsistence by working for others, paid in either food or money, or through charity from others living in the site, church groups, international NGOs or WFP food aid.

Most participants in the focus groups claim that their ability to generate income in the site is far less than their ability to do so before they were displaced. Some IDP households – most often headed by widows or orphans – do not have any source of economic livelihood and remain entirely dependent on external assistance and support networks that exist within the site where they currently reside."
DOCUMENTATION NEEDS AND CITIZENSHIP

General

Many IDPs do not have identity documents due to prohibitive cost (January 2008)

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
« Concernant les pièces d’identité, le constat sera bref : à l’identique des populations résidentes, les IDP ne justifient que d’une possession partielle de ces documents. Certains en ont, d’autres pas, et les causes de cette disparité reposent surtout sur l’absence de priorité donnée par les foyers les plus économiquement diminués à l’investissement qu’il faut consentir pour en obtenir.

En la matière, et sans que cela ne représente un effort financier préjudiciable, il pourrait être suggéré d’élargir les termes de référence du projet « Cartes Nationales d’Identité » déployé en faveur des rapatriés pour en faire également bénéficier les IDP. »

Returning IDPs and refugees lack identity cards (2005)

• Reasons given are financial as well as administrative constraints
• It is especially the case for women heads of household
• Many returning IDPs also do not see the usefulness of such documents
• IDPs lack the means to obtain identity cards necessary to participate in elections (2005)

NRC September 2005:
“Une grande partie des chefs de ménages ne dispose d’aucun document d’identité (33 % pour Kayogoro et 28 % Nyanza Lac). Ce manque de document d’identité est encore plus marqué lorsque le chef de ménage se trouve être la femme (50 % pour Kayogoro et 38 % pour Nyanza Lac). Cette situation découle du fait que, le manque de moyens financier et les démarches fastidieuses nécessaires pour obtenir ce document constitue pour eux un frein à la possession de la carte d’identité. Néanmoins, la cause principale sous-jacente à ces deux dernières citées ci haut, serait que ces populations ne sont pas sensibilisées sur l’utilité de ce document administratif.”

OCHA 26 May 2005:
« IV.5.2 Jouissance des droits civiques et politiques
Les personnes déplacées jouissent naturellement du droit de vote et participent au processus électoral en cours. Toutefois, la jouissance de leurs droits civiques peut être compromise par le manque de moyens pour se procurer des cartes d’identité. Cette dernière nécessite un investissement de 1500 fbu (500 pour la carte et 1000 pour la photo). Selon les témoignages, les déplacés ne sont pas prêts à investir une telle somme, le revenu journalier moyen ne dépassant pas 500 fbu. »
ISSUES OF FAMILY UNITY, IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Family unity

Endemic discrimination against displaced and other women despite pivotal role of in the household (1998-2004)

- High rate of widows among displaced women
- Support must be provided to help women face their new responsibilities as heads of households
- Discrimination against women in Burundi remains widespread

United Nations Resident Coordinator System in Burundi 1998, pp. 9-10:
"A UNFPA study carried out in 1995 found that nearly one third of all the women living in sites were widows. Given the intensity of the conflict during the last three years that has led to many adult males fighting in armed groups, being killed or 'disappearing', it is safe to assume that the percentage has since risen significantly.

In these circumstances, women are often forced to take on a taxing role as sole providers, not only of food and shelter, but also of moral and physical strength for their families. Having assumed a largely subservient role in the past, many women are unaccustomed to standing up for themselves and are ill-equipped to exercise authority, with the result that they are subjected to harassment and abuse in the sites. They are further disadvantaged because, according to Burundian tradition, they are not legally allowed to own land."

UN Commission on Human Rights 28 November 1998, para. 106:
"Investing in the social and psychological rehabilitation of the women affected by the crisis is an important factor to be taken into account by the international relief and development agencies. For instance, women have rarely participated in the perpetration of massacres and have been targets of killings less often; for these reasons they remain the stable element of the nuclear family and the society. Women are furthermore the centre of subsistence activity in the camps and are playing a major role in the reconstruction of their homes. Since many women have become widows as a result of the violence, and displaced women heads-of-household are particularly numerous, their economic survival, and that of their children, will depend on their being able to earn a living and receive education and training if needed. Their being able to own and inherit land should also become a priority. Investment in the youth, which consists of over 50 per cent of the country, and not just the educated youth, appears to be a priority, if, for example, the formation of militias and guerrillas is to be curbed."

AI 24 February 04:
"Discrimination against women in Burundi remains widespread. The husband is the head of the household and women often have little influence in decisions affecting their lives. A large proportion of women in Burundi are believed to be the victims of violence within the home and family. Women customarily do not own property or the land they work, placing them in positions of dependency, nor do they customarily inherit their husband's property or land making them dependent on his relatives. The level of education of women is generally much lower than that of men.
If a woman's status is low, that of a widow or a rape victim is even worse. The negative attitude to rape victims is not exclusive to men. Several women told Amnesty International how they had been mocked, humiliated and rejected by women relatives, classmates, friends or neighbours and their confidences betrayed, adding to their trauma.

Discrimination against women in Burundi extends to sexual health and family planning choices. Women's ability to choose and control these areas of their lives is additionally hampered by poverty, lack of access to healthcare as well as their subservient status.”
PROPERTY ISSUES

General

Few IDPs own their houses (January 2008)

- The majority of IDPs have built houses on land they did not own

UNHCR, 1 January 2008

"Tous ne peuvent donc se dire propriétaire de leur maison. A bien y regarder même, très rares sont ceux qui peuvent prétendre à ce titre. Car tout dépend du régime juridique du sol sur lequel ont été érigées les bâtisses. Or, il n'y a guère que ceux qui ont acquis la parcelle sur laquelle ils se sont installés qui disposent d'un droit de propriété plein et entier. Les autres, composant l'immense majorité, n'ont de droit sur leur immeuble que celui de la jouissance, lorsque ceux-ci ont été bâtis sur les terrains domaniaux, sur les fonds privés ou sur des parcelles intégrées au patrimoine de l'Eglise. Sachant que la question de l'espace au Burundi revêt une importance quasi vitale, la situation des IDP au regard de l'habitat est donc essentiellement caractérisée par un statut de grande précarité. Certains le savent, d'autres l'ignorent, ou préfèrent l'ignorer tant que personne ne vient leur en parler. Enfin, une fraction de ceux qui souhaitent retourner dans leur localité d'origine subordonnent ce départ au souhait de bénéficier d'une assistance pour reconstruire leur logis d'antan endommagé depuis par les affres du conflit ou l'usure naturelle.

IDPs close to their former land are better off than those who fled further (January 2008)

- IDPs close to their former homes are able to cultivate their land, while those who fled to distant areas face double problem: finding someone to farm their land and avoid illicit occupation of their land

UNHCR, 1 January 2008

« Les moyens de subsistance développés par les IDP peuvent être regroupés en deux grands ensembles : les activités agricoles, pour l’essentiel, et tout le reste, à titre marginal.

Concernant, tout d’abord, les revenus tirés de productions agricoles, il importe de différencier les déplacés qui résident dans des sites jouxtant leurs propriétés foncières et ceux qui sont originaires de localités beaucoup plus éloignées. La plupart des premiers continuent à faire prospérer leurs fonds sans grande difficulté. Hormis quelques cas de prédation sur des récoltes encore sur pied, il n’a pas été rapporté d’incident grave en la matière. En revanche, pour les seconds, ceux qui proviennent de localités si éloignées que la perspective d’exploiter leurs propriétés n’est pas concevable, ils se heurtent à un double problème : celui de trouver à louer leur force productrice en fermage – ce qui ne relève pas de soi dans certaines circonscriptions – et celui également d’une absence prolongée, qui les exposent au risque d’une occupation illicite de leurs parcelles.

L’on rejoint ici l’épineuse question d’envergure nationale des conflits fonciers, qui représentent sans nul doute l’un des motifs de tension les plus menaçants pour l’équilibre encore fragile qu’essaie de préserver la nouvelle société burundaise. Ces litiges affectent les réfugiés revenant
d’exil. Ils affectent tout autant les IDP lorsque ceux-ci décident de retourner sur leurs collines d’origine. »

**Enormous pressure on land with refugee return (2006-2007)**

- Thousands of returnees and IDPs lack agricultural land (2007)
- In August 2006, inauguration of the National Land Commission, comprised of four subcommissions: land, holdings, compensations and inventory of public lands

**IRIN 15 June 2007:**

« Pour les habitants de Bujumbura Rural, les conditions de vie se sont nettement améliorées et les milliers de personnes vivant dans des camps de déplacés internes sont rentrées chez elles.

Mai cette ouverture ne bénéfice pas à tout le monde. En effet, pour la majorité des milliers de réfugiés rapatriés des pays voisins et de déplacés internes, contraints de fuir une guerre civile qui a secoué le pays pendant plus de 10 ans, la vie aurait été plus simple s’ils avaient l’outil indispensable à leur survie : des terres cultivables.

« Nous vivons ici dans des conditions très précaires », a expliqué à IRIN Moise Barekezabe, responsable d’un camp de déplacés de la commune de Rukaramu. « Notre plus grand handicap est que nous ne possédons pas de terre cultivable ; pour survivre, nous sommes contraints de mendier auprès des communautés locales ».

**IRIN 23 November 2006:**

“In a bid to avert a land crisis that could potentially plunge the country back into civil war, the government set up the Commission Nationale des Terres et Autre Bien (CNTB) in July to deal with land and property issues resulting from the years of upheaval.

According to the United Nations refugee agency, UNHCR, about 319,000 refugees have been repatriated to Burundi since the agency started assisting their return in 2002. Neighbouring Tanzania, host to most of the refugees, has begun expelling them.

The return of refugees from Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo has already led to serious disagreements between the returnees and the current occupiers of the land.”

**UNSC 25 October 2006, eight report:**

“Land disputes continued to pose a major challenge to the justice sector and to national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace. On 31 August [2006], President Nkurunziza inaugurated the work of the 23-member National Land Commission, which was established in May. The Commission will comprise four subcommissions: land, holdings, compensations and inventory of public lands. The large number of complicated regulatory mechanisms continues to make the resolution of land disputes difficult, owing to overlaps and contradictions between the traditional land tenure system governed by customary law, the 1986 Land Act, the Environmental Act and the Constitution, adopted by referendum in 2005. The finalization of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, in which the land question is addressed, should be an important step towards the resolution of land disputes. At the same time, adequate international support for the Land Commission will be critical to ensure that it can operate effectively.”

**IDD 3 June 2006:**

“Some 40,000 hectares of public property have been identified by the government to be transformed into new villages or urban centers for landless Burundians, amongst them IDPs and repatriated persons.”
See also:
IRIN, 23 Oct 2006, Burundi: Bid to resolve land dispute under way [Internet]

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
Date: 28 Aug 2006
Burundian refugees face challenges of identity, land ownership on return [Internet]

Lack of housing and unresolved property rights issues deter IDPs and refugees from returning to their place of origin (August 2006)

Delrue August 2006:
"Lack of housing and unresolved land and property rights issues deter IDPs and refugees from returning to their place of origin and are a major potential threat to future stability. Several waves of displacement have resulted in complex and politically sensitive issues around land and property. In some cases IDPs and returning refugees have occupied land abandoned by those who fled conflict. Over the years, IDP sites have grown into village-like settlements.

Many are on state-owned, private or church-owned property and have insufficient land for cultivation. The status of the IDPs on these properties remains unclear and this has led to conflicts with original owners, many of them returnees. Some new owners are speculating with the land for commercial gain. This is a potential source of tension, especially where under-utilised plots are located in areas of land scarcity."

Surveys find that vast majority of IDPs have access to land of origin (2004-2005)

- 78 percent IDPs are found to have access to their land (2005)
- In the Western Provinces of Cibitoke and Bubanza, over 50 percent of people do not have access to land
- Small size of land plot and sporadic insecurity means that many IDPs cannot be self-sufficient
- Vast majority of IDPs continue to access and cultivate their native lands during the day, returning to the displacement sites to sleep at night
- Very few IDP households report having problems with land access due to disputes over land ownership/tenure
- However, crops are often stolen by neighbours who live permanently on the hills, or by armed groups or bandits
- IDPs also report not spending enough time on the farm in order to maintain their land adequately due to the distance from the site

OCHA 26 May 2005, p19:
En moyenne, 22% des ménages déplacés n’ont pas accès à la terre. Néanmoins comme le montre le graphique 2, ce chiffre cache d’importantes disparités. Les régions les plus touchées par le manque d’accès sont celles qui abritent les plus forts taux de rapatriés (Ouest et Sud et Est). Parmi les populations n’ayant pas accès, 33% n’avaient pas de terre avant, 27% évoquent des problèmes de sécurité sur leurs terres, enfin 22% sont contraints par l’éloignement.

Notons que les vieillards n’arrivent plus à exploiter leurs terres en raison non seulement de l’éloignement mais aussi de l’inaptitude physique (3.5%). Sur Bujumbura Rural, 35% n’ont pas accès à la terre pour des raisons de sécurité et de non possession de terre, antérieurement à la crise.

Par déduction, 78% des populations déplacées sur site ont accès à leurs propriétés d’origine. Ce taux reste élevé de part le fait que la grande majorité des déplacés habitent juste à côté de leur propriété d’origine et continuent à les exploiter à partir des sites. La même proportion avait été observée en 2004. Cependant, la petite taille des parcelles et la faible productivité des terres ne garantissent pas toujours une autosuffisance alimentaire. A ceci s’ajoutent les problèmes de sécurité perçus par les populations du Nord qui limitent leur temps de travail dans les champs. Enfin, les nombreux cas de vols sur pied reportés, toujours dans les provinces du Nord, nous informent que la récolte n’est pas toujours à la hauteur de la production. »

OCHA 26 May 2005, pp.32-33:
« Les droits fonciers des déplacés
D’après les résultats d’entretiens de groupes, les propriétés des déplacés sont restées intactes et la plupart d’entre eux (74%) continuent à les exploiter à partir des sites.

Concernant la sauvegarde des droits fonciers des déplacés sur leurs propriétés d’origine, il nous a semblé, à travers les entretiens de groupes, qu’il n’y a pas de faits particuliers à signaler.

En effet, chaque déplacé a accès à sa propriété et, sauf quelques cas rares de personnes
vivant sur des sites éloignés de leur zone d'origine, les déplacés vont cultiver leurs champs durant la journée et rentrent sur le site le soir. Du reste, les sites d'installation ont en général été choisis dans cette optique. Les déplacés qui avaient fui loin de leur zone d'origine ont été invités à se réinstaller sur le site le plus proche de leurs anciennes habitations.

Il nous a été signalé par les administrations locales, qu'au début de la crise, certaines personnes parmi celles qui sont restées sur les collines avaient parfois tenté de s'approprier les terres des voisins qu'ils avaient tués ou fait fuir. Mais toutes les situations du genre ont été normalisées et les litiges fonciers qui subsistent sont du type ordinaire : conflit entre frères et cousins résultant de successions mal réglées ou non encore liquidées, etc.

Par contre, dans la région non encore stabilisée, Bujumbura rural en particulier, les droits fonciers des déplacés ne sont pas assurés tant que le mouvement rebelle FNL-PALIPEHUTU est encore actif sur les lieux.

Dans l'ensemble, la situation telle qu'elle se présente sur le terrain n'appelle aucune intervention particulière de la part des pouvoirs publics. Pour ce qui est de Bujumbura rural et Bubanza où la situation n’est pas encore totalement rétablie, aucune mesure spécifique n’est envisageable non plus. Les droits des déplacés ne pourront être protégés que quand l’ordre public aura été rétabli durablement. »

**OCHA August 2004, pp.12-13:**

“The vast majority of IDPs continue to access and cultivate their native lands during the day, returning to the displacement sites to sleep at night. The survey teams found that in some sites, some IDPs can actually point to their place of origin only hundreds of meters away. Yet many of these IDPs – despite living so close to their original homes - have expressed an unwillingness to return and prefer instead to remain living in the sites […].

Proximity of the place of origin to the site is an important element in determining an IDP household’s level of vulnerability. Those IDP families that do not live close enough to their home areas to permit continued cultivation of their land must seek alternative means of economic livelihood, which are extremely limited. Although some of these families manage to make a meagre living through hiring out their labour on nearby farms or engaging in petty commerce or trade in the site, some remain entirely dependent on the aid of others. Female- and child-headed households that live far from their native lands are especially at-risk.[…]

Some 74% of IDP households report having ‘easy access’ to their land of origin. With the exception of Bujumbura Mairie, where only 13% of IDP households report having easy access to their land, the percentage of IDP households having easy access to their land is at least 60% in all provinces, and as high as 86% in Cankuzo province (interestingly, in Cankuzo only 9% of IDP households believe that the security situation is conducive to return, but this does not appear to inhibit a large percentage from accessing their land.)

However, as was revealed in the focus group discussions, having easy access to land does not necessarily translate into having an adequate level of agricultural activity or output. The overwhelming numbers of participants in the focus groups say they are able to cultivate their native land but they do not achieve a sufficient harvest. The primary reason cited is theft of their crops by neighbours who live permanently in the collines, by armed groups or bandits in areas of ongoing insecurity. Other reasons cited for the diminished yields are the limited time they are able to spend on the farm – because of the distance they must walk from the site – preventing them from adequately maintaining or protecting their land. One IDP woman explains, for instance, that although she accesses and cultivates her land daily, she is unable to fertilize her land with animal dung as she did before her displacement because her animals were stolen. The distance that IDPs have to travel from the site to reach their land is in direct proportion to their ability to
adequately manage and protect their land. Therefore, despite easy access to land, compromised productivity results in an erosion of livelihood capacity and decreased food security for many IDP households.

Very few IDP households report having problems with land access due to disputes over land ownership/tenure. The land tenure problem does not appear to be a significant concern among the current IDP population. This is in sharp contrast to the repatriating refugee population, for which land tenure is an issue of great concern.

Some IDP households report having no access to their native land either because it is in an area still affected by ongoing conflict (e.g. Bujumbura Rural), or because they were forced to sell it for economic reasons. Access to land is another important factor for determining the level of vulnerability of IDP households. Those households that have no possibility to access their land often have no option but to remain in the IDP site. Some displaced persons have nowhere else to go. Female- and child-headed households with no access to land are especially at risk.

Pending status of land where many IDP reside (2005-2006)

- IDP camps have been built on state-owned, private-owned and church-owned land
- Not clear what the future status of this land will be in case IDPs decide to settle there for good

OCHA 26 May 2005, pp33-35:
« Le statut des sites des déplacés
D’après les entretiens de groupes, il est apparu que, tant les intervenants et autorités que les déplacés eux-mêmes, n’ont pleinement conscience de la précarité du statut des sites. Dans l’optique de certains intervenants, et ce qui est le cas pour la plupart des déplacés, il y a une tendance à considérer que les parcelles sur lesquelles les déplacés ont été installés sont leurs propriétés et seule une minorité de déplacés reconnaissent ne détenir qu’un droit de simple jouissance.

A travers les travaux d’entretien de groupes, l’administration a révélé que les sites des déplacés sont d’une part établis sur des terrains domaniaux, et d’autre part sur des terrains appartenant à des personnes privés ou à des paroisses.

Les terrains publics
Les premières investigations ont été de savoir si un déplacé était propriétaire de sa maison lorsque celle-ci était construite sur une parcelle appartenant à l’Etat ou à la commune. A ce propos, les avis étaient partagés.

Lorsque les sites sont installés sur les domaines de l’Etat, les déplacés bénéficiaires considèrent que ces parcelles leur sont définitivement acquises.[…]

L’administration pense qu’un jour ces terrains pourront être affectés à d’autres besoins, lorsque les déplacés auront pu retourner chez eux.

L’administration est en général d’avis qu’il n’est pas recommandable que ces déplacés s’installent à demeure sur ces sites. Les administratifs à la base estiment que s’ils doivent se réjouir d’avoir mis les personnes déplacées à l’abri des menaces physiques et qu’ils disposent d’un endroit pour protéger leur intimité, ces logements gardent un caractère provisoire évident.[…]

Les terrains privés
En outre, des sites des déplacés ont également été implantés sur des terres appartenant à des particuliers. Cependant, même si les déplacés reconnaissent timidement que ces terres appartiennent à des personnes tierces, ils n’entendent pas bouger. Et si tel était le cas, ils estiment qu’ils seraient en droit d’être indemnisés pour les cultures et les constructions qu’ils y ont érigées.

Des particuliers qui ont cédé leurs propriétés, de leur plein gré ou contraints par l’administration demandent maintenant à l’État de leur faire justice en libérant leurs terres des ménages devenus encombrants.

Les terrains de l’Eglise
Les sites des déplacés ont aussi été installés sur des propriétés appartenant à des confessions religieuses, en vertu des conventions de mise à disposition provisoire spécifiant que les terrains devront être remis aux propriétaires quitte et libres de toutes charges «dès que la situation le permettra ». La question qui se pose est de savoir comment les deux partenaires (commune-État d’un côté, paroisse-Diocèse de l’autre) vont gérer les dossiers si les déplacés devaient séjourner davantage sur ces sites.

En conclusion, on peut s’inquiéter que plusieurs facteurs (la croissance démographique, l’absence d’un système cadastral des terres rurales auxquelles s’ajoutent les différents déplacements intérieurs des populations) exacerbent le problème des litiges fonciers au niveau national.

See also: Tom Delrue, August 2006, Burundi: sliding off the humanitarian radar screen?, in FMR 26 [Internet]

Dual land system in Burundi complicates return process (2005)

- Less than 5% of the land is registered, and oral traditions about its ownership predominate
- Provisions on land ownership, access and transfer as spelt out in the Land Code are little understood and hardly implemented
- Following the improvement of security, the value of land has gone up, and rich individuals have expanded the size or number of plots, while the land available to returning IDPs and refugees is getting smaller
- Revision of land code does not plan land redistribution

Mbura Kamungi and al., June 2005:
“Land-owners in Burundi are able to transfer land mainly through bequest to the male heir upon marriage or the parents’ death, while landless people can acquire land through purchase, donations from relatives or wealthier patrons, or distribution by the government. The primary beneficiaries of land distribution by the government are returning refugees, though the land donated is often unproductive swamp land and natural reserves, due to land scarcity. Another way of gaining access to land is through temporary leasing for one or several seasons, given the decreasing availability of land for cultivation by households.

Provisions on land ownership, access and transfer as spelt out in the Land Code are little understood and hardly implemented. Land tenure in Burundi, as in many countries, currently has both customary and modern systems operating in parallel, and with some overlapping and ‘hybrid’ arrangements in place. This creates confusion, contradictions, disconnects and points of interaction between the tenure systems, making the resolution of land disputes particularly intricate. For instance, the 1986 Land Tenure Code acknowledges the legitimacy of customary
claims but requires all land, and all land transactions, to be registered with the state. While the law states that registration must be passed on when it is sold, inherited or otherwise passed from one owner to the other, land is often sold in areas under indigenous tenure systems yet to be registered. Moreover, the state lacks the financial resources to disseminate and implement the Land Tenure Code. As a result, customary tenure regimes are still very influential in rural areas, and land holdings remain largely unregistered. Besides, less than 5% of the land is registered, and oral traditions about its ownership predominate. Thus title deeds hold little value, and endemic corruption in the Ministry of Lands has undermined the legitimacy of such documents. While the land code stipulates that all land belongs to the government and no transactions may occur, land sales do take place (whether registered or not) and renting of land is also significant, with up to one. fifth of households accessing some land through renting. The Burundi constitution allows the state to expropriate land in the public interest. However, expropriated land is often allocated to influential political and military figures without adequate compensation to those from whom it has been taken. […]

Following the cessation of hostilities, the value of land has gone up, and rich individuals and groups with the means to purchase or ‘grab’ land are expanding the size or number of plots for economic security, while the land available to returning IDPs and refugees is getting increasingly smaller. […]

The Land Code is now in the process of being revised, through the preparation of a draft document by a combination of foreign consultants – funded by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) – and a working group of civil servants.

Policy-makers have taken inspiration from Rwanda’s draft policy and have modeled several ideas upon it, such as the establishment of local-level land commissions. By May 2004, a draft was almost ready for presentation to Parliament for debate. However, the finalization of the Code is not currently a high priority, as the upcoming elections are the main political focus. There are several proposed changes to the law, […]. The Code seems to be broadly in line with the concepts of land tenure security and the need for land markets, as championed by the World Bank, the FAO and other institutions in a number of countries. Customary aspects are to be ‘replaced’ with a modern system, through universal land registration. Land redistribution is not being considered. Instead, it is envisaged that land markets will redress some imbalances.

90 percent of Batwa do not own land, due to displacement or other factors (2004)

IRIN 15 April 2004:

“The only way out of the ostracism and lowly status to which they [the Batwa] are subjected in society, he [Vital Bambanze, the secretary-general of the Union for the Promotion of the Batwa] said, would be for the Batwa to be given land. This would open the way to education, which Bambanze described as the key to development. He said some 90 percent of Batwa did not own land, thus exposing them to all kinds of exploitation, including something akin to serfdom. “In Mukike and Mugongo-Manga, [two communes of Bujumbura Rural], building a hut on somebody's property entitles the owner to demand three or four days of unpaid labour per week. This is slavery,” Bambanze said.

Like many residents of the site, Sinzobakwira used to live on someone's land at Mubone in Bujumbura Rural, where her entire family were serfs. But now, even though she lives in the city and owns no land, she prefers her present condition, because she lives free and without the constant threat of eviction.
Serfdom, which affected all of Burundi’s landless, irrespective of ethnicity, was outlawed in 1976 by the then president, Jean-Baptiste Bagaza. Despite this measure, however, the Batwa say they have not seen any benefits. Their lack of land ownership still makes them feel like slaves in their relationships with landowners.”

Land administration system has been negatively affected by conflict (2004)

- Lack of communication and reported corruption at the government level
- Poor consultation, minimal consensus-building during policy making and limited dissemination in relation to land policy has resulted in a confused land tenure situation on the ground

**ACTS 30 September 2004:**

“The land administration system in Burundi has been negatively affected by the conflict. The loss of human resources through out-migration is one issue; coordination between different government departments is also a big problem. Often, Provincial Governors will allocate state-owned land which is under the mandate of the Ministry of Environment, for example, without any communication between the two. Commissions appointed to look into land availability for the resettlement of refugees have at times appropriated the land for themselves or their wives. Double-registration of plots is another problem. The land reserve, intended for allocation to the landless is manipulated, resulting in some people waiting for years while others, who are not actually landless, receive plots rapidly due to favoritism or bribery.[…]

Over time, a situation of poor consultation, minimal consensus-building during policy making and limited dissemination in relation to land policy has resulted in a confused land tenure situation on the ground, which is subject to great variations at local level. Generally, local authorities make decisions based on a combination of statutory and customary law, and the interpretations of both custom and statute vary widely from province to province. Contradictions and disconnects in the current land tenure systems continue to create loopholes that are exploited through irregular allocation of state land to individuals in positions of influence in government, military and the civil service. Traditionally, land tenure conflicts are mediated by the local council of Hutu and Tutsi elders, the Bashingantahe. However, during the colonial period, this institution was weakened when individuals without the requisite qualities were appointed by the authorities. Recent efforts to support the institution have been criticized in some quarters, as some Bashingantahe included in donor-funded support projects have been civil servants or political figures, which is not allowed under custom. Nevertheless, the Arusha Agreement emphasizes their role in reconciliation, at the level of the colline.”

Property inheritance practices complicate restitution process (1994-2007)

- In March 2006, the Minister of National Solidarity said that a project of law allowing women to inherit land had been submitted to Parliament
- UNCHR warned in 2002 that land and property disputes were increasingly common
- Women are not entitled to inherit land under customary land
- Few legal titles exist, which creates tensions when former land owners try to regain their land

Robarts, Oddo Aug 2002, p9:

"Land and property disputes are increasingly common, and the justice system is unable to cope, leading some to call for a revitalisation of the traditional bashingantahe system of local arbitration. Indeed, one of the monitoring missions undertaken by UNHCR warned of:
The explosive mix between an uncontrolled increase in population (in 20 years the population of Burundi will double) and the traditional method of succession that divides among the male sons the property of the father. This means that land properties become smaller and smaller and insufficient to assure food security and subsistence to everybody. In a country where 90% of the population depends on agriculture, future conflicts for land ownership (even if hidden by ethnic reasons) become more and more probable.

CHR 7 March 2002, para.64:
"According to the UN Special Rapporteur on the human rights situation in Burundi, "Many obstacles to the advancement of women still remain, however, such as the hold-up over the bill on inheritance and matrimonial property rights, which has still not been brought to the attention of the minister responsible, far less the Council of Ministers. The minister foresees the adoption of the bill some time in the coming year. It must be hoped that the bill will rise above all the difficulties and social constraints that have been brought to the Special Rapporteur's attention, becoming one day a law that all in Burundi, male and female, will accept."

ACTS 30 September 2004:
"Under customary law, women cannot own or inherit land; they can only enjoy limited access bestowed through affiliation to the male legatees. Currently, women's access is further compromised by repeated displacement. Article 17 of the Constitutional Act of Transition establishes the equality of men and women before the law, and the 1993 amendment of the code of the Person and the Family includes the right to joint management of family property if the husband is absent. However, in practice, most men tend to delegate land matters to their male relatives. Matrimonial arrangements, succession, legacies and gifts are all governed by customary law, which does not sufficiently recognize women's land rights."

ITEKA March 2006:
"Le Burundi a préféré célébrer la journée internationale de la femme du 8 Mars autour du thème "l'héritage de la terre : un droit inaliénable à la femme burundaise" au moment où le thème choisi au niveau international est "la femme dans la prise de décisions : vaincre les défis en vue d'atteindre des changements". Or selon la coutume burundaise, les femmes n'héritent pas. Le ministre burundais de la solidarité nationale, des droits de la personne humaine et du genre, Mme Françoise Ngendahayo a, dans une déclaration faite à cette occasion, indiqué que la participation efficace de la femme dans la prise de décisions exige des conditions équitables dans la distribution des richesses comme le droit de propriété qui implique le droit à l'héritage de la fille.

La femme burundaise n'est pas établie dans ses droits en matière de succession suite à un manque de cadre légal qui réglemente cet aspect de sa vie. Alors que la terre reste le principal moyen de production commun aux burundais, particulièrement en milieu rural. La problématique de l'héritage de la terre devrait ainsi être analysée dans le souci d'une réglementation équitable aussi bien pour la fille que pour le garçon, a noté la ministre Françoise.

La ministre Françoise a précisé qu'un projet de loi sur les successions, les régimes matrimoniaux et les libéralités a été soumis aux instances habilitées pour être adopté."

CEDAW 6 March 2007:
"Nevertheless, with regard to succession — an area that is still governed by custom — men and women do not have the same rights of inheritance, especially with regard to land."

UN Commission on Human Rights, 28 November 1994, para. 37:
"A critical issue with regard to both the causes of and the solutions to the problem of displacement is that of land. In Burundi, land holding is very fluid. Few legal titles to land exist,
resulting in disagreements and confrontations when land is redistributed or changes hands. This was the case, for instance, following the redistribution to lower military officials and soldiers of land that had belonged to Hutus who left the country in 1972. Since then this land changed hands frequently, being passed on to others who would acquire legal title after a period of years if acquired in good faith from the previous occupier (bona fide occupier). The Government of Ndadaye tried to reinstall the returnees and former owners to their lands. This caused fear among the new owners that they would be evicted, and created unavoidable tensions.”
PATTERNS OF RETURN AND RESETTLEMENT

General

At least 389,000 Burundian refugees had returned home by March 08 (2008)

- A number of them are landless and at risk of becoming IDPs

UNHCR, 1 April 2008:
“UNHCR's repatriation operation for Burundian refugees in Tanzania which began in 2002 reached the 300,000 mark in March [2008]. In addition, tens of thousands of Burundian refugees have also returned home on their own – mainly from villages in the north-western Tanzania – bringing the total number of refugees returning to Burundi to 389,000. At the peak of the crisis, which started in the early 1990s, nearly half a million Burundians fled violence in their country and found shelter in neighbouring Tanzania.”

UNHCR, 31 March 2008:
“Out of the 262 returnees on the first convoy, 60 persons (i.e. 23 %) who did not have a place to go in Burundi have been transferred to Gitara camp for landless individuals, which is the only temporary accommodation available. These 60 persons (14 families) share the site with the 171 landless returnees who lived there before. Gitara (10 hangars, 40 rooms) is occupied beyond its capacity. Three of the families transferred to Gitara have said that they still have relatives who could host them. UNHCR’s partner PARESI is trying to find these families. The Governor of Makamba has allocated about 4 ha of additional land at Gitara for UNHCR to construct 28 shelters (112 rooms for a total of 171 individuals). Construction started on 24 March 2008 and will take about two months.”

See also:
UNHCR, 24 March 2008, Burundi bulletin réfugiés No 18 – fév. – mars 2008 [Internet]
IRIN, 13 Mar 2008, Burundi: Returning home after 35 years [Internet]

Rate of return of IDPs and refugees decreased significantly (2006-2007)

- According to UNHCR study in southern provinces, main reasons for remaining in sites included insecurity due to bandits in zones of return, insecurity due to FNL sporadic attacks (for IDPs from Bujumbura Rural), and isolation of zones of origin from which so many have left
- According to OCHA high population density in Burundi hinders effective resettlement of both IDPs and re-turning refugee populations

UNHCR, 1 January 2008:
2007
« Et, dans un parallélisme de situation, ce qui motiva les exilés de Tanzanie à rentrer, provoqua le retour, chez eux, des IDP. Les années 2004 et 2005 furent parmi les plus fastes en terme de rapatriement des réfugiés burundais. Elles le furent également pour ceux qui, sans franchir de frontière, quittèrent leurs domiciles pour s'installer ailleurs dans le pays. Prétendre cependant que
ce motif justifia à lui seul tous les retours serait abusif. Certains IDP prirent aussi la décision de partir pour rompre avec la précarité des conditions de vie dans les sites et retrouver le confort relatif de leur propriété, de leur domicile et de ce qui faisait leur ordinaire auparavant.

A l’opposé diamétral, ce qui suscita le départ de certains fut précisément ce qui en invita d’autres à y renoncer. Ainsi, si beaucoup souhaitèrent retourner habiter leur maison et exploiter leur parcelle, nombreux ne purent s’y résoudre en raison de la destruction de leur logement et l’occupation de leur lopin. Si certains optèrent pour le retour, assurés qu’ils étaient de recouvrer des conditions de vie meilleures, d’autres, au contraire, trouvèrent dans les sites des emplacements beaucoup plus favorables que ceux qu’ils avaient quittés. Quelques sites, ayant même bénéficié de programmes d’assistance en habitat, se commuèrent en « villages », proposant ainsi un cadre de vie envié de beaucoup.

A l’évidence, se sont dans ces complexes résidentiels que se dénombrent le moins d’intentions de retour. Nulles ici, elles s’avèrent partielles ailleurs et les arguments avancés pour ne plus rentrer se résument souvent autour des axes suivants :
- L’insécurité provoquée par quelques ruffians terrorisant les populations des zones où ils maraudent ;
- L’insécurité liée aux forfaits sporadiques perpétrés par le FNL (pour les IDP originaires de Bujumbura rural) ;
- L’isolement des contrées de retour vidées de leur population lors des phases d’exil massif. »

OCHA 3 October 2007 :
« Lack of access to land remains a key obstacle to any efforts made towards the resettlement of displaced populations in Rwanda, Burundi and Tanzania. High population density in Rwanda and Burundi hinder effective resettlement of both IDPs and re-turning refugee populations. The on-going expulsions of illegal immigrants from Tanzania has further aggravated the situation in both Burundi and Rwanda, as majority of the returnees are currently living in transit centres due to lack of addresses or land to repatriate back to. Assistance to cases of expulsion continues to be hampered by logistical challenges and insufficient financial re-sources. An estimated 20,000 Burundians and over 60,000 Rwandans who have been living illegally in Tanzania have been targeted for ex-pulsion by the end of 2007.”

2006
UNSC 21 March 2006, para.33-34:
“During the reporting period, the rate of return of Burundian refugees from the United Republic of Tanzania decreased significantly. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) facilitated 5,409 and 1,250 returns in November and December 2005, respectively, bringing the total number of refugee returns to 68,000 during 2005. However, in January and February, only 428 and 1,319 returns were registered.

This decline was attributed to several factors, including the precarious security situation, food insecurity in the northern and eastern provinces, increased human rights abuses and inadequate infrastructure and public services, as well as conflicts over access to land. These problems have also resulted in an outflow of more than 6,000 Burundians to the United Republic of Tanzania since November, including many new returnees. Since October, the return of displaced persons to their places of origin has also been minimal.”

UN 30 November 2006:
“Despite these positive [political] developments however, 2006 was characterised by a low level of return of displaced populations.[…]

Harsh economic and agricultural conditions and lack of sufficient trust among communities may explain this status quo. But other factors, such as new opportunities and livelihood found in sites or villages may also contribute to this slow return.[…]"
Lack of means to rebuild houses remains an additional obstacle to the return of both IDPs and returning refugees and is consequently a priority in the PRSP and PBC frameworks.

IDD 3 June 2006:
“The main reasons IDPs do not to return to their place of origin are the lack of housing, unresolved land and property rights issues and security. However, in discussions with IDPs met during the mission, it appeared that the vast majority of IDPs see return as their preferred solution under the condition that a reconciliation process accompanies the return.”

OCHA 5 November 2006:
“A small group of approximately 20 internally displaced persons site returned to their collines of origin from Karurama (Rugazi) site. This is one example of the continuing though slow return of IDPs.”

OCHA 15 May 2006:
In Makamba Province: “Displaced persons in Kibago (Mbizi) and Mabanda (Kije) are gradually returning to their collines of origin. Only 35 families remain in the site of Mbizi. OCHA has started close follow-up in order to monitor the trend of return.”

Large scale return of Burundian refugees and IDPs (2004-2005)

- 148,000 Burundian refugees returned home from 2001 to 2003, and 80,400 returned from Tanzania from January to September 2004
- In 2004 and 2005, massive return of IDPs in eastern and southern regions, particularly due to economic opportunities in the South and to precarious living conditions in IDP camps
- In the first half of 2005, return slowed down, but picked up in the second part of the year
- About 70 per cent of returning IDPs and refugees do not have houses or are returning to find their houses destroyed

OCHA 11 November 2004, p4:
“The trend of refugee and IDP return to their communities of origin continued throughout the year at a relatively constant pace. Of the total return figure of 100,000 foreseen by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for 2004, 80,400 Burundian refugees returned from Tanzania in the period January-September 2004 under UNHCR auspices, with a concentration in the provinces of Ruyigi, Muyinga and Makamba.”

OCHA 26 May 2005:
“Le retour sur les anciennes propriétés est observé depuis que le cessez-le-feu entre belligérants est devenu effectif. Les retours ont été massifs et spontanés dans les régions du Sud et de l’Est. Entre autres motivations de retour, ce sont d’une part les atouts économiques que présente la partie méridionale du pays, et d’autre part la précarité des conditions de vie sur site.

De manière fondamentale, les volontés de retour ou de maintien sur site trouvent leurs justifications profondes dans les circonstances qui ont prévalu au moment du déplacement. La fuite des déplacés présents sur sites, à partir de 1993 s’était faite dans un contexte extrêmement surchauffé, caractérisé par des massacres interethniques à grande échelle et suivis souvent d’une répression aveugle. C’est dire que le retour des déplacés sur les collines d’origine exige un important travail de rapprochement et d’éducation à la paix afin de s’assurer que les familles
retour soient acceptées par les communautés d’accueil et que leur présence ne risque pas de provoquer une reprise des conflits.[…]

Les résultats de l’enquête indiquent que la population des déplacés sur sites a connu une diminution continue entre 2004 et 2005, passant de 145.034 à 116.799 personnes. Cependant, les chiffres absolus de 2005 ne reflètent pas les mouvements réels de retour. Dans la même période, le nombre de sites est passé de 170 à 160. La différence ne correspond pas de manière absolue au nombre des sites démantelés (30). En effet, 20 nouveaux sites ont été recensés cette année qui n’avaient pas fait l’objet de l’étude l’année dernière.[…]

Le mouvement de retour massif et spontané observé dans les provinces du Sud et de l’Est va se poursuivre parallèlement au programme de rapatriement depuis la Tanzanie. Si le rythme mensuel de rapatriés a été très faible au 1er semestre 2005 (moins de 12’000 en 6 mois), l’évolution politique intérieure (nouveau gouvernement en place dès fin août) sera potentiellement un facteur d’accélération du mouvement.

Le statu quo observé dans les sites du Nord et du Centre résulte moins de l’environnement politique que d’une désagrégation communautaire consécutive à la crise de 1993. L’impact des élections à venir ou du rapatriement aura sans doute moins de poids que la qualité des rapports communautaires et les rapports de confiance au niveau local.»

OCHA, 2006, p8, p14:
“The return of refugees and IDPs to zones of origin continued without interruption during the year [2005]. The pace of refugee return slowed down considerably in the last quarter of 2004 and in the first months of 2005, mostly due to refugees’ concerns related to security conditions and the electoral process in the country. Nevertheless, the return started accelerating in mid-2005 at a weekly rate of 4,500 persons.” […]

[R]ecent UNHCR estimates indicate that 70% of returning refugees do not have houses, or are returning to find their houses destroyed. Similar needs have been observed for returning IDP families.

Three factors condition return: housing, security and political stability (2005)

- One major obstacle to return mentioned by many IDPs is the impunity of those who killed civilians in massacres and who allegedly stayed in their homes of origin

OCHA 26 May 2005:
« Parmi les ménages qui souhaitent rentrer, le retour sur la colline est conditionné par 3 éléments principaux :
• L’habitat
43% des ménages qui souhaitent rentrer posent la construction d’une maison sur le lieu d’origine comme condition préalable au retour. Ce taux s’élève à 67% dans la région Sud et Est. Il est certain qu’après plusieurs années d’abandon, la plupart des maisons sur les collines d’origine sont soit détruites soit complètement délabrées. Malgré les standards fournis par le MRRDR [Ministry for IDPs & Refugees], la palette des types d’habitat sur les sites de déplacés est extrêmement large, variant de l’habitat très précaire en paille à la maison en brique dure, en passant par les maisons en torchis ou en brique adobe. Les déplacés de retour sur la colline attendent de bénéficier de matériaux répondant aux standards minimum pour procéder au retour.
• Mouvement de retour collectif

86
31% des ménages estiment qu’ils rentreront « avec les autres ». Cet argument répond pour beaucoup aux besoins de sécurité et de protection liés à la problématique de réconciliation communautaire au Nord, au Centre et à l’Ouest du pays.

• La sécurité

Le niveau de sécurité requis pour rentrer n’est pas directement lié avec la perception de la sécurité précédemment citée. En effet, même si une partie des ménages estiment qu’aujourd’hui il n’y a pas de problèmes de sécurité sur leur colline d’origine, ils attendent la consolidation de la stabilité politique du pays pour rentrer. Ils souhaitent également avoir plus de garanties quant au niveau de protection dont ils bénéficieront une fois de retour. Pour cette raison, les élections ne constituent pas un facteur de retour majeur. […]

La poursuite judiciaire des criminels présumés est mentionnée partout. Les déplacés estiment que ceux qui ont tué les leurs restent sur les collines, jouissent de l’impunité et que par conséquent rien ne les empêcherait de parachever leurs assassinats en cas de retour sur les collines d’origine.»

See also:
IRIN, 23 May 2005, Burundi : 50,000 displaced people fear returning home, see link below

Rapport de monitoring de la population "rapatriée" et "déplacée-retournée" Communes de Kayogoro et Nyanza Lac, Province de Makamba, Burundi Septembre 2004 - Avril 2005, Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), September 2005, see link below

Some returning refugees have now become IDPs (2005)

• As of mid-2005, 18.5 per cent of IDPs in Southern and Eastern provinces were returning refugees, who either live on trade with Tanzania or who feel more secure in camps

OCHA 26 May 2005, p15:
According to a national survey conducted by OCHA in 2005, “L’enquête a permis en outre de mettre en évidence des sites où coexistent des déplacés et des rapatriés particulièrement dans les provinces du Sud et de l’Est. En effet, 18.5% des déplacées des provinces du Sud et de l’Est sont rapatriés de Tanzanie (enregistrés ou pas). Notons que la proportion de rapatriés est très variable d’une région à une autre, les provinces de l’Est abritant les plus forts pourcentages (jusqu’à 65% à Gisuru). La très grande majorité des ménages rapatriés vivent sur les sites situés à proximité de la frontière, particulièrement sur les communes de Gisuru (Ruyigi) et Nyanza-Lac (Makamba). Ceci s’explique par les activités commerciales trans-frontalières qu’ils exercent. Sur Cankuzo et Ruyigi, ce phénomène s’explique aussi par la criminalité qui prévaut dans ces provinces et qui encourage les rapatriés à rejoindre un site de déplacés pour des raisons de sécurité. »
HUMANITARIAN ACCESS

General

International NGO vehicle targeted by shooters in eastern Burundi (December 2007)

ACF, 1 January 2008:
"On Monday, December 31 2007, at 6:30 pm, an Action Against Hunger vehicle was targeted by shooters in the city of Ruyigi in the East of Burundi. Five people, including three female expatriate staff of Action Against Hunger, were inside the targeted vehicle. One of them, a psychologist of Action Against Hunger, died upon arrival at the hospital in Gitega as a result of her injuries. The second victim suffered a gunshot wound and underwent surgery in Gitega. The third Action Against Hunger expatriate escaped uninjured from the shooting."

Deterioration of security does not affect UN operations (November 2007)

UNSC 23 November 2007:
"Overall, the security situation in Burundi has deteriorated considerably since my previous report. The highest crime rates were recorded in Bujumbura and Bujumbura Rural, where the incidence of armed robberies and theft has increased. On 16 November [2007], the Government re-imposed a curfew on roads serving Bujumbura. The curfew, which had been lifted in 2006, starts at 1800 hours until 0700 hours. Bujumbura, Bubanza and Cibitoke remain in security phase III, while the remaining provinces are in security phase II.

The reporting period was marked by a surge in the number of ambushes on highways, an increase in the number of armed robberies, especially within the capital, grenade attacks and sporadic gunfire. The high number of small arms and grenades in circulation as well as the continued influx of illicit weapons into the country are considered factors impacting the security situation. Widespread poverty and the high level of unemployment also continue to be contributing factors. The deterioration of the overall security situation has not affected United Nations staff in a significant way."
NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL RESPONSES

National response

State institutions in charge of IDP reintegration and resettlement (2008)

Since its reorganization in March 2006, a Directorate General for Repatriation, Reinstallation and Reinsertion of Displaced and Repatriated Persons was created at the Ministry of National Solidarity, Human Rights and Gender in March. The Ministry also supervises the Project of Support for Repatriation and reinsertion of War Affected persons (PARESI) that works in collaboration with and funded by UNHCR (IDD, 3 June 2006). PARESI provides basic housing and infrastructure for returning refugees and IDPs.

The Arusha agreement of August 2000 decided to create a National Commission for the Reintegration of War-affected People (CNRS) in order to coordinate the return of refugees and IDPs with international organisations. The CNRS was established in March 2003, but was placed under the Ministry of Reintegration, which was not foreseen by the Arusha Agreement. Being under the Ministry robbed the CNRS of its role as central organ on IDP issues. Short of funds and staff, and lacking support from the government, the CNRS focused its action principally on returning refugees, to the detriment of the internally displaced (FMR September 2004). In 2005, PARESI, replaced the CNRS.

Throughout the years, the Burundian government launched several ambitious programmes which should have benefited IDPs. In 2004, it adopted a national programme for IDP and refugee rehabilitation, but the plan was never really implemented (IRIN 8 November 2004). In February 2006, the Burundian Government launched an emergency programme to cover post-war recovery needs for 2006, and international donors subsequently pledged the totality of the funds requested. The money received was to aid the drought-stricken population, support the rehabilitation of social infrastructures, the improvement of health care, the repatriation of refugees, and the resettlement of vulnerable people (Government of Burundi, 28 February 2006; IRIN, 1 March 2006). According to a study by Tufts University, the government programme competed with the UN Consolidated Appeal, although both requested $160 million for 2006 (Tufts University, 30 July 2006). The government launched a seven-year reconstruction plan of $32.7 million in the provinces of Bujumbura Rural, Buriri and Ruyigi in order to re-establish agricultural activities and rebuild infrastructure. The programme is mainly funded by the International Fund for Agriculture and Development (IFAD) under a loan agreement signed in September 2004 (IRIN, 12 April 2006).

International Response

International Coordination

- Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator for Burundi is responsible for ensuring a strategic and coordinated response to internal displacement
- Joint planning for humanitarian action is undertaken with the Government of Burundi, media and civil society under the leadership of BINUB
During the crisis of internal displacement in the 1990s and early 2000s, several high-level UN missions focused on improving response, especially in the context of forced relocation by the Burundian government.

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) is the UN focal point on IDPs issues.

In Burundi, the Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator for Burundi is responsible for ensuring a strategic and coordinated response to internal displacement in the country, and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) is the UN focal point on IDPs issues, and it provides policy guidance on the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (UN OCHA, 29 December 2003). There is however no lead agency to assist and protect IDPs (RI, 24 May 2004). The RC/HC, Youssef Mahmoud, is also the UNSG Executive Representative for Burundi and Head of the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB), which was established on 1 January 2007, following the conclusion of the mandate of the United Nations Operation in Burundi (ONUB) on 31 December 2006. While OCHA is currently the focal point on IDP issues, it is expected to leave Burundi in June 2008. It is not clear at this point whether UNHCR or any other agency will then take the lead on IDPs.

Joint planning for humanitarian action is undertaken with the Government of Burundi, media and civil society under the leadership of BINUB. Thematic Groups plan and coordinate sectoral activities. UNICEF is for example the cluster leader for education, and water and environmental sanitation (WES). Coordination structures are replicated at provincial and local levels in collaboration with local authorities, NGOs and community-based organizations (UNICEF, 1 January 2008).

In July 2007, a Steering Commission for the Repatriation and Reintegration of Returnees was established in Burundi. The Commission comprises representatives of four ministries, donors, BINUB, UNHCR, WFP, and UNICEF, with OCHA and UNDP providing its secretariat. The Commission aims to provide a coherent and integrated response to the basic needs of the returnees and displaced and expelled persons, as well as the needs of the host communities, including the promotion of cohesion and reconciliation (UNSC, 23 November 2007).

During the crisis of internal displacement in the 1990s and early 2000s, several high-level UN missions focused on improving response, especially in the context of forced relocation by the Burundian government. The international community in Burundi also undertook initiatives to improve coordination.

See for example:
- Report by the UN Special Representative on Internal Displacement, exhorting the Burundian government to pursue and implement the decision to dismantle the "regroupment" camps and asking the international community to provide appropriate international assistance to that end (UNSGR 6 March 2000).
- Report by the UN Senior Network on Internal Displacement, led by the UN Special Coordinator on Internal Displacement and composed of representatives of FAO, OHCHR, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP and WHO as well as an NGO representative, which recommended that humanitarian agencies focus their activities on the protection needs of the displaced (Senior Inter-Agency Network on Internal Displacement 23 Dec 2000).

- UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s series of criteria for delivering assistance in the context of the regroupment ((IASC 3 February 2000).
Following the recommendations of the Senior Network and the Special Representative on Internal Displacement, the UN Humanitarian Coordinator and the Burundian Minister of Human Rights signed in February 2001 a Framework for Consultation on the Protection of Internally Displaced Persons. The goal was to establish a forum to discuss issues related to IDPs, particularly access and protection, to facilitate assessment and rapid intervention mechanisms and to support the implementation of the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (UN OCHA 22 May 2001). The Framework created two main bodies: a high-level Committee on the Protection of IDPs and a Follow-Up Technical Group (Groupe Technique de Suivi, GTS). Membership of the Committee, which should come together on a monthly basis, includes Burundian Ministers and the President of the Governmental Human Rights Commission, as well as the UN Humanitarian Coordinator (Co-President), and head of UN Agencies, as well as representatives of international and Burundian NGOs. The GTS ceased to exist in 2005.

For more information of the GTS, please see Addressing the protection gap: the Framework for Consultation on IDPs in Burundi, in Forced Migration Review 15, by T. Santini, October 2002 [link below]

The GTS was briefly replaced by a Protection Working Group including UN agencies and international NGOs, as well as the Inter-Agency Cell for the Reinsertion of War-affected persons (CIR), created through a memorandum of understanding between UNHCR, UNDP, and the World Bank in 2002. (OCHA, 17 April 2005). The CIR was replaced in 2006 by a UNDP-led reintegration group and by the national structure PARESI (OCHA, 12 December 2006).

OCHA drafted a strategy for the reintegration of IDPs and refugees, it was not formally adopted. In August 2004, the United Nations defined the framework for a common strategy to reintegrate returning IDPs and refugees in Burundi (United Nations, August 2004).

The UN Inter-Agency Division on Internal Displacement (IDD), which focused on improving the UN response to internal displacement undertook several assessment missions to Burundi, the latest one in May-June 2006. The IDD became OCHA’s Displacement and Protection Support Section (DPSS) at the end of 2006. To view mission reports:
http://www.reliefweb.int/idp/docs/reports.htm

Further to the IDP survey completed by OCHA in 2005, OCHA regularly organizes follow up missions in IDP sites. Main findings were the confirmation that most IDPs have preferred to stay in sites-villages and have further integrated with neighboring communities, for example by being elected in last year local polls. According to OCHA, this trend shows that in many places we should rethink our approach to these issues and even stop using stereotypes such as ‘IDP’ or ‘site’ as these words do not necessarily reflect evolving situations (OCHA 25 July 2006).

In January 2008, UNHCR issued a study on IDPs in three southern provinces, i.e. Bururi, Makamba et Rutana. The study provides in-depth information on IDPs in these provinces (UNHCR, 1 January 2008).

UN response

Most IDP-related activities are integrated into agencies / NGO’s general humanitarian programmes. This is because most IDPs are living close to their areas of origin and most are facing the same constraints as the non-displaced. In addition, according to the UN Internal Displacement Division, providing specific assistance to IDPs is politically sensitive because most IDPs are Tutsis (IDD, 3 June 2006). In 2008 for example, UNICEF planned to provide health, education and non-food items to IDPs and returnees’ (UNICEF, 1 January 2008).
The fund to consolidate peace will contribute to the « projet sur la réinsertion des sinistrés » for 2 million USD (Government of Bu/UN, 31 December 2007).

Based on the findings of an IDP survey conducted by OCHA in 2005, humanitarian actions regarding IDPs will focus on improving coordination to maximise the existing expertise and capacity in monitoring and supporting IDP return (e.g. on basic needs, housing, land property issues, other protection issues). Also, a framework will be developed to identify durable solutions for IDPs not wishing to return to their zones of origin, adequate approaches for IDP return into the broader context of refugee return and community recovery and the specific problems of female headed households. These initiatives will also pay specific attention to the links between humanitarian/relief and reconstruction/development activities (OCHA, 23 June 2005, p8). OCHA is planning to revisit each of the site/settlement included in the 2005 survey, in order to get updated information by mid-2007.

For the first time, the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) and the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) jointly signed cooperation agreements with the authorities of Burundi in April for the period from 2005 to 2007, covering such fields as governance, poverty alleviation, water and sanitation, youth programmes, reproductive health and combating HIV/AIDS (UN News Service, 12 July 2005). In March 2006, UNDP launched an Integrated Action Plan for Reintegration in the five provinces receiving the bulk of repatriated persons. It focuses on war affected persons, including IDPs. The plan has been elaborated on the basis of workshops with relevant Burundian authorities, and aims among other to improve coordination and local ownership (UNDP, March 2006, plan opérationnel).

The programme will follow a community-based approach in order to ensure equity between the returnees and the local population (OCHA, 23 June 2005).

See:
UNDP March 2006, Plan Opérationnel Intégré de Réintégration 2006-2007 [Internet]
UNDP, March 2006, Plan Opérationnel Intégré de Réintégration 2006-2007, Cankuso [Internet]
UNDP, March 2006, Plan Opérationnel Intégré de Réintégration 2006-2007, Makamba [Internet]

For an overview of the activities of UN and NGO activities in Burundi, please see [Internet]

Successful reintegration of IDPs and returning refugees is central to sustainable peace

Amnesty International argued that the successful reintegration of IDPs and returning refugees is central to sustainable peace. It urged humanitarian organisations to adopt measures to address needs identified through enhanced monitoring of the displaced, particularly the special needs of unaccompanied minors, pregnant women, the sick and the disabled. Programmes to manage the return and the successful reintegration of IDPs should include measures to aid the reunification of families, the provision of identity documents, the provision of education and training, especially for children, and measures to enable IDPs to take part in economic activity and the full range of social and political rights (AI 13 January 2004).
In order to achieve durable solutions for IDPs and refugees, national and international programmes should focus on solving conflicting land claims (ICG 7 October 03). According to a survey conducted by OCHA and the government of Burundi, female and children headed households, who generally have no possibility to access their land (OCHA August 2004). One urgent measure is to allow displaced and other women to inherit land. In its strategy for IDP and refugee return, the Burundian government promised the explicit recognition of the right of women to land ownership in a new law (Government of Burundi January 2004).

In October 2006, the first country-specific meeting of the UN Peace Building Commission (PBC) recommended that Burundi and Sierra Leone be the first countries to receive support from the newly established Peace Building Fund (PBF). UNHCR said that it sees it as an opportunity to better ensure a sustainable return and reintegration for thousands of refugees and IDPs in Burundi. Following this meeting, the Governments, in consultation with the international community within the respective countries began to develop Priority Plans and detailed project notes. In Burundi, return was specifically mentioned as one of the government’s priorities and is seen as closely inter-linked with transitional justice, land reform and the broader socio-economic recovery (UNHCR, December 2006). In July 2007, the Peacebuilding Commission reported that in Burundi, projects amounting to a total of US$ 15,483,000 had been approved, notably in priority areas of human rights and security-sector reform (UNSC, 25 July 2007).

Selected activities of the Red Cross Movement and NGOs

The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) monitors the return of refugees and IDPs to their homes; it supports emergency education (teachers’ program) and provides advice in the resolution of land and property disputes. It also does awareness-raising of the rights of IDPs and returnees at the local level. Catholic Relief Services (CRS) includes vulnerable groups of IDPs in its non-food distributions and economic recovery activities. Danish Church Aid, Handicap International Belgium, and UNMAS are active in minesweeping and mine awareness to enhance safe return. CARE conducts grass roots reconciliation programs in places of potential return (IDD, 3 June 2006). The International Federation of Red Cross And Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) provides assistance to IDPs, particularly to female heads of household (IFRC, 24 March 2006).

ITEKA, Search for Common Ground, Accord, Global Rights and NRC also provide legal support to IDPs and others to solve land issues in a pacific way. These organisations also disseminate legal and procedural codes on land issues to community leaders, especially in Bururi, Makamba, Ruyigi and Muyinga Provinces (OCHA, 26 May 2005, p28).

Donor response

- The main donors responding to Burundi’s humanitarian needs are the United States, the European Commission and individual European countries, as well as Canada and Japan
- The Peace Building Commission is also planning to make considerable sums available to Burundi from its $142 million fund

A successful reintegration of the displaced requires increased commitments by donors. Since the beginning of the crisis in 1993, donors have appeared reluctant to provide funding to meet the needs of Burundians. During the crisis, the UN launched yearly Consolidated Appeal Processes. The last UN Consolidated Appeal was for 2007, which requested close to 128 million dollars (UN, 30 November 2006). Having assessed that Burundi no longer faced an acute humanitarian crisis, the Government and the UN agreed not to launch a Consolidated Appeal Process for Burundi in 2008 (UNSC, 23 November 2007).
The main donors responding to Burundi’s humanitarian needs are the United States, the European Commission and individual European countries, as well as Canada and Japan (OCHA, 31 January 2005).

The main source of funding to improve the situation of IDPs and returnees is the UN Peacebuilding Commission, created in 2006. In May 2007, the UN Secretary-General approved an allocation of $35 million for Burundi, based on the Government’s peacebuilding priority plan (UNSC, 17 May 2007). The Peacebuilding fund will contribute to the « projet sur la réinsertion des sinistrés » for 2 million USD (Government of Bu/UN, 31 December 2007).

In order to guide the engagement and dialogue between the Government of Burundi, other stakeholders and the Peacebuilding Commission in the pursuit of sustainable peace in Burundi, a “Strategic Framework for Burundi” was endorsed in June 2007 (UN Peacebuilding Commission, 22 July 2007). One of the key objectives mentioned in the Strategic Framework is to find “sustainable solutions to the land issue and to socioeconomic recovery of populations affected by the war and conflicts, including through monitoring the implementation of the PRSP as well as the ratification and implementation of the Pact on Security, Stability and Development in the Great Lakes region.” In a briefing to the Peacebuilding Commission, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Louise Arbour, said that peacebuilding success could be measured by the successful return and full integration of refugees and internally displaced persons (UNGA, 30 May 2007).

References to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement

Known references to the Guiding Principles (as of May 2008)

- Reference to the Guiding Principles in the national legislation
- Other References to the Guiding Principles (in chronological order)
- Availability of the Guiding Principles in local languages
- Training on the Guiding Principles (in chronological order)

Reference to the Guiding Principles in the national legislation

None

Other References to the Guiding Principles (in chronological order)

[Tubiyage theatre group: an association of seven theatre groups in Burundi assists the international community in disseminating the Guiding Principles for IDPs by using “art, participatory education and ‘tradition.’ ”

Document: ‘Burundians use innovative ways to protect the displaced,’ Greta Zeender in Forced Migration Review No. 16, January 2003 [Internet]

Groupe Technique de Suivi (GTS): IDP protection mechanism established by the government and the UN to follow up on the recommendations of the Framework for Consultation

Date: created in 2001
Framework for Consultation on the Protection of IDPs: established by several ministries, the UN and NGOs to better solve protection issues in the light of the Guiding Principles

Date: created in February 2001

Documents:
UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA), 13 March 2002, Compte Rendu de la réunion du Groupe de Contact du mercredi 13 mars 2002 [Internet]

UN Senior Inter-Agency Network: During its visit to Burundi, the Senior Network observed that the Guiding Principles should be used more actively to engage the government and non-State actors on their responsibility towards IDPs.

Date: 23 December 2000


UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Internally Displaced Persons, Dr. Francis M. Deng: in all its meetings with the government, the Special Representative drew attention to and disseminated the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement.

Date: February 2000

Documents:

Availability of the Guiding Principles in local languages

The GP are available in in Kirundi.

Date: 2002

Documents:
GP in Kirundi, translated by UNICEF Burundi [Internet]

Training on the Guiding Principles

Technical Follow-up Group with the Framework for the Protection of IDPs: held several information exchange meetings to disseminate the Guiding Principles on internal displacement, for example with administrative staff of Bujumbura Rural; with local government and military officials in Cankuzo and Ruyigi provinces. In 2003 and 2004, GTS completed sensitisation of IDPs on the Guiding Principles for the protection of IDPs in the provinces of Kayanza, Bubanza, Muramvya and Makamba. The GTS also carried out a routine field visit in several IDPs sites in Gitega provinces.
NRC training workshops: IDMC (then Global IDP Project) (NRC) together with Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)’s office in Burundi held a training workshop on the Guiding Principles in the capital of Burundi, Bujumbura in October 2001. The workshop was part of a global NRC effort to disseminate and explain the Guiding Principles to representatives of governments, NGOs, the UN agencies and the displaced themselves, in order to ensure better protection and assistance to internally displaced persons.

Following the October 2001 workshop, NRC launched a local training project, first with the support from IDMC.

NRC Burundi has been conducting training workshops on the UN Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in several provinces of Burundi since August 2002. Participants include provincial authorities, UN agencies, international and national NGOs, and IDP representatives. The workshops are part of a global NRC effort to disseminate and explain the Guiding Principles in order to ensure better protection and assistance to internally displaced persons.

In 2004, NRC held training workshops in the provinces of Muyinga, Makamba and Bujumbura Rural (five trainings per province).

In 2003, NRC held training workshops in the following provinces:
- Muramwya, February [report]
- Bujumbura Mairie, February
- Bururi, March, [Report]
- Kayanza, April [Report]
- Kirundo/Muyinga, August [Report]
- Cibitoke, August [Report]
- Mwaro, Sept [Report]

In 2002, NRC’s office in Burundi conducted training on the Guiding Principles in the following provinces: Kirundo (Aug), Muyinga (Aug), Makamba (Oct) [Report], Bujumbura Rural (Oct) [Report], Karuzi (Nov) [Report], Gitega (Dec) [Report], Ngozi (Dec) [Report].
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), 10-12 June 2003, Workshop on 'Protection of Internally Displaced Women' (Report)
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