

Burundi

2016 Country Review

COUNTRY WATCH

<http://www.countrywatch.com>

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	1
Country Overview	1
Country Overview	2
Key Data	3
Burundi	4
Africa	5
Chapter 2	7
Political Overview	7
History	8
Political Conditions	11
Political Risk Index	32
Political Stability	47
Freedom Rankings	62
Human Rights	74
Government Functions	79
Government Structure	81
Principal Government Officials	93
Leader Biography	94
Leader Biography	94
Foreign Relations	96
National Security	99
Defense Forces	102
Chapter 3	104
Economic Overview	104
Economic Overview	105
Nominal GDP and Components	107
Population and GDP Per Capita	108
Real GDP and Inflation	109
Government Spending and Taxation	110
Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment	111
Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate	112
Data in US Dollars	113
Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units	114

Energy Consumption and Production QUADS	115
World Energy Price Summary	116
CO2 Emissions	117
Agriculture Consumption and Production	118
World Agriculture Pricing Summary	120
Metals Consumption and Production	121
World Metals Pricing Summary	123
Economic Performance Index	124
Chapter 4	136
Investment Overview	136
Foreign Investment Climate	137
Foreign Investment Index	139
Corruption Perceptions Index	152
Competitiveness Ranking	164
Taxation	173
Stock Market	173
Partner Links	174
Chapter 5	175
Social Overview	175
People	176
Human Development Index	178
Life Satisfaction Index	182
Happy Planet Index	193
Status of Women	202
Global Gender Gap Index	206
Culture and Arts	215
Etiquette	215
Travel Information	216
Diseases/Health Data	226
Chapter 6	232
Environmental Overview	232
Environmental Issues	233
Environmental Policy	234
Greenhouse Gas Ranking	235
Global Environmental Snapshot	246
Global Environmental Concepts	257

International Environmental Agreements and Associations	271
Appendices	296
Bibliography	297

Chapter 1

Country Overview

Country Overview

BURUNDI

Since independence from Belgium in 1962, Burundi has been plagued by tensions between the dominant Tutsi minority and the Hutu majority. Burundi's first democratically elected president was assassinated in October 1993 after only 100 days in office, triggering widespread ethnic violence between Hutu and Tutsi factions. The country was then plunged into civil war, in which tens of thousands of people were killed and hundreds of thousands were displaced. An internationally brokered power-sharing agreement between the Tutsi-dominated government and the Hutu rebels in 2003 paved the way for a transition process that led to an integrated defense force, established a new constitution in 2005, and elected a majority Hutu government in 2005.

In September 2006, the new government led by President Pierre Nkurunziza signed a peace agreement with the country's last active rebel group, the Forces for National Liberation (FNL), and a ceasefire agreement was signed between the government and FNL in May 2008.

Continuing peace talks have led to some positive developments in the process of national reconciliation, however, instability and violence have prevailed to date, making clear the precarious position of the elected government. The 2010 election was regarded as a stabilizing measure on Burundi's political landscape; however, the decision of President Nkurunziza to contest the 2015 election under spurious constitutional circumstances has re-introduced precariousness to the political landscape in Burundi.

Landlocked with limited resources and situated in Sub-Saharan Africa, Burundi is among the poorest countries in the world. More than a decade of civil conflict had a significant impact on the country's economy. However, Burundi has made steady progress in its macroeconomic performance in recent years supported by the international community despite a difficult environment. Based on that progress, the World Bank and the IMF approved debt relief for Burundi under the MDRI (Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative) in January 2009.

Key Data

Key Data	
Region:	Africa
Population:	11574246
Climate:	Temperate; warm; occasional frost in uplands; dry season from June to September.
Languages:	Kirundi (Official) French (Official) Swahili
Currency:	1 Burundi Franc = 100 centimes
Holiday:	Independence Day is 1 July (1962), Rwagasore's Day is 13 October
Area Total:	27830
Area Land:	25650
Coast Line:	0

Burundi

Country Map



Africa

Regional Map



© MAGELLAN Geographics® Santa Barbara, CA (800) 929-4MAP

Chapter 2

Political Overview

History

Bahutu agriculturists migrated to Burundi in the 6th century C.E. In the 14th century Batutsis began their migration into the Bahutu-controlled area of present-day Burundi. By the 17th century the Batutsis had established a feudal structure.

In 1890 Burundi became the German Protectorate of East Africa, and after many attempts to subjugate the people, the Germans finally succeeded in 1903 with a treaty that allowed the Germans a military base and free passage through the land.

After World War I, Germany lost all its colonial territories, and Belgium took over control of Burundi. The Belgians succeeded in transforming the government of Burundi. Various councils were formed which further divided the country into governing units. By the mid-1950s, demands were being made for independence.

In 1961, the son of King Mwambutsa, Prince Rwagasore, who was also the leader of the popular Union and National Progress Party, was assassinated after his party had won legislative elections. This signified a perpetuation of feudal divisions despite increased Burundian nationalism and imminent independence, which Burundi was granted within a year.

In 1965, a coup attempt by Bahutu officers and the successful assassination of the Bahutu Prime Minister Pierre Ngendandumwe were triggered by the king's dismissal of election results that would have placed the Bahutus in power in the National Assembly. In response to the coup, all of the Bahutu suspects were executed, and the king appointed his secretary, Leopold Biha, to be prime minister.

In 1966, the Batutsi-Hima secretary of state, Cpt. Michel Micombero, was appointed prime minister and the king turned the crown over to his younger son, who, a few months later, overthrew the monarchy and declared himself president of the First Republic. The military regime was responsible for the death of hundreds of thousands of civilians. Bahutus were the main target of this political violence. In addition to intensifying inter-ethnic conflict, the political situation within the ruling group became more complex. Intra-Batutsi divisions between clans (particularly the Batare and Bezi of the Ganwa, a class of princely elites) also intensified during the early independence period.

More than almost any other country in Africa, ethnocidal massacres started to become a pattern in social fabrication. In 1972, Bahutus revolted against continued Batutsi oppression. An estimated 100,000 to 200,000 Bahutus were killed (as compared to only 2,000-3,000 Batutsis). This was a watershed event in the creation of ethnic awareness in Burundi. It was also a watershed event in the formulation of Western foreign policy towards the region. Rather than intervene, Europe and the United States stood by and watched the massacre unfold. Shortly thereafter, a pattern of denial emerged in which Western authorities refused to recognize the extent or basis of the carnage.

Lemarchand names three causes for this event: 1) the effect of the independence revolution in Rwanda, and Belgian support of that revolution; 2) the ethnic crisis in the Uprona party that dominated Burundian politics for thirty years following the assassination of Rwagasore in 1961; and 3) the crisis of legitimacy in the mid-1960s which led to a Batutsi coup in 1965 and the subsequent subversion of the Batutsi monarchical structure to the Batutsi military structure. Other scholars cite as further causal factors class domination by specific Batutsi groups, social deprivation in the face of grave land shortages, and continued competition for resources.

Another coup took place in 1976, under the command of a relative of Micombero, Jean Baptiste Bagaza. Bagaza's goal was to bring the religious power of the Catholic Church under the control of the newly formed Second Republic.

The Third Republic was formed in 1987, after a coup headed by yet another relative, Pierre Buyoya. Buyoya made significant progress in settling the nation, by recognizing the conflict between the Bahutu and the Batutsi, and restoring the Catholic Church. Buyoya, a Batutsi, brought about Burundi's first power-sharing arrangement. Bahutus gained power in the government, though the state house, armed forces and local governments were still dominated by Batutsis.

Following clashes in August 1988, an estimated 20,000 people, the majority of whom were Bahutu were killed in a Bahutu uprising. Despite hope that the present government might be able to resolve the country's deep-seated ethnic conflict and consequent violence, the unrest continued. The international reaction to this violence was somewhat different than the international reaction in 1973. The West declared its outrage and Belgian troops were deployed. These troops managed to halt the violence before it became genocidal.

In August 1988, after the clashes, Buyoya's Batutsi government tried to redress the balance of power by naming a Bahutu, Sibomana, as prime minister. Bahutus were also given half the posts in the new cabinet. In February 1992 a referendum was held in order to approve a proposed Charter of National Unity, aimed at abolishing ethnic discrimination and establishing a plural constitution. This led to the first multi-party election in February 1993.

In this election, Melchior Ndadaye became the first Bahutu head of state and the Bahutu were

appointed to 14 of the 22 cabinet positions (the most ethnically balanced government yet). The newly appointed president was killed in a coup d'etat and ethnic violence ensued. Once again the West returned to its position of denial. There was no official recognition of the violence, and no Western country intervened. This blind eye of the world's great powers once again left the oppressive Batutsi forces to their own devices, resulting in the killing of between 25,000 and 50,000 people, and the flight of some 800,000 to neighboring countries.

In April 1994, the new head of state -- Cyprien Ntaryamira, a Hutu, and Rwandan President Habyarimana flew to Arusha, Tanzania for discussion with Tanzania's former president, Julius Nyerere, about ways to resolve the conflicts in the two countries. On the return flight, the plane was shot down by forces close to President Habyarimana and both heads of state were killed. While the violence in Rwanda that ensued captured the world's attention, Burundi went through clashes of its own. A Bahutu speaker of the National Assembly, Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, was appointed. The army, comprised of Batutsis, attacked the Bahutu administration and attempted a coup d'etat. Violence continued throughout the year.

The government remained completely ineffective. The Unity for National Progress party prevented any further progress when it twice brought the government to a standstill, first in protest of a Bahutu's election as speaker and then in order to force Kanyenkiko, who had been disowned by the Unity for National Progress, to resign from the position of prime minister. When the party got their way with the installation of a Batutsi as prime minister, tens of thousands of people escaped to Tanzania.

Civil war ensued throughout Burundi in 1996. Critical to understanding this conflict, the war was as clan-based as it was ethnic-based. Each group created what Lemarchand refers to as a "mythology of conflict." Individual responsibility is subverted by collective identity in order to waylay guilt. The divisions between Bahutus and Batutsi were apparent, but Batutsi on Batutsi violence, born in the clan conflicts and galvanized in the 1972 massacres, also was prevalent. Neither the Burundian government nor foreign powers intervened. The lack of government intervention resulted in the suspension of aid from both the European Union and the United States. The government opposed intervention from any parties, resulting in neighboring countries joining the embargo imposed by the United States and the European Union.

In July 1996, for the second time, Pierre Buyoya -- from the Batutsi community -- was installed as president by a military coup d'etat. In the early 2000s, on the basis of the peace process, Buyoya acted as president over a transitional government. Then in 2003, Buyoya stepped down from office as head of the country's transitional government and was replaced by a Hutu president, Domitien Ndayizeye.

In 2005, under the aegis of the peace agreement, a new parliament was elected to power. Under the peace accords' provisions, 40 percent of parliamentary seats were to be reserved for the Tutsi

minority and 60 percent of seats were to be reserved for the Hutu majority. The new president elected was Pierre Nkurunziza. The implications of the shift in power were expected to chart the country's future path.

Supplementary sources: SIPRI; Human Rights Watch; Amnesty International; Lemarchand, Rene; APIC; Africanews.org.

Note on History: In certain entries, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used. A full listing of sources is available in the Bibliography.

Political Conditions

More than almost any other country in Africa, ethnocidal massacres started to become a pattern in social fabrication in Burundi. In 1972, Bahutus revolted against continued Batutsi oppression. An estimated 100,000 to 200,000 Bahutus were killed (as compared to only 2,000-3,000 Batutsis). This was a watershed event in the creation of ethnic awareness in Burundi. It was also a watershed event in the formulation of Western foreign policy towards the region. Rather than intervene, Europe and the United States stood by and watched the massacre unfold. Shortly thereafter, a pattern of denial emerged in which Western authorities refused to recognize the extent or basis of the carnage.

Rene Lemarchand, an African scholar, has named three causes for this event: 1) the effect of the independence revolution in Rwanda, and Belgian support of that revolution; 2) the ethnic crisis in the Uprona party that dominated Burundian politics for thirty years following the assassination of Rwagasore in 1961; and 3) the crisis of legitimacy in the mid-1960s which led to a Batutsi coup in 1965 and the subsequent subversion of the Batutsi monarchical structure to the Batutsi military structure. Other scholars cite as further causal factors class domination by specific Batutsi groups, social deprivation in the face of grave land shortages, and continued competition for resources.

Another coup took place in 1976, under the command of a relative of Micombero, Jean Baptiste Bagaza. Bagaza's goal was to bring the religious power of the Catholic Church under the control of the newly formed Second Republic.

The Third Republic was formed in 1987, after a coup headed by yet another relative, Pierre Buyoya. Buyoya made significant progress in settling the nation, by recognizing the conflict

between the Bahutu and the Batutsi, and restoring the Catholic Church. Buyoya, a Batutsi, brought about Burundi's first power-sharing arrangement. Bahutus gained power in the government, though the state house, armed forces and local governments were still dominated by Batutsis.

Following clashes in August 1988, an estimated 20,000 people, the majority of whom were Bahutu, were killed in a Bahutu uprising. Despite hope that the present government might be able to resolve the country's deep-seated ethnic conflict and consequent violence, the unrest continued. The international reaction to this violence was somewhat different than the international reaction in 1973. The West declared its outrage and Belgian troops were deployed. These troops managed to halt the violence before it became genocidal.

In August 1988, after the clashes, Buyoya's Batutsi government tried to redress the balance of power by naming a Bahutu, Sibomana, as prime minister. Bahutus were also given half the posts in the new cabinet.

In February 1992 a referendum was held in order to approve a proposed Charter of National Unity, aimed at abolishing ethnic discrimination and establishing a plural constitution. This led to the first multi-party election in February 1993. In this election, Melchior Ndadaye became the first Bahutu head of state and the Bahutu were appointed to 14 of the 22 cabinet positions (the most ethnically balanced government yet).

The newly appointed president was killed in a coup d'etat and ethnic violence ensued. Once again the West returned to its position of denial. There was no official recognition of the violence, and no Western country intervened. This blind eye of the world's great powers once again left the oppressive Batutsi forces to their own devices, resulting in the killing of between 25,000 and 50,000 people, and the flight of some 800,000 to neighboring countries.

In April 1994, the new head of state, Cyprien Ntaryamira, a Hutu, and Rwandan President Habyarimana flew to Arusha, Tanzania, for discussion with Tanzania's former president, Julius Nyerere, about ways to resolve the conflicts in the two countries. On the return flight, the plane was shot down by forces close to President Habyarimana and both heads of state were killed. While the violence in Rwanda that ensued captured the world's attention, Burundi went through clashes of its own. A Bahutu speaker of the National Assembly, Sylvestre Ntibantunganya, was appointed. The army, comprised of Batutsis, attacked the Bahutu administration and attempted a coup d'etat. Violence continued throughout the year.

The government remained completely ineffective. The Unity for National Progress party prevented any further progress when it twice brought the government to a standstill, first in protest of a Bahutu's election as speaker and then in order to force the resignation of prime minister. When the party got their way with the installation of a Batutsi as prime minister, tens of thousands of people escaped to Tanzania.

Civil war ensued throughout Burundi in 1996. Critical to understanding this conflict, the war was as clan-based as it was ethnic-based. Each group created what Lemarchand referred to as a "mythology of conflict." Individual responsibility is subverted by collective identity in order to waylay guilt. The divisions between Bahutus and Batutsi were apparent, but Batutsi on Batutsi violence, born in the clan conflicts and galvanized in the 1972 massacres, also was prevelant.

The Burundian government did not intervene. The lack of government intervention resulted in the suspension of aid from both the European Union and the United States. The government opposed intervention from any parties, resulting in neighboring countries joining the embargo imposed by the United States and the European Union.

By mid-1996, when Pierre Buyoya was installed as president via a military coup d'etat.

Burundi's political conflict has cost the country around one million lives and countless millions of dollars in lost property. The growing involvement of various African, European and American governments increased pressure on the Buyoya administration to negotiate a peaceful settlement with the Bahutu insurgency.

In 1999, Buyoya and parliament agree on a transitional constitution under which he was formally inaugurated as the president.

Also in 1999, as challenges by civil society groups increased, Buyoya banned all "collective sport" to prevent gatherings by either Batutsi militias seeking to rival his authority or Bahutu nationalists.

This measure coincided with Bahutu raids, led by the FDD "Conseil National for la Défense de la Démocratie-Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie" (FDD), which was aimed at derailing the peace summit scheduled for September. By the end of the month, there was renewed violence. The FDD led the charge against the military forces, but Batutsi militias also were involved. The government reacted with unexpected severity, attacking Bahutu civilians as potential FDD sympathizers. There were also reports of armed Batutsis joining the government in the killing.

The number of people who died is unknown but the number of internally displaced persons increased from an estimated 650,000 to over 800,000 between September and October. In addition, the ranks of the FDD were thought to have swelled during this period to over 10,000.

Under peace talks led by former Tanzanian President Julius Nyerere, the FDD was determined to be an irreconcilably detrimental force to peace and was banned from the peace proceedings. This was consistent with the Lusaka Accord, which specified that any resolution to the fighting must include the disbanding of the FDD. The FDD thus saw no way in which it could benefit from the summit taking place.

The death of Julius Nyerere -- a renowned statesman and the pillar of the peace talks -- on Oct. 14, 1999 acted only to fuel the conflagration. The disparate groups quickly found little reason to come to the table. The Organization of African Unity began rapidly searching for a competent replacement as moderator of the talks.

Under the mediation of Nelson Mandela, the new Arusha peace process kicked off in northern Tanzania on Feb. 21, 2000. In a marked break from Nyerere, Mandela announced that no resolution could be reached unless all parties were represented. He thus invited the FDD (and the smaller FNL or National Liberation forces) to take part in the talks. The FDD was Burundi's largest insurgency force. Under the leadership of Jean Bosco Ndaykengurukiye, the FDD controlled much of the eastern area of the Democratic Republic of Congo. In return, they received support for their war back home from Congolese President Laurent Kabila (now deceased). The smaller FNL was the armed wing of one of Burundi's Bahutu rebel movements, the Palipe Bahutu. The FNL operated mainly in northern Burundi, along the border with Rwanda.

Neither the FDD nor the FNL chose to enter the talks until mid-2000. While the invitation overrode Nyerere's snub, and validated the political importance of their organizations, Mandela did not work to reverse the Lusaka Accord statute, which predetermines their dismantling. The FDD looked at this statute as a precondition for their involvement.

Under significant pressure from the United States, Nelson Mandela, and several other international forces, a peace agreement, the Arusha Accord, was finally reached on Aug. 28, 2000. While the government and 19 faction parties signed the accord, the FDD and the FNL both refused. The Arusha Accord did serve to legitimate Buyoya with the 19 signatories. However, it failed to address the key issues of conflict.

In January 2000, Buyoya ordered military officials, along with local administrators, to forcibly remove 350,000 people living in rural Bujumbura to 53 camps. The government described this move as an effort to provide alternative economic opportunities and to protect the population from the insurgent militias. In practice, however, those affected were used as a counter-insurgency measure to remove cover from armed opposition groups. The organization Human Rights Watch reported that conditions in the camps were appalling, including dramatic food shortages, overcrowding and little or no sanitation. Dehydration, typhus, malaria, meningitis and cholera were abundant. There were no medical facilities. Women were routinely raped by soldiers. Men were routinely extradited for questioning and disappeared.

The Buyoya government came under significant international criticism for the camps. On Jan. 19, 2000, the United Nations Security Council devoted a session to Burundi and adopted a resolution calling for all parties to ensure humanitarian access to the displaced persons throughout Burundi. In April 2000, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights more specifically passed a resolution

calling on Burundi to terminate the camps and allow the population to return to their livelihoods.

The most notable voice in opposition to the camps belonged to Nelson Mandela. A draft resolution by the 36th OAU summit in June 2000 congratulated Nelson Mandela for his efforts as a facilitator in Burundi. Mandela and the OAU strongly encouraged Buyoya to dismantle the camps. He agreed to do so by the end of July 2000. By July 7, 2000, all but five camps had been dismantled, and by October 2000, Buyoya agreed to dismantle the remaining camps. He continued, however, to use what he termed "temporary" camps for the maintenance of security. Well into 2001, these "temporary" camps continued to proliferate, drawing the ire of the international community.

At issue for President Buyoya was the recruitment and protection of rebel troops. Buyoya insisted that all areas in which people had been rounded up into camps were areas where the rebels recruited heavily or areas which were known to harbor rebels. While this was not largely disputed by international human rights organizations and other international actors on the ground, they challenged Buyoya's conclusion that the potential for rebel sympathizers in an area justified the internment of all citizens of that area.

On July 2, 2000, Belgium became the first Western government to commit itself to an effort aimed at resolving the conflict in Burundi. It stressed that it would side with Buyoya as a peacemaker against the FDD. The FDD remained mute to this comment, focusing on their increasing role in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. For his part, Buyoya asked the international community to release its embargo in favor of socioeconomic development aid, stating that any lasting peace would have to be supported by economic gains.

In the six months that followed Belgium's commitment, international support mounted. In November 2000, United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan appointed Berhanu Dinka, his special representative for the Great Lakes regions, as chairman of the Implementation Monitoring Committee in accordance with Protocol V, Article 3.2b of the Arusha Peace Agreement. He and Jean Arnault, representative of the secretary general for Burundi, met with parties in Arusha from November 25 to November 28 to seek an agreement.. Malawian President Bakili Muluzi brokered the talks.

Violence escalated in the latter half of 2000. Armed gangs based in Tanzania attacked civilians in Cankuzo Province, and other civilians were attacked by rebels in the south of the country. Notably, a British teacher with the Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO), Charlotte Wilson, was killed. While she was working in Rwanda, she took a bus to Bujumbura with her Burundian fiancée in order to meet his family. The bus was ambushed just outside the city. Charlotte, her fiancée, and 17 other people were killed, and another 11 were shot non-fatally and left on the roadside. With the failing ability of the government to bring criminals to justice, such sporadic gang violence has increased in the surrounds of the capital.

Prior to the Arusha talks, Mandela issued a warning to the rebels that the time for gentle persuasion was over. In a remarkable show of concession, the government of Burundi accepted the FNL precondition for continued discussions by formally recognizing the Paliphehutu-FNL as a political organization. The FNL entered into the discussions. The FDD, however, distanced itself from the process.

The peace talks collapsed on Jan. 28, 2001. The largest issue of contention at that point was who would lead the transition period. The three foreseeable presidential candidates included Pierre Buyoya, retired army officer Col. Epitace Bayaganakandi, and Domitien Ndayizeye. The FNL and other Hutu factions insisted that the transitional leader be Hutu. The Tutsi leadership was divided on whether to allow President Buyoya to proceed, to name another Tutsi, or accept a Hutu as a transitional leader.

Two coup d'etat attempts were made, one in April and one in July, allegedly by Tutsi hardliners. Both attempts failed.

By July 2001, Nelson Mandela announced President Buyoya would head the three-year transitional government for 18 months beginning November 1, after which a Hutu leader would come to power. No cease-fire agreement, however, had been made.

In January 2002, the leader of the Hutu party, Jean Minani, was elected president of the national assembly. Many hoped Minani would represent a genuine conciliatory political gesture toward the Hutu. There was a relatively equal representation of Hutu and Tutsi in the new government with 14 Hutu ministers and 12 Tutsi ministers -- a Hutu majority at 60 percent and a Tutsi minority at 40 percent. Exiled Hutu politicians were also granted amnesty to return to Burundi to take part in the transitional government. These politicians were protected by South African troops.

Despite this important step towards political stability, fighting continued well into 2002. Tutsi hardliners resisted any political sharing with Hutu and, likewise, a number of Hutu rebel forces refused to participate in any talks as they do not trust the Tutsi-controlled army. Both factions continued to attack civilians. Days after the interim government was inaugurated, Hutu rebels slaughtered 35 civilians in southern Burundi, and kidnapped 60 schoolchildren as well as four teachers in Ruyigi.

There also was the pressing issue of the repatriation of 300,000 Burundian refugees in Tanzania; continued fighting between the army and rebels has made the task difficult. In early June 2002, the United Nations announced the fighting was also keeping humanitarian aid from reaching those displaced persons who desperately need it. In mid-August, however, at least 16,000 Burundian refugees returned from Tanzania under a voluntary repatriation campaign launched on February 28. The repatriation exercise has been coordinated by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Tanzania and Bujumbura as well as the governments of the two countries. According to UNHCR statistics, 70,000 Burundian refugees based in Tanzania were willing to

return home out of the 400,000 living in the neighboring country.

The history of violence along ethnic and clan lines -- in 1965, 1972, 1988, 1991, 1993, 1996, 1999, 2000 -- leaves little room for hope that a lasting peace is near for Burundi. Optimists hold that there are a few reasons to believe that change might be on its way: Nelson Mandela, one of the most charismatic leaders of our time, had been a leading mediator in the process until 2001. The military itself has reached an impasse. Its own internal divisions stop it from being an effective genocidal force. If Burundi were seeking peace in a vacuum this could work. Bahutu leaders are still marginalized from power and Bahutu civilians -- though 85 percent of the population -- are treated as second-class citizens. Even intra-Batutsi rivalries based in caste and clan cleavages seem far from resolved.

Despite escalated violence and failures to reach an accord, the peace talks continued to serve a critical purpose. Burundi suffers from a civil war with multitudinous fronts but on a relatively limited scale. There has been the overshadowing potential for a mass genocide similar to that which took place in Rwanda. A majority of scholars argue that genocide is a political phenomenon. It is about maximizing power for a particular group, and it is a tool for regime consolidation and maintenance. With a weak regime, the factors leading to genocide have flourished. There is significant economic and social stress that the regime cannot confront and a history of violence; there are strong and growing group identities with particularistic characteristics; there are divergent international forces supporting different groups, and each group perceives itself as the victim and the other group as the perpetrator.

While Mandela's talks did not yield a peace dividend, or even a framework for peace, they served to find enough commonality between groups to get them to the bargaining table.

The process of talks itself had no doubt served to stem the rate of the tide of violence. Continued international probes into both government and rebel actions, support for more moderate forces, and the perpetuation of the United Nations commission of inquiry, no doubt, helped to establish accountability and justice necessary for future stability.

Still, with the no absolute resolution in the offing, in October 2002, several African heads of state met to discuss the civil war in the Tanzanian capital of Dar es Salaam. Included in the group were the leaders of the Democratic republic of Congo, South Africa, Uganda and the host country, Tanzania. As Burundi's civil war reached its 10th anniversary, regional leaders wanted to bring some hope to a part of the world that had been ensconced in violence for a decade. Discussions between the Burundi government and the key rebel players were unsuccessful and the violence increased.

By December 2002, the government and main rebel groups signed a ceasefire agreement, again in the country of Tanzania. Under the new agreement, rebel factions would be integrated into the

national army. Nevertheless, by January 2003, fighting between government and rebel factions again erupted. Meanwhile, a peace mission of military observers from the African Union arrived in Burundi to monitor the cease-fire.

On April 30, 2003, President Pierre Buyoya, the Tutsi leader, stepped down from office as head of the country's transitional government and was replaced by a Hutu president, Domitien Ndayizeye.

In the few months following, however, there were significant violations of the cease-fire. As well, the main Hutu rebel group, FDD, warned they would increase attacks on the capital Bujumbura if the government did not agree to negotiate the role of rebel groups in the power-sharing transitional government. Complicating matters was the fact that the other rebel groups, such as FNL, who did not sign the cease-fire, could decide to take a more offensive role and step up attacks. Despite the existence of the cease-fire, the promise of stability and peace in Burundi remained questionable.

Indeed, in July 2003, the violence and bloodshed erupted once again with a major rebel assault on Bujumbura. Several hundred rebels and about 15 government forces were killed, while many thousands left their homes fearing for their lives.

A ray of hope emerged in November 2003 when the government and FDD signed a peace agreement, aimed at ending the country's decade-long civil war. With several African leaders present at the signing ceremony in Dar es Salaam, the capital of Tanzania, calls were made for smaller rebel groups to also enter into peace talks with the government. Under the agreement, the FDD would get four ministers in the government, 40 percent of the officer positions in a new military, 15 members of parliament and elections were scheduled for the following November. However, in February 2004 the government announced that November elections were not likely as several prerequisites (a population census, identification cards, and disarmament of rebel groups) had not yet been completed.

In May 2004, the FDD quit the government claiming that the promises made in the peace agreement had not been honored. In talks held in South Africa, the FDD and the government hammered out a new draft of a power-sharing agreement. In the agreement, power was to be split along ethnic lines: a 60-40 split of National Assembly seats for Hutus and Tutsis, respectively; 60-40 in the cabinet; and 50-50 in the Senate. The Tutsi Uprona party protested the agreement and called for party representation as well. In late July, six Tutsi parties abandoned negotiations complaining that the agreement did not represent their interests.

In April 2004 it was announced that preparations had begun to send a United Nations peacekeeping force to relieve the African Union peacekeepers that had been in place since the previous October.

The FNL, which is dominant in areas around the capital city of Bujumbura, is still fighting against the government. Without its inclusion in the peace process, a comprehensive peace in Burundi is

unlikely. In August 2004, the FNL claimed responsibility for a brutal massacre of 160 Congolese Tutsi refugees near the Congo DRC border. Most of the victims were women and children and observers said many were burned to death and killed with machetes. The FNL said they were moving to attack a military base in the area when they were fired on from the direction of the camp. Burundi army officials accused the Congolese army of participating in the massacre.

The conflict, which has centered on the fight for power between the majority Hutu rebels and the Tutsi-dominated army, is estimated to have claimed 300,000 lives in the past decade. Burundi has been trying to deal with the aftermath of this ethnic conflict.

In early 2005, voters went to the polls to decide whether or not to accept a new constitution in Burundi. The new constitution was designed to facilitate power-sharing between Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups. While it was generally believed the referendum would afford a change in the constitutional provisions, the bigger challenge would come later when elections were to be held. Moreover, the question of whether or not such changes would actually mean an end to ethnic conflict was yet unknown.

In June 2005, the win by Burundi's former rebels in local council elections was viewed as a possible harbinger for things to come in the upcoming national assembly elections. The Hutu-dominated Defense of Democracy won 75 out of 129 Municipal seats and delivered a defeat to the party of President Domitien Ndayizeye. These were the first national elections since the outbreak of civil war in 1993 between the Hutu rebels and the minority Tutsi-dominated armed forces. The elections were held under new rules, which provide for representation of both Hutus and Tutsis. The elections were marred by some degree of violence, however, as ethnic dissonance prevailed.

Voters in Burundi again went to the polls in the first part of July 2005 to elect members of parliament. The election was regarded as a significant step in the process intended to end the civil war started in 1993 between the two main ethnic groups. Under the aegis of the peace agreement, 40 percent of parliamentary seats were to be reserved for the Tutsi minority and 60 percent of seats were to be reserved for the Hutu majority. The party aligned with the Hutu rebels was expected to win the majority of votes. As well, both political power and government jobs were to be shared proportionately between the two ethnic groups.

Although the new provisions reflected the country's ethnic complexity, the minority Tutsi held grave anxieties about what Hutu political domination in Burundi would mean for them. As such, ethnic divisions remained a concern in Burundi. Early estimates placed turnout at 65 percent and the United Nations Operation in Burundi said there had been few reports of fraud or voter intimidation. As such, the situation was far calmer than the period of local elections a month earlier, which were marred by attacks as noted above.

Almost a week after the actual voting, results showed that Burundi's former Hutu rebels ("Conseil

National for la Défense de la Démocratie - Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie" or FDD) won a parliamentary majority. President Domitien Ndayizeye's Frodebu party garnered second place. Official results gave the FDD 59 seats, Frodebu 24 seats, Uprona 10 seats and others seven (7) seats.

Putting some of the Tutsi fears to rest, the FDD said it would focus on poverty alleviation and ethnic reconciliation. The new parliamentarians were expected to choose a new president in August 2005. FDD leader and former university lecturer, Pierre Nkurunziza, was expected to be elected.

Then, in late August 2005, former Burundi rebel leader Pierre Nkurunziza was inaugurated as the country's president after being selected by recently-elected members of parliament. In his inauguration address, the new president said, "I pledge to fight all ideology and acts of genocide and exclusion, to promote and defend the individual and collective rights and freedoms of persons and of the citizen."

His words were a reminder of the ongoing ethnic divisions. Indeed, some of his Tutsi opponents have suggested that Nkurunziza should be brought to justice for crimes they allege that he committed as a rebel leader during the civil war, and for which a Burundian court sentenced him to death back in 1998. (He was later granted amnesty in the peace agreement.) In a move intended to help bridge the ethnic divide, outgoing President Domitien Ndayizeye characterized the day as the most significant in Burundi's history, despite the defeat of his Frodebu Party by Nkurunziza's FDD in the parliamentary elections. Still, the task ahead for the new president of Burundi was expected to be a challenging one. Indeed, to date, no elected government has ever served its complete term in Burundi.

Meanwhile, in the spring of 2005, several thousand Hutus from Rwanda sought refuge in Burundi when village courts, based on traditional systems of justice, were convened to confront alleged Hutu attackers from the 1994 genocide. The Rwandan Hutus said they were facing persecution at home as a result of the village court trials. By mid-2005, however, the Rwandan Hutus were being forced to return home from Burundi against their will. The government of Burundi characterized the Rwandan Hutus as illegal immigrants and began the process of returning them home from various camps. The Interior Minister of Burundi, Jean Marie Ngendahayo, said: "Nothing justifies the presence of these people in Burundi. Rwanda is in peace and there is no persecution." The United Nations refugee agency, however, warned that it was illegal to return the Hutus to Rwanda without first determining whether or not refugee status might be granted.

In mid-June 2006, following close to three weeks of negotiations, rebels in Burundi agreed to a truce plan with the government. At the signing ceremony in Tanzania, Burundi's President Pierre Nkurunziza was present, along with the presidents of South African and Tanzanian. Also witnessing the ceremony were representatives of the African Union and the United Nations.

The framework accord formalized an agreement between the government of Burundi government and the country's last active rebel group -- the Hutu National Liberation Forces (FNL) -- to bring an end to the hostilities between their respective sides. The agreement would facilitate FNL's reconstitution as a political party, which would be involved in post-war reconstruction and development. The agreement also provided for the creation of a permanent ceasefire deal. Although there was agreement on a ceasefire in 2005, fighting continued nonetheless. It was hoped that this new deal would finally bring an end to the conflict and instability that has plagued the country.

Until the establishment of this new framework accord, the FNL was the only one of several Hutu rebel groups that was not a signatory to the 2000 peace deal that brought the current power-sharing government to power. As such, the FNL presented a challenge to the prospect of enduring peace in Burundi following a long-standing civil war.

Despite these developments, June 2006 was also a period when the government issued a clampdown for security reasons. That clampdown had been spurred by violence in the capital of Bujumbura, carried out by the FNL-Palipehutu rebel group. That particular rebel group was not amenable to the truce and talks between the FNL--Palipehutu and the government had seen little progress. The violence that occurred sparked an official inquiry, which lasted several weeks.

By the start of August 2006, the authorities in Burundi had arrested several people in connection with an alleged coup attempt. Among those arrested was Aleen Mugaravabona, the leader of a former rebel group, the FNL-Chanzo, which had signed a ceasefire agreement with the government in 2005 (referenced above). Several other former politicians and activists were also arrested. These developments were essentially an outcome of the aforementioned investigation that had been carried out because of the June 2006 violence. That investigation uncovered that the coup plot was being hatched in mid-June and that the actual coup had been planned for June 30, 2006.

On August 21, 2006, former President Domitien Ndayizeye of Burundi was arrested by police and taken in for questioning in relation to an apparent coup plot earlier in 2006. A number of presidential aides were also included on a list of alleged coup plotters, along with the former president.

On September 5, 2006, Vice-President Alice Nzomukunda resigned from office. She explained that corruption and human rights abuses were affecting Burundi's progress and development. To this end, she said, "My decision was motivated by numerous political problems which Burundian people are undergoing - problems of security, of not respecting the law, the management of state finances and of human rights laws which are violated. The country was on a good path to overcome all these problems, but corruption and economic embezzlement are undermining it." Nzomukunda has been a member of President Nkurunziza's predominantly Hutu

FDD party.

Also in September 2006, Burundi's last remaining rebels signed a ceasefire agreement with the government and prepared to lay down arms. The National Liberation Forces, known by the acronym FNL, was the remaining Hutu group to have resisted the peace process for the past several years. The new ceasefire agreement was expected to result in the disarmament of the FNL fighters and their possible integration into the national army. The process was expected to take approximately one month and would be monitored by both the African Union (AU) and the United Nations (UN).

While it was hoped that the developments would ideally bring a further sense of peace to Burundi, which had endured more than a decade of civil war, political experts remained cautious about the prospects for stability. Despite the signing of the ceasefire agreement, the FNL and the government remained at odds the actual issues entrenched in a larger peace deal.

By the close of 2006, there was a rising sense of anxiety in Burundi with some pointing to the increased level of authoritarianism by the government. Of particular concern were the arrests of government critics, including the arrest of the former president (as aforementioned), press and media limitations, alleged human rights abuses, and more control over the economy. Collectively, these moves indicated that the government was tightening its rein over all aspects of the country in what could be regarded as a "drift" toward authoritarianism. The International Crisis Group warned that such a trend, if sustained, could spur unrest, undermine the fragile sense of stability gained from the peace process, and certainly reverse the path charted toward peace.

This warning notwithstanding, in early 2007, the United Nations closed its peacekeeping mission and concentrated its efforts on post-conflict reconstruction instead.

On the political front at the start of 2007, former President Domitien Ndayizeye was acquitted of charges that he conspired to kill the president. As noted above, Ndayizeye had been arrested and charged in relation to an apparent coup plot in 2006. His case gained international notoriety with some critics, including the International Crisis Group, accusing the government of going after Ndayizeye for political reasons. Four other individuals were also acquitted, however, two people including a former rebel leader, were convicted and sentenced to several years in jail.

Also in early 2007 on the political front, Vice President Marina Barampama, who had been appointed only six months before, was fired on the basis of irresponsibility and insubordination. She had been named to replace Alice Nzomukunda, who resigned over corruption and human rights issues, as noted above.

At the core of the matter involving Barampama's dismissal was her support for the ousted chairman of the governing Forces for the Defence of Democracy (FDD) party, Hussein Radjabu,

whom Nzomukunda said had impeded her work. In this way, Barampama's dismissal appeared to be indicative of internal party struggles.

By the spring of 2007, Burundi, along with Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo, reconstituted its regional economic bloc known as Great Lakes Economic Community. Also, by mid-2007, Burundi, along with Rwanda, was officially invited to be asked to join the East African Community, whose existing membership included Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. The group, which was founded in 1999, is largely characterized by a customs union that took effect in recent years. However, there have been discussions about including political elements to the group.

Burundi's central bank governor, Isaac Bizimana, was arrested in August 2007 for allegedly embezzling state funds. At issue were millions of dollars lost due to overpayment to an oil importation company. That company, Interpetrol, was supposedly compensated for financial losses that were endured before 2002 when the country was placed under an economic blockade as a result of a coup d'etat. According to prosecutors, Bizimana signed off on a payment that was much higher than the amount actually at stake. The Bizimana case was only the latest episode in a rash of scandals and disputes involving key officials in a country trying to forge a fragile peace after years of bloody ethnic conflict.

In April 2008, Bujumbura -- the capital city of Burundi -- was heavily shelled by suspected rebels. In response to the violence, Burundi's army launched a counter-attack in the area and the clashes resulted in the deaths of four soldiers and 10 rebels. While most of Burundi's rebel groups signed peace accords with the government, and one rebel enclave has also joined the government, there have been rebel factions that remain active across the country. Among them -- as noted above -- has been the National Liberation Forces, known by the acronym FNL. This group was believed to be responsible for the Bujumbura attacks, according to the government. A spokesperson for the FNL placed the blame on the army, saying that it began the fighting.

In November 2009, leaders from Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi were set to meet in Nairobi to sign a common market treaty. The East African Community was proposed a decade ago with efforts moving forward towards its adoption. Once the agreement was signed, it was expected that the East African Community would come into being by mid-2010.

In April 2010, Burundi President Pierre Nkurunziza affirmed that he would seek re-election by contesting the presidential election in that country, scheduled for June 28, 2010. He was to be designated as the candidate of the ruling National Council for the Defense of Democracy/Defense Democratic Forces. Several other candidates were also slated to contest the country's first elections by universal direct suffrage. The 2005 election that brought Nkurunziza to power was an indirect poll taken within both parliamentary chambers, however, since that time, changes were made to the constitution.

The distinctive nature of the election was compromised when Burundi's opposition parties decided to withdraw from the poll. They were protesting district-level elections that yielded victory for the ruling party in May 2010. They charged the country's electoral body with failing to prevent irregularities, arguing that it was unlikely to prevent further fraud at the presidential election level.

With political tensions on the rise, Africa Union Commission President Jean Ping called for a peaceful election, warning that political tensions and dissonance could return the country to a state of crisis. He also called on opposition parties to use peaceful means to register their grievances over the district level elections. To that end, he urged the opposition the Alliance of Democrats for Change "to focus exclusively on legal remedies" to resolve the disputes related to elections. Meanwhile, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon urged opposition parties to reconsider their decision to boycott the impending presidential election.

There were reports of arrests of opposition militants in the days leading up to the election. Then, election day itself -- June 28, 2010 -- was marked by violence in Burundi with gunmen opening fire at a polling station in the country's western province of Bubanza, presumably in an attempt to disrupt the vote. There were no casualties reported as a result. Burundi's National Electoral Commission said that turnout was very low and that provisional results would not be available for at least two days. With opposition candidates withdrawing from the presidential contest, leaving ruling party candidate Pierre Nkurunziza as the only choice, it was not surprising that turnout was low; clearly, the outcome of the election was also not expected to be a surprise. Indeed, two days after the election took place, the country's electoral commission said that President Pierre Nkurunziza has won re-election victory. The electoral commission said that Nkurunziza was elected by 91.62 percent.

In the aftermath of the presidential election, the citizens of Burundi went to the polls to vote in parliamentary elections, despite the opposition boycott, on July 23, 2010. Due to the limited competition ensconced in these elections, perhaps not surprisingly, voter turnout was low. As with the presidential race, victory was regarded as a foregone conclusion for President Pierre Nkurunziza's ruling party.

On Aug. 26, 2010, Burundi President Pierre Nkurunziza was inaugurated for another five-year term in office in Bujumbura, the country's capital. During his oath, President Nkurunziza swore to abide by the Unity Charter, the National Constitution and national solidarity. The president promised to work towards peace, human rights and social cohesion, and to guard against genocide and exclusion, which characterized a dark and disturbing chapter of Burundi's modern history. In a speech offered after the swearing-in ceremony, Pierre Nkurunziza said that his "victory in the election is a victory of every Burundian citizen." He also reiterated campaign promises to establish a Truth and Reconciliation Committee (TRC) to address the ills of the past, while building the infrastructure of the future via the construction roads, railways and schools. Poverty alleviation, decreasing corruption, environmental protection and promotion of tourism were also among his

policy agenda items.

In February 2014, the government of Burundi was in political crisis as several cabinet ministers from the ruling party, Unity for National Progress (UPROMA), resigned from office. The internal turmoil was sparked when President Pierre Nkurunziza sacked the first Vice-President in charge of political, security and administrative matters, Bernard Busokoza, for alleged "partisan conduct on public affairs." That move motivated a wave of resignations in solidarity with Busokoza, the most significant of which included Trade Industry and Tourism Minister Victoire Ndikumna and a cadre of Communal Development and Communications ministers. This apparent power struggle within the ruling party was having an effect in the practical realm as everyday governance was being slowed down. In an effort to normalize the situation, President Nkurunziza appointed the head of the Cabinet of the Vice-President, Anicet Niyongabo, to resolve the crisis.

Parliamentary elections were originally set to be held in Burundi in May 2015, but were subsequently scheduled to be held in June 2015. Likewise, a presidential elections was originally set to be held in Burundi in late June 2015, with a second round set to be held in July 2015, if no one candidate won an outright majority. As discussed below, these parliamentary and presidential elections were subsequently delayed to late June 2015 and July 2015 respectively as unrest, including an attempted coup, rocked the country due to President Pierre Nkurunziza's questionable bid to contest another term in office.

In Burundi, the bicameral parliament or Parlement consists of a National Assembly or Assemblée Nationale (minimum 100 seats - 60 percent Hutu and 40 percent Tutsi with at least 30 percent being women; additional seats are appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation; members are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms) and a Senate (54 seats; 34 by indirect vote to serve five-year terms, with remaining seats being assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state).

The previous elections were held in 2010. Due to the limited competition ensconced in these election because of an opposition boycott, perhaps not surprisingly, voter turnout was low. As with the presidential race, victory was regarded as a foregone conclusion for President Pierre Nkurunziza's ruling party. In the National Assembly, the vast majority of seats were won by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD. Other parties securing seats in the last lower chamber were Union for National Progress (Union pour le Progress Nationale) or UPRONA and Burundi Democratic Front or FRODEBU. It was to be seen if these parties would see the same type of success in 2015.

At the executive level, typically, presidents in Burundi are barred from serving more than two terms in office. As such, there were questions as to whether incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza -- in power since 2005 and directly elected in 2010 -- was eligible to contest a third term. At first, it was not know if President Pierre Nkunrunziza actually intended to contest the

2015 presidential contest, and speculation about his potential candidacy abounded in the public sphere. Supporters of the president argued that he was within his rights to seek re-election in 2010 since in his first term, he was not elected by popular vote but via an internal parliamentary vote. Detractors of the president, however, made clear that the pursuit of a third term in office should be regarded as illegal.

It should be noted that Tanzania, which has played a key mediating role in Burundi's peace process following a bloody conflict involving Burundian Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups, warned that violence could be in the offing if Nkurunziza contested the presidential election. During a visit to Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi, Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete said, "If people decide to violate the constitution and the Arusha peace agreement, there is a risk of a new violence that will be hard to stop."

Already, both the Catholic Church to which a lion's share of Burundians belong, as well as a United Nations delegation, have warned that strict adherence to the constitution should characterize the elections. Several regional groups also joined the chorus of calls for the president to adhere to strict term limits, in the interests of national stability.

By mid-April 2015, violent protests were breaking out in Burundi as persons opposed to a third term in office for President Nkurunziza took to the streets of the capital city of Bujumbura to register their outrage. Police used tear gas and water cannons to control the crowds, but that action only serve to further raise the ire of protesters and opposition groups. Meanwhile, thousands of Burundians were fleeing the country for neighboring Rwanda, presumably due to fear that another bloody conflict could erupt in Burundi.

A congress of the ruling party met in late April 2015 and decided to nominate President Nkurunziza as its candidate. The decision by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD made it clear that the incumbent president was seeking another term in office. The party decided to deal with the constitutional question by saying that the constitutional court would have to rule on any appeals against its candidate.

For his part, Nkurunziza dismissed criticisms of his bid to hold onto power and contest these election. He said, "I want to tell everybody that there is no more silence from today. No-one will stop the CNDD-FDD Party. It is the party created by people who are defending democracy."

Of course, outside his party support, President Nkurunziza had no shortage of critics, with opposition activists returning to the streets to protest en masse his bid for another presidential term. The president urged peace but warned of consequences for those opposed to him. He said, "I call people to go to the election in peace. But I would like to warn everyone: whoever wants to create problems with the ruling party elected by the people, he'll find himself in trouble." It was unlikely that this warning, which was imbued by tacit threats to dissent, would find positive

resonance among the protesters.

In fact, at the start of May 2015, as Burundi's constitutional court placed its official stamp on President Pierre Nkurunziza's bid for a third term in office by validating his candidacy, a new burst of protests emerged on the streets of the capital city. As protesters approached the embassy of the United States, police used tear gas and aerial gunshots to try to disperse the crowds.

By mid-May 2015, President Pierre Nkurunziza had registered to contest the presidency and secure a third term in office. The symbolic procedure sparked fresh protests in Burundi's capital of Bujumbura. Protesters barricaded roads and threw stones at police who responded with tear gas and water cannon. The situation in Burundi was signaling alarm bells across the world, especially as reports emerged that weapons were being delivered to militias supportive of Nkurunziza. Following a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, United States Ambassador Samantha Power warned that her country would impose sanctions on those responsible for violence, should the unrest escalate.

On May 13, 2015, outrage over President Nkurunziza's bid to pursue a third term in office on dubious constitutional grounds reached a boiling point as an attempted coup was underway. It was unclear at the time of writing whether the coup orchestrated by Major General Godefroid Niyombare had been successful, or, if was in fact foiled, as stated by the office of the presidency.

A statement by the office of the presidency read as follows: "It is with regret that we have learned that a group from the armed forces mutinied this morning and declared an imaginary coup."

In actuality, President Nkurunziza was attending a conference in Tanzania when the apparent coup took place. Despite the presidency's insistence that the coup was neutralized, the fact of the matter was that the aircraft carrying President Nkurunziza was not allowed to land in Burundi and was forced to return to Tanzania.

Indeed, in a radio address, Major General Niyombare made clear that his forces held control over the airport and the border; he also declared that the government had been dissolved and that President Nkurunziza had been "dismissed." He said, "President Pierre Nkurunziza has been relieved of his duties. The government is overthrown." He continued by saying that the mission of his self-declared "salvation committee" was the "restoration of national unity... and the resumption of the electoral process in a peaceful and fair environment."

Clashes between police and a mixed crowd of soldiers and protesters ensued and resulted in the deaths of several people. That confrontation was emblematic of the scene in Burundi on May 13, 2015, with some citizens and security forces backing the president and others supportive of the protesters and attempted coup. Increasingly, the dividing line was taking on an ethnic dimension with the ruling party and the Nkurunziza holding the allegiance of former Hutu rebels, while the

opposition had the support of the old Tutsi-dominated army.

On May 14, 2015, the two factions -- one on one hand, forces loyal to the president, and on the other hand those loyal to Niyombare -- were vying for control of the capital of Bujumbura. Fighting was described as heavy, with deaths reported, and Burundi was sinking into a state of political crisis. Early on May 15, 2015, however, the coup plotters were acknowledging that their attempt to overthrow the government had failed and the president -- now back in Burundi -- appeared to have regained control over the country. It was to be seen if these developments presaged calm in Burundi, or, if they augured further instability.

As May 2015 came to a close, regional leaders were urging Burundi to postpone the presidential election, given the unrest surrounding President Nkurunziza's decision to contest a third term. They also called for the restoration of calm in Burundi, noting a more hospitable climate would facilitate the return of tens of thousands of people who fled the country amidst the eruption of violence and the attempted coup discussed above.

By the start of June 2015, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by renewed protests, as demonstrators again took to the streets to rail against President Nkurunziza and to register their outrage over his decision to run for a questionable third term in office. Protesters said they were in the streets also because the aforementioned meeting of regional leaders was centered simply on the postponement of the elections, and was not at all focused on halting the president outright from trying to hold onto power. Now, the country was falling into an abyss of instability unseen since the ethnic conflict that plagued the country from the mid-1990s until a ceasefire and elections in the 2000s.

Note that before either the parliamentary contest or the first round of the presidential elections could be held in June 2015, authorities in Burundi opted to postpone the vote in both cases due to prevailing unrest over the attempted coup and the president's bid to hold onto power. All expectations were that the elections would have to be held before Aug. 26, 2015, when the existing presidential term was set to expire.

To that end, Burundi's electoral commission announced that the parliamentary elections should be held on June 29, 2015, with the presidential election to follow on July 15, 2015. This new timeline did little to assuage the anger of opposition parties and activists, who again noted that a delayed schedule would not address the essential problem of Nkurunziza's candidacy. Not surprisingly, several opposition leaders soon called for a boycott of the presidential vote, while activists urged a return to the streets for mass protests.

Meanwhile, Burundi continued to be rocked by unrest, manifest in the third week of June 2015 by a fresh burst of clashes between security forces and activists. The violence resulted with the deaths of scores of people and injuries to some 500 others, as well as mass displacement of

citizens as people fled amidst fears of election violence. The unrest in Burundi was -- as before -- in response to President Nkurunziza's bid to contest a third term.

At the end of June 2015, on the eve of the parliamentary contest, gunmen set fire to ballots and other election materials in Burundi while the opposition reminded the country of its election boycott. These developments spurred United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon as well as the government of the United States to call for a delay in the elections. But the government dismissed these calls and insisted on moving forward with the elections, while promising victory for the ruling party.

In the aftermath of the parliamentary contest, which were criticized by the international community, for not being hospitable to a fair vote, the outcome was hardly mysterious. With an opposition boycott, the president's ruling CNDD-FDD party was expected to control parliament. To that end, it was soon announced that the ruling party won 77 out of 100 elected seats in parliament. Meanwhile, violent clashes erupted in Burundi, with several deaths reported.

Burundi's authorities were insistent that the presidential contest go forward on July 15, 2015, despite the combination of unrest and global condemnation. For his part, President Nkurunziza was unfazed. In fact, he was reported to be on the campaign trail and enjoying significant support at political rallies. As stated by presidential spokesperson Gervais Abayeho, "The president is on a campaign trail in the last few days and people are turning out in large numbers from his CNDD-FDD party, and the operation is going quite well in the countryside and even the capital, Bujumbura."

But the political conditions in Burundi were clearly deteriorating. Of note was the threat posed by a Burundian general who was played a role in the attempted coup of May 2015 calling for President Nkurunziza to be removed from power. General Leonard Ngendakumana said in an interview with Reuters News that the president was fomenting ethnic tensions between Hutus and Tutsis. Of particular concern has been the rise of a militia, known as the Imbonerakure, which was posing a threat to opposition supporters as well as refugees displaced from the unrest. Warning of dire consequences, Ngendakumana said, "This situation can lead to a genocide." Ngendakumana also said indicated that the goal to remove President Nkurunziza from office in the failed coup remained a priority as he declared, "At that time (in May), we just failed to remove Nkurunziza from power. The aim is still there." Ngendakumana continued, "The only way to reach this objective is to use force."

Note that with only days until the scheduled date for the presidential election to be held, and amidst rising warning from the United Nations and regional African bodies about Burundi slipping into political chaos, the presidential contest was again delayed. The new date for the presidential election was set for July 21, 2015. Two days ahead of that new election day, three opposition candidates -- Domitien Ndayizeye, Jean Minani and Sylvestre Ntibantunganya -- issued a

statement noting that Burundi's political and security environment was not conducive to the holding of free and fair elections, and thus announced their intent to boycott the polls. The government of Burundi dismissed these moves and said the election would go forward regardless.

On July 21, 2015, people of Burundi went to the polls to vote in a presidential election that was boycotted by the opposition, and criticized by the global community for not being a credible exercise in democracy. The election was said to be marked by exceptionally low turnout in the capital of Bujumbura. The outcome was not a mystery with incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza winning a third term in office with 69 percent of the vote share due to the non-competitive nature of the election. His closest rival, Agathon Rwaso, did not breach the 20 percent mark, garnering less than 19 percent. Meanwhile, the main opposition parties who participated in the boycott promised that they would not recognize the outcome of the election. Regional powers warned that Burundi could well be headed down the road of turmoil. The international community also entered the fray, with global powers such as the United States and the European Union, cast the election as flawed and called for dialogue between the ruling party and the opposition.

In August 2015, in the aftermath of President Pierre Nkurunziza's re-election victory, his close aide, General Adolphe Nshimirimana, was killed in an attack in the capital city of Bujumbura. The killing appeared to be a coordinated assassination, as the assailants used machine guns and rocket launchers to target c's car. Of note was the fact that Nshimirimana was responsible for the president's personal security and was instrumental in the crackdown on anti-government public protests. As such, the assassination was being interpreted as a political act intended to deliver a message to the president. That message might well be that his opponents may not have been able to prevent him from securing another term in office at the ballot box, but they were prepared to use violence to achieve their ends.

In September 2015, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by turmoil. Arrests and assassinations characterized the country, with the blame resting on the growing gap between a president willing to use dubious interpretations of the constitution to hold onto power and an enraged bloc opposed to him.

Since the assassination of Nshimirimana, the country was beset by violence, death, and mass arrests. Violent clashes became common fare in the capital of Bujumbura. As well, killings were becoming regularized occurrences, with victims reported to have been shot at close range and often subjected to torture. As with the case of Nshimirimana, the explanation resided with an enraged bloc who were unable to stop Nkurunziza from holding onto power, but were now resorting to extraordinary means to go after their political enemies. But even that theory was tested with the news that an opposition party official, Jean Baptiste Nsengiyumva, was assassinated at the end of September 2015. There was no immediate explanation for the killing of Nsengiyumva; however, the fact that an opposition official was now another casualty of the rising tide of violence indicated that the country was becoming dangerously polarized.

Meanwhile, officials in Burundi were carrying out a massive crackdown on anyone deemed to be opposed to the president. The result was the incarceration of more than 700 individuals and overcrowding in the country's prisons as a result. Complicating matters was an increasing climate of tension and discontent from among the military. Then, in late 2015, after military bases faced attacks, the government carried out a harsh crackdown that left close to 90 people dead.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, Burundi was slipping into chaos as he said, "Almost every day, dead bodies are found lying on the streets of some of Bujumbura's neighborhoods. " In a statement, the United Nations human rights chief issued the following warning: "There is an increasing risk that spiraling tit-for-tat violence will plunge the country back into its bloody past."

By 2016, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by turmoil. Arrests and assassinations characterized the country, with the blame resting on the growing gap between a president willing to use dubious interpretations of the constitution to hold onto power and an enraged bloc opposed to him. Indeed, the government had carried out a harsh crackdown on the political opposition, while at the same time, there were fares of ongoing violence.

The scene took a particularly ominous turn as the human rights group, Amnesty International, claimed that it had evidence of "mass graves" in the form of satellite images. The footage released by Amnesty International depicted what the human rights group said was disturbed earth in the area of Buringa close to the capital of Bujumbura. As stated by Muthoni Wanyeki, Amnesty International's regional director for East Africa, the Horn and the Great Lakes.: These images suggest a deliberate effort by the authorities to cover up the extent of the killings by their security forces and to prevent the full truth from coming out."

It should be noted that the United Nations said it would analyze satellite imagery in its own investigation of mass graves, with particular attention to one site at a military camp where 100 corpses were believed to be located.

The African Union has for peacekeeping troops to be deployed in Burundi to guard against the complete slide into ethnic conflict; however, there were limited expectations that President Nkurunziza would accept this proposal.

Editor's Note:

From the time of independence, the political control of the country has been held by the minority Tutsi elite. In 1993, conflict erupted between the Tutsi-led army and rebel groups from the majority Hutu population. That war was sparked in 1993 when Burundi's first Hutu president and democratically elected leader, Melchior Ndadaye, was assassinated. The bloody war left around

300,000 people dead and hundreds of thousands more displaced. A peace process has been underway for several years, culminating in elections intended to usher in a power-sharing government. In 2000, a peace agreement brought an interim government to power. A ceasefire agreement, ratification of a constitution, and elections followed in 2005. Continuing peace talks have led to some positive developments in the process of national reconciliation, however, instability and violence have prevailed to date, making clear the precarious position of the elected government. The 2010 election was regarded as a stabilizing measure on Burundi's political landscape; however, the decision of President Nkurunziza to contest the 2015 election under spurious constitutional circumstances has re-introduced precariousness to the political landscape in Burundi. From that time in mid-2015, Burundi has deteriorated into chaos, with violence, harsh crackdowns, and assassinations becoming regularized fare. In fact, close to 500 people have been killed in Burundi since mid-2015, and 240,000 have been displaced as they sought refuge, according to the United Nations. In 2016, Burundi was still rocked by turmoil, but the scene took a particularly ominous turn as a human rights group claimed that it had evidence of "mass graves."

-- February 2016

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, www.countrywatch.com. Research sources listed in Bibliography. Supplementary sources: BBC; SIPRI; Human Rights Watch; Amnesty International; Lemarchand, Rene; APIC; Africanews.org.

Political Risk Index

Political Risk Index

The **Political Risk Index** is a proprietary index measuring the level of risk posed to governments, corporations, and investors, based on a myriad of political and economic factors. The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on varied criteria* including the following consideration: political stability, political representation, democratic accountability, freedom of expression, security and crime, risk of conflict, human development, jurisprudence and regulatory transparency, economic risk, foreign investment considerations, possibility of sovereign default, and corruption. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the highest political risk, while a

score of 10 marks the lowest political risk. Stated differently, countries with the lowest scores pose the greatest political risk. A score of 0 marks the most dire level of political risk and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the lowest possible level of political risk, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater risk.

Country	Assessment
Afghanistan	2
Albania	4
Algeria	6
Andorra	9
Angola	4
Antigua	8
Argentina	4
Armenia	4-5
Australia	9.5
Austria	9.5
Azerbaijan	4

Bahamas	8.5
Bahrain	6
Bangladesh	3.5
Barbados	8.5-9
Belarus	3
Belgium	9
Belize	8
Benin	5
Bhutan	5
Bolivia	5
Bosnia-Herzegovina	4
Botswana	7
Brazil	7
Brunei	7
Bulgaria	6
Burkina Faso	4
Burma (Myanmar)	4.5
Burundi	3

Cambodia	4
Cameroon	5
Canada	9.5
Cape Verde	6
Central African Republic	3
Chad	4
Chile	9
China	7
China: Hong Kong	8
China: Taiwan	8
Colombia	7
Comoros	5
Congo DRC	3
Congo RC	4
Costa Rica	8
Cote d'Ivoire	4.5
Croatia	7
Cuba	4-4.5

Cyprus	5
Czech Republic	8
Denmark	9.5
Djibouti	4.5
Dominica	7
Dominican Republic	6
East Timor	5
Ecuador	6
Egypt	5
El Salvador	7
Equatorial Guinea	4
Eritrea	3
Estonia	8
Ethiopia	4
Fiji	5
Finland	9
Fr. Yugoslav Rep. Macedonia	5
France	9

Gabon	5
Gambia	4
Georgia	5
Germany	9.5
Ghana	6
Greece	4.5-5
Grenada	8
Guatemala	6
Guinea	3.5
Guinea-Bissau	3.5
Guyana	4.5
Haiti	3.5
Holy See (Vatican)	9
Honduras	4.5-5
Hungary	7
Iceland	8.5-9
India	7.5-8
Indonesia	6

Iran	3.5-4
Iraq	2.5-3
Ireland	8-8.5
Israel	8
Italy	7.5
Jamaica	6.5-7
Japan	9
Jordan	6.5
Kazakhstan	6
Kenya	5
Kiribati	7
Korea, North	1
Korea, South	8
Kosovo	4
Kuwait	7
Kyrgyzstan	4.5
Laos	4.5
Latvia	7

Lebanon	5.5
Lesotho	6
Liberia	3.5
Libya	2
Liechtenstein	9
Lithuania	7.5
Luxembourg	9
Madagascar	4
Malawi	4
Malaysia	8
Maldives	4.5
Mali	4
Malta	8
Marshall Islands	6
Mauritania	4.5-5
Mauritius	7
Mexico	6.5
Micronesia	7

Moldova	5
Monaco	9
Mongolia	5
Montenegro	6
Morocco	6.5
Mozambique	4.5-5
Namibia	6.5-7
Nauru	6
Nepal	4
Netherlands	9.5
New Zealand	9.5
Nicaragua	5
Niger	4
Nigeria	4.5
Norway	9.5
Oman	7
Pakistan	3.5
Palau	7

Panama	7.5
Papua New Guinea	5
Paraguay	6.5-7
Peru	7
Philippines	6
Poland	8
Portugal	7.5
Qatar	7.5
Romania	5.5
Russia	5.5
Rwanda	5
Saint Kitts and Nevis	8
Saint Lucia	8
Saint Vincent and Grenadines	8
Samoa	7
San Marino	9
Sao Tome and Principe	5.5
Saudi Arabia	6

Senegal	6
Serbia	5
Seychelles	7
Sierra Leone	4.5
Singapore	9
Slovak Republic (Slovakia)	8
Slovenia	8
Solomon Islands	6
Somalia	2
South Africa	7
Spain	7.5
Sri Lanka	5
Sudan	3.5
Suriname	5
Swaziland	5
Sweden	9.5
Switzerland	9.5
Syria	2

Tajikistan	4.5
Tanzania	6
Thailand	6.5
Togo	4.5
Tonga	7
Trinidad and Tobago	8
Tunisia	6
Turkey	7
Turkmenistan	4.5
Tuvalu	7
Uganda	6
Ukraine	3.5-4
United Arab Emirates	7
United Kingdom	9
United States	9.5
Uruguay	8
Uzbekistan	4
Vanuatu	7

Venezuela	4
Vietnam	5
Yemen	3
Zambia	4.5
Zimbabwe	3

*Methodology

The [Political Risk Index](#) is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. political stability (record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of government to stay in office and carry out policies as a result of productive executive-legislative relationship, perhaps with popular support vis a vis risk of government collapse)
2. political representation (right of suffrage, free and fair elections, multi-party participation, and influence of foreign powers)
3. democratic accountability (record of respect for political rights, human rights, and civil liberties, backed by constitutional protections)
4. freedom of expression (media freedom and freedom of expression, right to dissent or express political opposition, backed by constitutional protections)
5. security and crime (the degree to which a country has security mechanisms that ensures safety of citizens and ensures law and order, without resorting to extra-judicial measures)
6. risk of conflict (the presence of conflict; record of coups or civil disturbances; threat of war; threats posed by internal or external tensions; threat or record of terrorism or insurgencies)
7. human development (quality of life; access to education; socio-economic conditions; systemic concern for the status of women and children)
8. jurisprudence and regulatory transparency (the impartiality of the legal system, the degree of transparency within the regulatory system of a country and the durability of that structure)

9. economic conditions (economic stability, investment climate, degree of nationalization of industries, property rights, labor force development)
10. corruption (the degree of corruption in a country and/or efforts by the government to address graft and other irregularities)

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world.

North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) -- retain their low rankings.

Several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), [Libya](#), [Syria](#), [Iraq](#) and [Yemen](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. The worst downgrades affected [Syria](#) where civil war is at play, along with the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamist terrorists who have also seized control over part of Syrian territory. [Iraq](#) has been further downgraded due to the rampage of Islamist terrorists and their takeover of wide swaths of Iraqi territory. [Libya](#) has also been downgraded further due to its slippage into failed state status; at issue in [Libya](#) have been an ongoing power struggle between rival militias. [Yemen](#) continues to hold steady with a poor ranking due to continued unrest at the hands of Houthi rebels, secessionists, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, and Islamic State. Its landscape has been further complicated by the fact that it is now the site of a proxy war between [Iran](#) and [Saudi Arabia](#). Conversely, [Tunisia](#) and [Egypt](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, [Zimbabwe](#) continues to be one of the bleak spots of the world with the Mugabe regime effectively destroying the country's once vibrant economy, and miring [Zimbabwe](#) with an exceedingly high rate of inflation, debilitating unemployment, devolving public services, and critical food shortages; rampant crime and political oppression round out the landscape. [Somalia](#) also sports a poor ranking due to the continuing influence of the terror group, al-Shabab, which was not operating across the border in [Kenya](#). On the upside, [Nigeria](#), which was ineffectively dealing with the threat posed by the terror group, Boko Haram, was making some strides on the national security front with its new president at the helm. [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels and a continued state of lawlessness in that country. [South Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment;

however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Burkina Faso](#), [Burundi](#) and [Guinea](#) have been downgraded due to political unrest, with [Guinea](#) also having to deal with the burgeoning Ebola crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. Strains on the infrastructure of southern and eastern European countries, such as [Serbia](#), [Croatia](#), and [Hungary](#), due to an influx of refugees was expected to pose social and economic challenges, and slight downgrades were made accordingly. So too, a corruption crisis for the Romanian prime minister has affected the ranking of that country. Meanwhile, the rankings for [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were maintained due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was earlier downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, no further downgrade was added since the country was able to successfully forge a bailout rescue deal with creditor institutions. Cyprus' exposure to Greek banks yielded a downgrade in its case.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability and a constitutional crisis that prevails well after landmark elections were held. Both [India](#) and [China](#) retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating. Meanwhile, [Singapore](#) retained its strong rankings due to its continued effective stewardship of the economy and political stability.

In the Americas, ongoing political and economic woes, as well as crime and corruption have affected the rankings for [Mexico](#), [Guatemala](#), and [Brazil](#). [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to its mix of market unfriendly policies and political oppression. For the moment, the [United States](#) maintains a strong ranking along with [Canada](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean; however, a renewed debt ceiling crisis could cause the [United States](#) to be downgraded in a future edition. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Political Stability

Political Stability

The **Political Stability Index** is a proprietary index measuring a country's level of stability, standard of good governance, record of constitutional order, respect for human rights, and overall strength of democracy. The [Political Stability Index](#) is calculated using an established methodology* by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's record of peaceful transitions of power, ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse. Threats include coups, domestic violence and instability, terrorism, etc. This index measures the dynamic between the quality of a country's government and the threats that can compromise and undermine stability. Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of political stability and an ultimate nadir, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of political stability possible, according to this proprietary index. Rarely will there be scores of 0 or 10 due to the reality that countries contain complex landscapes; as such, the index offers a range of possibilities ranging from lesser to greater stability.

Country	Assessment
Afghanistan	2
Albania	4.5-5
Algeria	5
Andorra	9.5
Angola	4.5-5
Antigua	8.5-9

Argentina	7
Armenia	5.5
Australia	9.5
Austria	9.5
Azerbaijan	5
Bahamas	9
Bahrain	6
Bangladesh	4.5
Barbados	9
Belarus	4
Belgium	9
Belize	8
Benin	5
Bhutan	5
Bolivia	6
Bosnia-Herzegovina	5
Botswana	8.5
Brazil	7

Brunei	8
Bulgaria	7.5
Burkina Faso	4
Burma (Myanmar)	4.5
Burundi	4
Cambodia	4.5-5
Cameroon	6
Canada	9.5
Cape Verde	6
Central African Republic	3
Chad	4.5
Chile	9
China	7
China: Hong Kong	8
China: Taiwan	8
Colombia	7.5
Comoros	5
Congo DRC	3

Congo RC	5
Costa Rica	9.5
Cote d'Ivoire	3.5
Croatia	7.5
Cuba	4.5
Cyprus	8
Czech Republic	8.5
Denmark	9.5
Djibouti	5
Dominica	8.5
Dominican Republic	7
East Timor	5
Ecuador	7
Egypt	4.5-5
El Salvador	7.5-8
Equatorial Guinea	4.5
Eritrea	4
Estonia	9

Ethiopia	4.5
Fiji	5
Finland	9
Fr. Yugoslav Rep. Macedonia	6.5
France	9
Gabon	5
Gambia	4.5
Georgia	5
Germany	9.5
Ghana	7
Greece	6
Grenada	8.5
Guatemala	7
Guinea	3.5-4
Guinea-Bissau	4
Guyana	6
Haiti	3.5-4
Holy See (Vatican)	9.5

Honduras	6
Hungary	7.5
Iceland	9
India	8
Indonesia	7
Iran	3.5
Iraq	2.5
Ireland	9.5
Israel	8
Italy	8.5-9
Jamaica	8
Japan	9
Jordan	6
Kazakhstan	6
Kenya	5
Kiribati	8
Korea, North	2
Korea, South	8.5

Kosovo	5.5
Kuwait	7
Kyrgyzstan	5
Laos	5
Latvia	8.5
Lebanon	5.5
Lesotho	5
Liberia	3.5-4
Libya	2
Liechtenstein	9
Lithuania	9
Luxembourg	9.5
Madagascar	4
Malawi	5
Malaysia	8
Maldives	4.5-5
Mali	4.5-5
Malta	9

Marshall Islands	8
Mauritania	6
Mauritius	8
Mexico	6.5-7
Micronesia	8
Moldova	5.5
Monaco	9.5
Mongolia	6.5-7
Montenegro	8
Morocco	7
Mozambique	5
Namibia	8.5
Nauru	8
Nepal	4.5
Netherlands	9.5
New Zealand	9.5
Nicaragua	6
Niger	4.5

Nigeria	4.5
Norway	9.5
Oman	7
Pakistan	3
Palau	8
Panama	8.5
Papua New Guinea	6
Paraguay	8
Peru	7.5
Philippines	6
Poland	9
Portugal	9
Qatar	7
Romania	7
Russia	6
Rwanda	5
Saint Kitts and Nevis	9
Saint Lucia	9

Saint Vincent and Grenadines	9
Samoa	8
San Marino	9.5
Sao Tome and Principe	7
Saudi Arabia	6
Senegal	7.5
Serbia	6.5
Seychelles	8
Sierra Leone	4.5
Singapore	9.5
Slovak Republic (Slovakia)	8.5
Slovenia	9
Solomon Islands	6.5-7
Somalia	2
South Africa	7.5
Spain	9
Sri Lanka	5
Sudan	3

Suriname	5
Swaziland	5
Sweden	9.5
Switzerland	9.5
Syria	2
Tajikistan	4.5
Tanzania	6
Thailand	6
Togo	5
Tonga	7
Trinidad and Tobago	8
Tunisia	5
Turkey	7.5
Turkmenistan	5
Tuvalu	8.5
Uganda	6
Ukraine	3.5-4
United Arab Emirates	7

United Kingdom	9
United States	9
Uruguay	8.5
Uzbekistan	4
Vanuatu	8.5
Venezuela	4.5-5
Vietnam	4.5
Yemen	2.5
Zambia	5
Zimbabwe	3

*Methodology

The Political Stability Index is calculated by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on the combined scoring of varied criteria as follows --

1. record of peaceful transitions of power (free and fair elections; adherence to political accords)
2. record of democratic representation, presence of instruments of democracy; systemic accountability
3. respect for human rights; respect for civil rights
4. strength of the system of jurisprudence, adherence to constitutional order, and good governance
5. ability of a government to stay in office and carry out its policies vis a vis risk credible risks of government collapse (i.e. government stability versus a country being deemed "ungovernable")

6. threat of coups, insurgencies, and insurrection
7. level of unchecked crime and corruption
8. risk of terrorism and other threats to national security
9. relationship with regional powers and international community; record of bilateral or multilateral cooperation
10. degree of economic strife (i.e. economic and financial challenges)

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the current climate of upheaval internationally -- both politically and economically -- has affected the ratings for several countries across the world. The usual suspects -- North Korea, [Afghanistan](#), and [Somalia](#) -- retain their low rankings. The reclusive and ultra-dictatorial North Korean regime, which has terrified the world with its nuclear threats, has exhibited internal instability. Of note was a cut-throat purge of hundreds of high ranking officials deemed to be a threat to Kim Jung-un. Despite their attempts to recover from years of lawlessness, war, and warlordism, both [Afghanistan](#) and [Somalia](#) continue to be beset by terrorism and turmoil. In [Afghanistan](#), while international forces have seen success in the effort against the terror group, al-Qaida, the other Islamist extremist group, the Taliban, continues to carry out a vicious insurgency using terrorism. In [Somalia](#), while the government attempts to do the nation's business, the terror group, al-Shabab continues to make its presence known not only in [Somalia](#), but across the border into [Kenya](#) with devastating results/ Also in this category is [Iraq](#), which continues to be rocked by horrific violence and terrorism at the hands of Islamic State, which has taken over wide swaths of Iraqi territory.

Syria, [Libya](#), and [Yemen](#) have been added to this unfortunate echelon of the world's most politically unstable countries. [Syria](#) has been mired by the twin hazards of 1. a civil war as rebels oppose the Assad regime; and 2. the rampage of terror being carried out by Islamic State, which also seized control over vast portions of Syrian territory. Meanwhile, the post-Qaddhafi landscape of [Libya](#) has devolved into chaos as rival militias battle for control -- the elected government of the country notwithstanding. Rounding out this grim triad is [Yemen](#), which was dealing with a Houthi rebellion, secessionists in the south, as well as the threat of terrorism from al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula as well as Islamic State, while also being the site of a proxy war between Shi'a [Iran](#) and Sunni [Saudi Arabia](#).

Meanwhile, several Middle Eastern and North African countries, such as [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and

[Bahrain](#) were downgraded in recent years due to political instability occurring in the "season of unrest" sweeping the region since 2011 and continuing today. All three of these countries have stabilized in recent years and have been upgraded accordingly. In [Bahrain](#), the landscape had calmed. In [Egypt](#), the secular military-backed government has generated criticism for its crackdown on the Muslim Brotherhood; however, the country had ratified the presidency via democratic elections and were on track to hold parliamentary elections as the country moved along the path of democratization. Perhaps the most impressive story was coming out of [Tunisia](#) -- the country whose Jasmine Revolution sparked the entire Arab Spring -- and where after a few years of strife, a new progressive constitution was passed into law and a secular government had been elected to power. [Tunisia](#), [Egypt](#), and [Bahrain](#) have seen slight upgrades as these countries stabilize.

In Africa, the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded the previous year due to the takeover of the government by Muslim Seleka rebels. Although the country has been trying to emerge from this crisis, the fact of the matter was that it was difficult to halt the precipitous decline into lawlessness in that country. [Zimbabwe](#) has maintained its consistently poor ranking due to the dictatorial regime of Mugabe, who continues to hold a tight grip on power, intimidates the opposition, squashes dissent, and oppresses the white farmer population of the country. Moving in a slightly improved direction is [Nigeria](#), which has sported abysmal ratings due to the government's fecklessness in dealing with the threat posed by the Islamist terror group, Boko Haram. Under its newly-elected government, there appears to be more of a concerted effort to make national security a priority action item. [Mali](#) was also slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Political instability has visited [Burkina Faso](#) and [Burundi](#) as the leaders of those countries attempted to side-step constitutional limits to hold onto power. In [Burundi](#), an attempted coup ensued but quelled, and the president won a (questionable) new term in office; unrest has since punctuated the landscape. In [Burkina Faso](#), the political climate has turned stormy as a result of a successful coup that ended the rule of the president, and then a putsch against the transitional government. These two African countries have been downgraded as a result.

It should be noted that the African country of South [Sudan](#) -- the world's newest nation state -- has not been officially included in this assessment; however, it can be unofficially assessed to be in the vicinity of "3" due to its manifold political and economic challenges. [Guinea](#) has endured poor rankings throughout, but was slightly downgraded further over fears of social unrest and the Ebola heath crisis.

In Europe, [Ukraine](#) was downgraded due to the unrest facing that country following its Maidan revolution that triggered a pro-Russian uprising in the eastern part of the country. [Russia](#) was also implicated in the Ukrainian crisis due to its intervention on behalf of pro-Russian separatists, as well as its annexation of the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. [Serbia](#) and [Albania](#) were slightly downgraded due to eruptions of unrest, while [Romania](#) was slightly downgraded on the basis of

corruption charges against the prime minister. [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#) were downgraded due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. [Greece](#), another euro zone nation, was downgraded the previous year due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, the country successfully forged a rescue deal with international creditors and stayed within the Euro zone. Greek voters rewarded the hitherto unknown upstart party at the polls for these efforts. As a result, [Greece](#) was actually upgraded slightly as it proved to the world that it could endure the political and economic storms. Meanwhile, [Germany](#), [France](#), [Switzerland](#), the [United Kingdom](#), the [Netherlands](#), and the Scandinavian countries continue to post impressive ranking consistent with these countries' strong records of democracy, freedom, and peaceful transfers of power.

In Asia, [Nepal](#) was downgraded in response to continuous political instability well after landmark elections that prevails today. [Cambodia](#) was very slightly downgraded due to post-election instability that has resulted in occasional flares of violence. Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and China retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability. Increasing violence and political instability in [Pakistan](#) resulted in a downgrade for this country's already low rating.

In the Americas, [Haiti](#) retained its downgraded status due to ongoing political and economic woes. [Mexico](#) was downgraded due to its alarming rate of crime. [Guatemala](#) was downgraded due to charges of corruption, the arrest of the president, and uncertainty over the outcome of elections. [Brazil](#) was downgraded due to the corruption charges erupting on the political landscape, the stalling of the economy, and the increasingly loud calls for the impeachment of President Rousseff. [Argentina](#) was downgraded due to its default on debt following the failure of talks with bond holders. [Venezuela](#) was downgraded due to the fact that the country's post-Chavez government is every bit as autocratic and nationalistic, but even more inclined to oppress its political opponents. [Colombia](#) was upgraded slightly due to efforts aimed at securing a peace deal with the FARC insurgents. A small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States. Meanwhile, the [United States](#), [Canada](#), [Costa Rica](#), [Panama](#), and most of the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean retain their strong rankings due to their records of stability and peaceful transfers of power.

In the Pacific, [Fiji](#) was upgraded due to its return to constitutional order and democracy with the holding of the first elections in eight years.

In Oceania, [Maldives](#) has been slightly downgraded due to the government's continued and rather relentless persecution of the country's former pro-democracy leader - former President Nasheed.

Source:

Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Freedom Rankings

Freedom Rankings

Freedom in the World

Editor's Note: This ranking by Freedom House quantifies political freedom and civil liberties into a single combined index on each sovereign country's level of freedom and liberty. The initials "PR" and "CL" stand for Political Rights and Civil Liberties, respectively. The number 1 represents the most free countries and the number 7 represents the least free. Several countries fall in the continuum in between. The freedom ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

Country	PR	CL	Freedom Status	Trend Arrow
Afghanistan	6 ?	6	Not Free	
Albania*	3	3	Partly Free	
Algeria	6	5	Not Free	

Andorra*	1	1	Free	
Angola	6	5	Not Free	
Antigua and Barbuda*	3 ?	2	Free	
Argentina*	2	2	Free	
Armenia	6	4	Partly Free	
Australia*	1	1	Free	
Austria*	1	1	Free	
Azerbaijan	6	5	Not Free	
Bahamas*	1	1	Free	
Bahrain	6 ?	5	Not Free ?	
Bangladesh*	3 ?	4	Partly Free	
Barbados*	1	1	Free	
Belarus	7	6	Not Free	
Belgium*	1	1	Free	
Belize*	1	2	Free	
Benin*	2	2	Free	
Bhutan	4	5	Partly Free	
Bolivia*	3	3	Partly Free	

Bosnia-Herzegovina*	4	3	Partly Free	
Botswana*	3 ?	2	Free	
Brazil*	2	2	Free	
Brunei	6	5	Not Free	
Bulgaria*	2	2	Free	
Burkina Faso	5	3	Partly Free	
Burma	7	7	Not Free	
Burundi*	4	5	Partly Free	↑
Cambodia	6	5	Not Free	↓
Cameroon	6	6	Not Free	
Canada*	1	1	Free	
Cape Verde*	1	1	Free	
Central African Republic	5	5	Partly Free	
Chad	7	6	Not Free	
Chile*	1	1	Free	
China	7	6	Not Free	
Colombia*	3	4	Partly Free	
Comoros*	3	4	Partly Free	

Congo (Brazzaville)	6	5	Not Free	↓
Congo (Kinshasa)	6	6	Not Free	↓
Costa Rica*	1	1	Free	
Cote d'Ivoire	6	5	Not Free	
Croatia*	1 ?	2	Free	
Cuba	7	6	Not Free	
Cyprus*	1	1	Free	
Czech Republic*	1	1	Free	
Denmark*	1	1	Free	
Djibouti	5	5	Partly Free	
Dominica*	1	1	Free	
Dominican Republic*	2	2	Free	↓
East Timor*	3	4	Partly Free	
Ecuador*	3	3	Partly Free	
Egypt	6	5	Not Free	
El Salvador*	2	3	Free	
Equatorial Guinea	7	7	Not Free	
Eritrea	7	7 ?	Not Free	

Estonia*	1	1	Free	
Ethiopia	5	5	Partly Free	↓
Fiji	6	4	Partly Free	
Finland*	1	1	Free	
France*	1	1	Free	
Gabon	6	5 ?	Not Free ?	
The Gambia	5	5 ?	Partly Free	
Georgia	4	4	Partly Free	
Germany*	1	1	Free	
Ghana*	1	2	Free	
Greece*	1	2	Free	
Grenada*	1	2	Free	
Guatemala*	4 ?	4	Partly Free	
Guinea	7	6 ?	Not Free	
Guinea-Bissau*	4	4	Partly Free	
Guyana*	2	3	Free	
Haiti*	4	5	Partly Free	
Honduras	4 ?	4 ?	Partly Free	

Hungary*	1	1	Free	
Iceland*	1	1	Free	
India*	2	3	Free	
Indonesia*	2	3	Free	
Iran	6	6	Not Free	↓
Iraq	5 ?	6	Not Free	
Ireland*	1	1	Free	
Israel*	1	2	Free	
Italy*	1	2	Free	
Jamaica*	2	3	Free	
Japan*	1	2	Free	
Jordan	6 ?	5	Not Free ?	
Kazakhstan	6	5	Not Free	↓
Kenya	4	4 ?	Partly Free	
Kiribati*	1	1	Free	
Kosovo	5 ?	4 ?	Partly Free ?	
Kuwait	4	4	Partly Free	
Kyrgyzstan	6 ?	5 ?	Not Free ?	

Laos	7	6	Not Free	
Latvia*	2	1	Free	
Lebanon	5	3 ?	Partly Free	
Lesotho*	3 ?	3	Partly Free ?	
Liberia*	3	4	Partly Free	
Libya	7	7	Not Free	
Liechtenstein*	1	1	Free	
Lithuania*	1	1	Free	
Luxembourg*	1	1	Free	
Macedonia*	3	3	Partly Free	↑
Madagascar	6 ?	4 ?	Partly Free	
Malawi*	3 ?	4	Partly Free	
Malaysia	4	4	Partly Free	
Maldives*	3 ?	4	Partly Free	
Mali*	2	3	Free	
Malta*	1	1	Free	↓
Marshall Islands*	1	1	Free	
Mauritania	6	5	Not Free	

Mauritius*	1	2	Free	
Mexico*	2	3	Free	
Micronesia*	1	1	Free	
Moldova*	3 ?	4	Partly Free	
Monaco*	2	1	Free	
Mongolia*	2	2	Free	↑
Montenegro*	3	2 ?	Free ?	
Morocco	5	4	Partly Free	↓
Mozambique	4 ?	3	Partly Free	
Namibia*	2	2	Free	
Nauru*	1	1	Free	
Nepal	4	4	Partly Free	
Netherlands*	1	1	Free	
New Zealand*	1	1	Free	
Nicaragua*	4	4 ?	Partly Free	
Niger	5 ?	4	Partly Free	
Nigeria	5	4	Partly Free	↓
North Korea	7	7	Not Free	↓

Norway*	1	1	Free	
Oman	6	5	Not Free	
Pakistan	4	5	Partly Free	
Palau*	1	1	Free	
Panama*	1	2	Free	
Papua New Guinea*	4	3	Partly Free	
Paraguay*	3	3	Partly Free	
Peru*	2	3	Free	
Philippines	4	3	Partly Free	↓
Poland*	1	1	Free	
Portugal*	1	1	Free	
Qatar	6	5	Not Free	
Romania*	2	2	Free	
Russia	6	5	Not Free	↓
Rwanda	6	5	Not Free	
Saint Kitts and Nevis*	1	1	Free	
Saint Lucia*	1	1	Free	
Saint Vincent and Grenadines*	2	1	Free	

Samoa*	2	2	Free	
San Marino*	1	1	Free	
Sao Tome and Principe*	2	2	Free	
Saudi Arabia	7	6	Not Free	
Senegal*	3	3	Partly Free	
Serbia*	2 ?	2	Free	
Seychelles*	3	3	Partly Free	
Sierra Leone*	3	3	Partly Free	
Singapore	5	4	Partly Free	
Slovakia*	1	1	Free	↓
Slovenia*	1	1	Free	
Solomon Islands	4	3	Partly Free	
Somalia	7	7	Not Free	
South Africa*	2	2	Free	
South Korea*	1	2	Free	
Spain*	1	1	Free	
Sri Lanka*	4	4	Partly Free	
Sudan	7	7	Not Free	

Suriname*	2	2	Free	
Swaziland	7	5	Not Free	
Sweden*	1	1	Free	
Switzerland*	1	1	Free	↓
Syria	7	6	Not Free	
Taiwan*	1 ?	2 ?	Free	
Tajikistan	6	5	Not Free	
Tanzania	4	3	Partly Free	
Thailand	5	4	Partly Free	
Togo	5	4 ?	Partly Free	
Tonga	5	3	Partly Free	
Trinidad and Tobago*	2	2	Free	
Tunisia	7	5	Not Free	
Turkey*	3	3	Partly Free	↓
Turkmenistan	7	7	Not Free	
Tuvalu*	1	1	Free	
Uganda	5	4	Partly Free	
Ukraine*	3	2	Free	

United Arab Emirates	6	5	Not Free	
United Kingdom*	1	1	Free	
United States*	1	1	Free	
Uruguay*	1	1	Free	
Uzbekistan	7	7	Not Free	
Vanuatu*	2	2	Free	
Venezuela	5 ?	4	Partly Free	
Vietnam	7	5	Not Free	↓
Yemen	6 ?	5	Not Free ?	
Zambia*	3	4 ?	Partly Free	
Zimbabwe	6 ?	6	Not Free	

Methodology:

PR and CL stand for political rights and civil liberties, respectively; 1 represents the most free and 7 the least free rating. The ratings reflect an overall judgment based on survey results.

? ? up or down indicates a change in political rights, civil liberties, or status since the last survey.

↑ ↓ up or down indicates a trend of positive or negative changes that took place but that were not sufficient to result in a change in political rights or civil liberties ratings of 1-7.

* indicates a country's status as an electoral democracy.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of Freedom House's Freedom in the World 2010 edition.

Available at URL: <http://www.freedomhouse.org>

Updated:

Reviewed in 2015

Human Rights

Overview of Human Rights in Burundi

Since 2002, over 230,000 Hutu refugees have returned to Burundi from Tanzania. Many fled the violence of the previous years and, since returning, now want to claim their lands and holdings. This could become an issue due to the fact there are still 250,000 ethnic Burundi refugees who might possibly repatriate and reclaim their lands.

While humanitarian relief agencies now have greater access to the local populations, poverty, food shortages, lack of basic infrastructure, and high levels of debt continue to undermine the ability to stabilize the nation and thus improve their human rights record.

In 2005, Burundi held elections for the first time in twelve years in what was perceived by international monitors to be a generally free and fair process. President Pierre Nkurunziza declared his commitment to righting the wrongs of past human rights abuses and establishing rule of law in a nation long marked by widespread violence and governmental corruption. However, after a year in office, many Burundians have been disappointed to see many governmental officials committing the same abuses as the old regime.

Despite the peace process, the Forces of National Liberation (FNL), a guerilla group that controlled much of the territory surrounding the capital city of Bujumbura, in recent years, both guerilla and government soldiers killed, raped, abducted, and robbed hundreds of civilians. It is hoped that progress on the peace front, particularly FNL's decision to accept the peace deal in 2006, will bring an end to such abuses.

Meanwhile, hundreds of soldiers and military combatants who have ended their military activities have taken up lives of crime as there are no real prospects of employment in Burundi.

Human Development Index (HDI) Rank:

See full listing of the Human Development Index located in the Social Overview of this report for this country's current rank.

Human Poverty Index Rank:

80th out of 103

Gini Index:

33.3

Life Expectancy at Birth (years):

58.29 years

Unemployment Rate:

N/A

Population living on \$1 a day (%):

58.4%

Population living on \$2 a day (%):

89.2%

Population living beneath the Poverty Line (%):

68%

Internally Displaced People:

170,000

Note-532,000 foreign refugees currently in Burundi

Total Crime Rate (%):

N/A

Health Expenditure (% of GDP):

Public: 0.6%

% of GDP Spent on Education:

3.9%

Human Rights Conventions Party to:

- International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
- Conventions on the Rights of the Child
- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees
- Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

*Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index that measures the level of well-being in 177 nations in the world. It uses factors such as poverty, literacy, life-expectancy, education, gross domestic product, and purchasing power parity to assess the average achievements in each nation. It has been used in the United Nation's Human Development Report since 1993.

*Human Poverty Index Ranking is based on certain indicators used to calculate the Human Poverty Index. Probability at birth of not surviving to age 40, adult literacy rate, population without sustainable access to an improved water source, and population below income poverty line are the indicators assessed in this measure.

*The Gini Index measures inequality based on the distribution of family income or consumption. A value of 0 represents perfect equality (income being distributed equally), and a value of 100 perfect inequality (income all going to one individual).

*The calculation of the total crime rate is the % of the total population which has been effected by property crime, robbery, sexual assault, assault, or bribery (corruption) related occurrences.

Turmoil rocks Burundi; human rights group says it has evidence of "mass graves"

In 2016, the African country of Burundi was rocked by turmoil, but with the scene taking a particularly ominous turn as a human rights group claimed that it had evidence of "mass graves." The political landscape in Burundi had been fractious since 2015 President Pierre Nkurunziza was re-elected to power under questionable constitutional circumstances. But it took a dismal turn for the worse in the period after with crackdowns on the political opposition and ongoing flares of violence.

Going back to May 2015, outrage over President Nkurunziza's bid to pursue a third term in office on dubious constitutional grounds sparked mass protests and reached a boiling point with an attempted coup. Although the coup was foiled, the continuing state of mass violence prevailed and increasingly, the dividing line was taking on an ethnic dimension with the ruling party and the Nkurunziza holding the allegiance of former Hutu rebels, while the opposition had the support of the old Tutsi-dominated army.

By mid-2015, the country was falling into an abyss of instability unseen since the ethnic conflict that plagued the country from the mid-1990s until a ceasefire and elections in the 2000s. The violence resulted with the deaths of hundreds of people and injuries to some 500 others, as well as mass displacement of citizens as people fled amidst fears of intensified pre-election violence. Burundi's authorities were insistent that the presidential contest go forward in July 2015, despite the combination of unrest and global condemnation. For his part, President Nkurunziza was unfazed despite the clearly deteriorating political conditions.

On July 21, 2015, people of Burundi went to the polls to vote in a presidential election that was boycotted by the opposition, and criticized by the global community for not being a credible exercise in democracy. The election was said to be marked by exceptionally low turnout in the capital of Bujumbura. The outcome was not a mystery with incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza winning a third term in office with 69 percent of the vote share due to the non-competitive nature of the election. Regional powers warned that Burundi could well be headed down the road of turmoil. The international community also entered the fray, with global powers such as the United States and the European Union, cast the election as flawed and called for dialogue between the ruling party and the opposition.

In August 2015, in the aftermath of President Pierre Nkurunziza's re-election victory, his close aide, General Adolphe Nshimirimana, was killed in an attack in the capital city of Bujumbura. The killing appeared to be a coordinated assassination, as the assailants used machine guns and rocket launchers to target c's car. Of note was the fact that Nshimirimana was responsible for the president's personal security and was instrumental in the crackdown on anti-government public

protests. As such, the assassination was being interpreted as a political act intended to deliver a message to the president. That message might well be that his opponents may not have been able to prevent him from securing another term in office at the ballot box, but they were prepared to use violence to achieve their ends.

Since the assassination of Nshimirimana, the country was beset by violence, death, and mass arrests. Violent clashes became common fare in the capital of Bujumbura. As well, killings were becoming regularized occurrences, with victims reported to have been shot at close range and often subjected to torture. As with the case of Nshimirimana, the explanation resided with an enraged bloc who were unable to stop Nkurunziza from holding onto power, but were now resorting to extraordinary means to go after their political enemies. But even that theory was tested with the news that an opposition party official, Jean Baptiste Nsengiyumva, was assassinated at the end of September 2015. There was no immediate explanation for the killing of Nsengiyumva; however, the fact that an opposition official was now another casualty of the rising tide of violence indicated that the country was becoming dangerously polarized.

Meanwhile, officials in Burundi were carrying out a massive crackdown on anyone deemed to be opposed to the president. The result was the incarceration of more than 700 individuals and overcrowding in the country's prisons as a result. Complicating matters was an increasing climate of tension and discontent from among the military. Then, in late 2015, after military bases faced attacks, the government carried out a harsh crackdown that left close to 90 people dead.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, Burundi was slipping into chaos as he said, "Almost every day, dead bodies are found lying on the streets of some of Bujumbura's neighborhoods." In a statement, the United Nations human rights chief issued the following warning: "There is an increasing risk that spiraling tit-for-tat violence will plunge the country back into its bloody past."

By 2016, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by turmoil. Arrests and assassinations characterized the country, with the blame resting on the growing gap between a president willing to use dubious interpretations of the constitution to hold onto power and an enraged bloc opposed to him.

The scene took a particularly ominous turn as the human rights group, Amnesty International, claimed that it had evidence of "mass graves" in the form of satellite images. The footage released by Amnesty International depicted what the human rights group said was disturbed earth in the area of Buringa close to the capital of Bujumbura. As stated by Muthoni Wanyeki, Amnesty International's regional director for East Africa, the Horn and the Great Lakes.: These images suggest a deliberate effort by the authorities to cover up the extent of the killings by their security forces and to prevent the full truth from coming out."

It should be noted that the United Nations said it would analyze satellite imagery in its own investigation of mass graves, with particular attention to one site at a military camp where 100 corpses were believed to be located.

The African Union has for peacekeeping troops to be deployed in Burundi to guard against the complete slide into ethnic conflict; however, there were limited expectations that President Nkurunziza would accept this proposal.

Editor's Note:

From the time of independence, the political control of the country has been held by the minority Tutsi elite. In 1993, conflict erupted between the Tutsi-led army and rebel groups from the majority Hutu population. That war was sparked in 1993 when Burundi's first Hutu president and democratically elected leader, Melchior Ndadaye, was assassinated. The bloody war left around 300,000 people dead and hundreds of thousands more displaced. A peace process has been underway for several years, culminating in elections intended to usher in a power-sharing government. In 2000, a peace agreement brought an interim government to power. A ceasefire agreement, ratification of a constitution, and elections followed in 2005. Continuing peace talks have led to some positive developments in the process of national reconciliation, however, instability and violence have prevailed to date, making clear the precarious position of the elected government. The 2010 election was regarded as a stabilizing measure on Burundi's political landscape; however, the decision of President Nkurunziza to contest the 2015 election under spurious constitutional circumstances has re-introduced precariousness to the political landscape in Burundi. From that time in mid-2015, Burundi has deteriorated into chaos, with violence, harsh crackdowns, and assassinations becoming regularized fare. In fact, close to 500 people have been killed in Burundi since mid-2015, and 240,000 have been displaced as they sought refuge, according to the United Nations. In 2016, Burundi was still rocked by turmoil, but the scene took a particularly ominous turn as a human rights group claimed that it had evidence of "mass graves."

Government Functions

Editor's Note

February 2005 marked a historic time in Burundi's political history since it was the period in which the constitution was ratified. Under the aegis of this new constitution, voters in Burundi went to the

polls in the first part of July 2005 to elect members of parliament. The election was regarded as a significant step in the process intended to end the civil war started in 1993 between the two main ethnic groups.

From the time of independence, the political control of the country has been held by the minority Tutsi elite. In 1993, conflict erupted between the Tutsi-led army and rebel groups from the majority Hutu population. A peace process has been underway for several years, culminating in elections intended to usher in a power-sharing government.

Constitution

The constitution, as noted above, was ratified by popular referendum on February 28, 2005.

Provisions Within the Legislature

The bicameral Parliament or Parlement, consists of a National Assembly or "Assemblée Nationale" and a Senate. Legislative authority is vested in the bicameral Parliament or Parlement.

In the National Assembly or "Assemblée Nationale," there are a minimum 100 seats, which under the terms of the peace agreement, consists of seats divided proportionally - 60 percent Hutu and 40 percent Tutsi. There are additional seats that may be appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation. At least 30 percent of the total seats are also proportionally allocated to women. Members of the of National Assembly or "Assemblée Nationale" are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms.

In the a Senate, there are 54 seats. Of these seats, 34 are elected by indirect vote to serve five year terms, with remaining seats assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state.

Executive Governance

Members of parliament elect the president of Burundi. The president is elected by popular vote to a five-year term and has full executive authority. The president is eligible to stand for election to a second term in office. The president appoints the prime minister, who forms a government.

Note that the constitution adopted in February 2005 permitted the post-transition president to be elected by a two-thirds majority of the parliament.

Constitutional changes since that time have provided for election of the president by direct universal

suffrage.

System of Jurisprudence

The legal system is based on German and Belgian civil codes and customary law. Burundi has not accepted compulsory ICJ jurisdiction. Judicial organs include the following: Supreme Court or Cour Supreme; Constitutional Court; Courts of Appeal (there are three in separate locations); Tribunals of First Instance (17 at the province level and 123 small local tribunals).

Government Structure

Names:

conventional long form:

Republic of Burundi

conventional short form:

Burundi

local long form:

Republika y'u Burundi

local short form:

Burundi

former:

Urundi

Type:

Republic

Executive Branch:

Chief of state:

President Pierre Nkurunziza (since 2005; re-elected in 2010 and 2015).

Presidential Note:

The 2005 election that brought Nkurunziza to power was an indirect poll taken within both parliamentary chambers, however, since that time, changes were made to the constitution.

Primer on 2015 presidential election in Burundi

Summary --

A presidential election was set to be held in Burundi in mid-2015. Typically, presidents in Burundi are barred from serving more than two terms in office. As such, there were questions as to whether incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza -- in power since 2005 and directly elected in 2010 -- was eligible to contest a third term. At first, it was not known if President Pierre Nkurunziza actually intended to contest the 2015 presidential contest, and speculation about his potential candidacy abounded in the public sphere. His decision to contest another questionable term in office spurred unrest and even an attempted coup d'etat. As such, the presidential contest, which was originally scheduled to be held in late June 2015 was postponed until mid-July 2015. However, as political conditions deteriorated in Burundi, the presidential contest was delayed further, finally being held on July 21, 2015, amidst an opposition boycott and ensuing criticisms from the global community about the credibility of the polls. See below for details.

In Detail --

Parliamentary elections were originally set to be held in Burundi in May 2015, but were subsequently scheduled to be held in June 2015. Likewise, a presidential elections was originally set to be held in Burundi in late June 2015, with a second round set to be held in July 2015, if no one candidate won an outright majority. As discussed below, these presidential and parliamentary elections were subsequently delayed as unrest, including an attempted coup, rocked the country due to President Pierre Nkurunziza's questionable bid to contest another term in office.

In Burundi, the bicameral parliament or Parlement consists of a National Assembly or Assemblée Nationale (minimum 100 seats - 60 percent Hutu and 40 percent Tutsi with at least 30 percent being women; additional seats are appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation; members are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms) and a Senate (54 seats; 34 by indirect vote to serve five-year terms, with remaining seats being assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state).

The previous elections were held in 2010. Due to the limited competition ensconced in these election because of an opposition boycott, perhaps not surprisingly, voter turnout was low. As with the presidential race, victory was regarded as a foregone conclusion for President Pierre Nkurunziza's ruling party. In the National Assembly, the vast majority of seats were won by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD. Other parties securing seats in the last lower chamber were Union for National Progress (Union pour le Progress Nationale) or UPRONA and Burundi Democratic Front or FRODEBU. It was to be seen if these parties would see the same type of success in 2015.

At the executive level, typically, presidents in Burundi are barred from serving more than two

terms in office. As such, there were questions as to whether incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza -- in power since 2005 and directly elected in 2010 -- was eligible to contest a third term. At first, it was not known if President Pierre Nkurunziza actually intended to contest the 2015 presidential contest, and speculation about his potential candidacy abounded in the public sphere. Supporters of the president argued that he was within his rights to seek re-election in 2010 since in his first term, he was not elected by popular vote but via an internal parliamentary vote. Detractors of the president, however, made clear that the pursuit of a third term in office should be regarded as illegal.

It should be noted that Tanzania, which has played a key mediating role in Burundi's peace process following a bloody conflict involving Burundian Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups, warned that violence could be in the offing if Nkurunziza contested the presidential election. During a visit to Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi, Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete said, "If people decide to violate the constitution and the Arusha peace agreement, there is a risk of a new violence that will be hard to stop."

Already, both the Catholic Church to which a lion's share of Burundians belong, as well as a United Nations delegation, have warned that strict adherence to the constitution should characterize the elections. Several regional groups also joined the chorus of calls for the president to adhere to strict term limits, in the interests of national stability.

By mid-April 2015, violent protests were breaking out in Burundi as persons opposed to a third term in office for President Nkurunziza took to the streets of the capital city of Bujumbura to register their outrage. Police used tear gas and water cannons to control the crowds, but that action only served to further raise the ire of protesters and opposition groups. Meanwhile, thousands of Burundians were fleeing the country for neighboring Rwanda, presumably due to fear that another bloody conflict could erupt in Burundi.

A congress of the ruling party met in late April 2015 and decided to nominate President Nkurunziza as its candidate. The decision by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD made it clear that the incumbent president was seeking another term in office. The party decided to deal with the constitutional question by saying that the constitutional court would have to rule on any appeals against its candidate.

For his part, Nkurunziza dismissed criticisms of his bid to hold onto power and contest these elections. He said, "I want to tell everybody that there is no more silence from today. No-one will stop the CNDD-FDD Party. It is the party created by people who are defending democracy."

Of course, outside his party support, President Nkurunziza had no shortage of critics, with opposition activists returning to the streets to protest en masse his bid for another presidential term. The president urged peace but warned of consequences for those opposed to him. He said,

"I call people to go to the election in peace. But I would like to warn everyone: whoever wants to create problems with the ruling party elected by the people, he'll find himself in trouble." It was unlikely that this warning, which was imbued by tacit threats to dissent, would find positive resonance among the protesters.

In fact, at the start of May 2015, as Burundi's constitutional court placed its official stamp on President Pierre Nkurunziza's bid for a third term in office by validating his candidacy, a new burst of protests emerged on the streets of the capital city. As protesters approached the embassy of the United States, police used tear gas and aerial gunshots to try to disperse the crowds.

By mid-May 2015, President Pierre Nkurunziza had registered to contest the presidency and secure a third term in office. The symbolic procedure sparked fresh protests in Burundi's capital of Bujumbura. Protesters barricaded roads and threw stones at police who responded with tear gas and water cannon. The situation in Burundi was signaling alarm bells across the world, especially as reports emerged that weapons were being delivered to militias supportive of Nkurunziza. Following a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, United States Ambassador Samantha Power warned that her country would impose sanctions on those responsible for violence, should the unrest escalate.

On May 13, 2015, outrage over President Nkurunziza's bid to pursue a third term in office on dubious constitutional grounds reached a boiling point as an attempted coup was underway. It was unclear at the time of writing whether the coup orchestrated by Major General Godefroid Niyombare had been successful, or, if was in fact foiled, as stated by the office of the presidency.

A statement by the office of the presidency read as follows: "It is with regret that we have learned that a group from the armed forces mutinied this morning and declared an imaginary coup."

In actuality, President Nkurunziza was attending a conference in Tanzania when the apparent coup took place. Despite the presidency's insistence that the coup was neutralized, the fact of the matter was that the aircraft carrying President Nkurunziza was not allowed to land in Burundi and was forced to return to Tanzania.

Indeed, in a radio address, Major General Niyombare made clear that his forces held control over the airport and the border; he also declared that the government had been dissolved and that President Nkurunziza had been "dismissed." He said, "President Pierre Nkurunziza has been relieved of his duties. The government is overthrown." He continued by saying that the mission of his self-declared "salvation committee" was the "restoration of national unity... and the resumption of the electoral process in a peaceful and fair environment."

Clashes between police and a mixed crowd of soldiers and protesters ensued and resulted in the deaths of several people. That confrontation was emblematic of the scene in Burundi on May 13,

2015, with some citizens and security forces backing the president and others supportive of the protesters and attempted coup. Increasingly, the dividing line was taking on an ethnic dimension with the ruling party and the Nkurunziza holding the allegiance of former Hutu rebels, while the opposition had the support of the old Tutsi-dominated army.

On May 14, 2015, the two factions -- one on the one hand, forces loyal to the president, and on the other hand those loyal to Niyombare -- were vying for control of the capital of Bujumbura. Fighting was described as heavy, with deaths reported, and Burundi was sinking into a state of political crisis. Early on May 15, 2015, however, the coup plotters were acknowledging that their attempt to overthrow the government had failed and the president -- now back in Burundi -- appeared to have regained control over the country. It was to be seen if these developments presaged calm in Burundi, or, if they augured further instability.

As May 2015 came to a close, regional leaders were urging Burundi to postpone the presidential election, given the unrest surrounding President Nkurunziza's decision to contest a third term. They also called for the restoration of calm in Burundi, noting a more hospitable climate would facilitate the return of tens of thousands of people who fled the country amidst the eruption of violence and the attempted coup discussed above.

By the start of June 2015, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by renewed protests, as demonstrators again took to the streets to rail against President Nkurunziza and to register their outrage over his decision to run for a questionable third term in office. Protesters said they were in the streets also because the aforementioned meeting of regional leaders was centered simply on the postponement of the elections, and was not at all focused on halting the president outright from trying to hold onto power. Now, the country was falling into an abyss of instability unseen since the ethnic conflict that plagued the country from the mid-1990s until a ceasefire and elections in the 2000s.

Note that before either the parliamentary contest or the first round of the presidential elections could be held in June 2015, authorities in Burundi opted to postpone the vote in both cases due to prevailing unrest over the attempted coup and the president's bid to hold onto power. All expectations were that the elections would have to be held before Aug. 26, 2015, when the existing presidential term was set to expire.

To that end, Burundi's electoral commission announced that the parliamentary elections should be held on June 29, 2015, with the presidential election to follow on July 15, 2015. This new timeline did little to assuage the anger of opposition parties and activists, who again noted that a delayed schedule would not address the essential problem of Nkurunziza's candidacy. Not surprisingly, several opposition leaders soon called for a boycott of the presidential vote, while activists urged a return to the streets for mass protests.

Meanwhile, Burundi continued to be rocked by unrest, manifest in the third week of June 2015 by a fresh burst of clashes between security forces and activists. The violence resulted with the deaths of scores of people and injuries to some 500 others, as well as mass displacement of as many as 150,000 citizens as people fled amidst fears of election violence. The unrest in Burundi was -- as before -- in response to President Nkurunziza's bid to contest a third term.

At the end of June 2015, on the eve of the parliamentary contest, gunmen set fire to ballots and other election materials in Burundi while the opposition reminded the country of its election boycott. These developments spurred United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon as well as the government of the United States to call for a delay in the elections. But the government dismissed these calls and insisted on moving forward with the elections, while promising victory for the ruling party.

In the aftermath of the parliamentary contest, which were criticized by the international community, for not being hospitable to a fair vote, the outcome was hardly mysterious. With an opposition boycott, the president's ruling CNDD-FDD party was expected to control parliament. To that end, it was soon announced that the ruling party won 77 out of 100 elected seats in parliament. Meanwhile, violent clashes erupted in Burundi, with several deaths reported.

Burundi's authorities were insistent that the presidential contest go forward on July 15, 2015, despite the combination of unrest and global condemnation. For his part, President Nkurunziza was unfazed. In fact, he was reported to be on the campaign trail and enjoying significant support at political rallies. As stated by presidential spokesperson Gervais Abayeho, "The president is on a campaign trail in the last few days and people are turning out in large numbers from his CNDD-FDD party, and the operation is going quite well in the countryside and even the capital, Bujumbura."

But the political conditions in Burundi were clearly deteriorating. Of note was the threat posed by a Burundian general who was played a role in the attempted coup of May 2015 calling for President Nkurunziza to be removed from power. General Leonard Ngendakumana said in an interview with Reuters News that the president was fomenting ethnic tensions between Hutus and Tutsis. Of particular concern has been the rise of a militia, known as the Imbonerakure, which was posing a threat to opposition supporters as well as refugees displaced from the unrest. Warning of dire consequences, Ngendakumana said, "This situation can lead to a genocide." Ngendakumana also said indicated that the goal to remove President Nkurunziza from office in the failed coup remained a priority as he declared, "At that time (in May), we just failed to remove Nkurunziza from power. The aim is still there." Ngendakumana continued, "The only way to reach this objective is to use force."

Note that with only days until the scheduled date for the presidential election to be held, and amidst rising warning from the United Nations and regional African bodies about Burundi slipping into

political chaos, the presidential contest was again delayed. The new date for the presidential election was set for July 21, 2015. Two days ahead of that new election day, three opposition candidates -- Domitien Ndayizeye, Jean Minani and Sylvestre Ntibantunganya -- issued a statement noting that Burundi's political and security environment was not conducive to the holding of free and fair elections, and thus announced their intent to boycott the polls. The government of Burundi dismissed these moves and said the election would go forward regardless.

On July 21, 2015, people of Burundi went to the polls to vote in a presidential election that was boycotted by the opposition, and criticized by the global community for not being a credible exercise in democracy. The election was said to be marked by exceptionally low turnout in the capital of Bujumbura. The outcome was not a mystery with incumbent President Pierre Nkurunziza winning a third term in office with 69 percent of the vote share due to the non-competitive nature of the election. His closest rival, Agathon Rwaswa, did not breach the 20 percent mark, garnering less than 19 percent. Meanwhile, the main opposition parties who participated in the boycott promised that they would not recognize the outcome of the election. Regional powers warned that Burundi could well be headed down the road of turmoil. The international community also entered the fray, with global powers such as the United States and the European Union, cast the election as flawed and called for dialogue between the ruling party and the opposition.

Cabinet:

Council of Ministers

Legislative Branch:

Bicameral Parliament or Parlement:

Consists of a National Assembly or Assemblée Nationale (minimum 100 seats - 60% Hutu and 40% Tutsi with at least 30% being women; additional seats appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation; members are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms) and a Senate (54 seats; 34 by indirect vote to serve five year terms, with remaining seats assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state)

Primer on 2015 parliamentary elections in Burundi

Summary --

Parliamentary elections in Burundi were to be held on June 29, 2015. The elections were originally set to be held in Burundi on May 26, 2015, but were postponed until June 2, 2015, and again until June 29, 2015, due to prevailing unrest over an attempted coup caused by the president's questionable bid to hold onto power.

In Burundi, the bicameral parliament or Parlement consists of a National Assembly or Assemblée Nationale (minimum 100 seats - 60 percent Hutu and 40 percent Tutsi with at least 30 percent

being women; additional seats are appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation; members are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms) and a Senate (54 seats; 34 by indirect vote to serve five year terms, with remaining seats being assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state).

The last elections were held in 2010. Due to the limited competition ensconced in these election because of an opposition boycott, perhaps not surprisingly, voter turnout was low. As with the presidential race, victory was regarded as a foregone conclusion for President Pierre Nkurunziza's ruling party. In the National Assembly, the vast majority of seats were won by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD. Other parties securing seats in the last lower chamber were Union for National Progress (Union pour le Progress Nationale) or UPRONA and Burundi Democratic Front or FRODEBU. It was to be seen if these parties would see the same type of success in 2015.

In detail --

Parliamentary elections were originally set to be held in Burundi in May 2015, but were subsequently scheduled to be held in June 2015. Likewise, a presidential elections was originally set to be held in Burundi in late June 2015, with a second round set to be held in July 2015, if no one candidate won an outright majority. As discussed below, these presidential and parliamentary elections were subsequently delayed as unrest, including an attempted coup, rocked the country due to President Pierre Nkurunziza's questionable bid to contest another term in office.

In Burundi, the bicameral parliament or Parlement consists of a National Assembly or Assemblée Nationale (minimum 100 seats - 60 percent Hutu and 40 percent Tutsi with at least 30 percent being women; additional seats are appointed by a National Independent Electoral Commission to ensure ethnic representation; members are elected by popular vote to serve five-year terms) and a Senate (54 seats; 34 by indirect vote to serve five-year terms, with remaining seats being assigned to ethnic groups and former chiefs of state).

The previous elections were held in 2010. Due to the limited competition ensconced in these election because of an opposition boycott, perhaps not surprisingly, voter turnout was low. As with the presidential race, victory was regarded as a foregone conclusion for President Pierre Nkurunziza's ruling party. In the National Assembly, the vast majority of seats were won by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD. Other parties securing seats in the last lower chamber were Union for National Progress (Union pour le Progress Nationale) or UPRONA and Burundi Democratic Front or FRODEBU. It was to be seen if these parties would see the same type of success in 2015.

At the executive level, typically, presidents in Burundi are barred from serving more than two terms in office. As such, there were questions as to whether incumbent President Pierre

Nkurunziza -- in power since 2005 and directly elected in 2010 -- was eligible to contest a third term. At first, it was not known if President Pierre Nkurunziza actually intended to contest the 2015 presidential contest, and speculation about his potential candidacy abounded in the public sphere. Supporters of the president argued that he was within his rights to seek re-election in 2010 since in his first term, he was not elected by popular vote but via an internal parliamentary vote. Detractors of the president, however, made clear that the pursuit of a third term in office should be regarded as illegal.

It should be noted that Tanzania, which has played a key mediating role in Burundi's peace process following a bloody conflict involving Burundian Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups, warned that violence could be in the offing if Nkurunziza contested the presidential election. During a visit to Bujumbura, the capital of Burundi, Tanzanian President Jakaya Kikwete said, "If people decide to violate the constitution and the Arusha peace agreement, there is a risk of a new violence that will be hard to stop."

Already, both the Catholic Church to which a lion's share of Burundians belong, as well as a United Nations delegation, have warned that strict adherence to the constitution should characterize the elections. Several regional groups also joined the chorus of calls for the president to adhere to strict term limits, in the interests of national stability.

By mid-April 2015, violent protests were breaking out in Burundi as persons opposed to a third term in office for President Nkurunziza took to the streets of the capital city of Bujumbura to register their outrage. Police used tear gas and water cannons to control the crowds, but that action only served to further raise the ire of protesters and opposition groups. Meanwhile, thousands of Burundians were fleeing the country for neighboring Rwanda, presumably due to fear that another bloody conflict could erupt in Burundi.

A congress of the ruling party met in late April 2015 and decided to nominate President Nkurunziza as its candidate. The decision by the National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD made it clear that the incumbent president was seeking another term in office. The party decided to deal with the constitutional question by saying that the constitutional court would have to rule on any appeals against its candidate.

For his part, Nkurunziza dismissed criticisms of his bid to hold onto power and contest these elections. He said, "I want to tell everybody that there is no more silence from today. No-one will stop the CNDD-FDD Party. It is the party created by people who are defending democracy."

Of course, outside his party support, President Nkurunziza had no shortage of critics, with opposition activists returning to the streets to protest en masse his bid for another presidential term. The president urged peace but warned of consequences for those opposed to him. He said, "I call people to go to the election in peace. But I would like to warn everyone: whoever wants to

create problems with the ruling party elected by the people, he'll find himself in trouble." It was unlikely that this warning, which was imbued by tacit threats to dissent, would find positive resonance among the protesters.

In fact, at the start of May 2015, as Burundi's constitutional court placed its official stamp on President Pierre Nkurunziza's bid for a third term in office by validating his candidacy, a new burst of protests emerged on the streets of the capital city. As protesters approached the embassy of the United States, police used tear gas and aerial gunshots to try to disperse the crowds.

By mid-May 2015, President Pierre Nkurunziza had registered to contest the presidency and secure a third term in office. The symbolic procedure sparked fresh protests in Burundi's capital of Bujumbura. Protesters barricaded roads and threw stones at police who responded with tear gas and water cannon. The situation in Burundi was signaling alarm bells across the world, especially as reports emerged that weapons were being delivered to militias supportive of Nkurunziza. Following a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, United States Ambassador Samantha Power warned that her country would impose sanctions on those responsible for violence, should the unrest escalate.

On May 13, 2015, outrage over President Nkurunziza's bid to pursue a third term in office on dubious constitutional grounds reached a boiling point as an attempted coup was underway. It was unclear at the time of writing whether the coup orchestrated by Major General Godefroid Niyombare had been successful, or, if was in fact foiled, as stated by the office of the presidency.

A statement by the office of the presidency read as follows: "It is with regret that we have learned that a group from the armed forces mutinied this morning and declared an imaginary coup."

In actuality, President Nkurunziza was attending a conference in Tanzania when the apparent coup took place. Despite the presidency's insistence that the coup was neutralized, the fact of the matter was that the aircraft carrying President Nkurunziza was not allowed to land in Burundi and was forced to return to Tanzania.

Indeed, in a radio address, Major General Niyombare made clear that his forces held control over the airport and the border; he also declared that the government had been dissolved and that President Nkurunziza had been "dismissed." He said, "President Pierre Nkurunziza has been relieved of his duties. The government is overthrown." He continued by saying that the mission of his self-declared "salvation committee" was the "restoration of national unity... and the resumption of the electoral process in a peaceful and fair environment."

Clashes between police and a mixed crowd of soldiers and protesters ensued and resulted in the deaths of several people. That confrontation was emblematic of the scene in Burundi on May 13, 2015, with some citizens and security forces backing the president and others supportive of the

protesters and attempted coup. Increasingly, the dividing line was taking on an ethnic dimension with the ruling party and the Nkurunziza holding the allegiance of former Hutu rebels, while the opposition had the support of the old Tutsi-dominated army.

On May 14, 2015, the two factions -- one on one hand, forces loyal to the president, and on the other hand those loyal to Niyombare -- were vying for control of the capital of Bujumbura. Fighting was described as heavy, with deaths reported, and Burundi was sinking into a state of political crisis. Early on May 15, 2015, however, the coup plotters were acknowledging that their attempt to overthrow the government had failed and the president -- now back in Burundi -- appeared to have regained control over the country. It was to be seen if these developments presaged calm in Burundi, or, if they augured further instability.

As May 2015 came to a close, regional leaders were urging Burundi to postpone the presidential election, given the unrest surrounding President Nkurunziza's decision to contest a third term. They also called for the restoration of calm in Burundi, noting a more hospitable climate would facilitate the return of tens of thousands of people who fled the country amidst the eruption of violence and the attempted coup discussed above.

By the start of June 2015, the political landscape in Burundi was marked by renewed protests, as demonstrators again took to the streets to rail against President Nkurunziza and to register their outrage over his decision to run for a questionable third term in office. Protesters said they were in the streets also because the aforementioned meeting of regional leaders was centered simply on the postponement of the elections, and was not at all focused on halting the president outright from trying to hold onto power. Now, the country was falling into an abyss of instability unseen since the ethnic conflict that plagued the country from the mid-1990s until a ceasefire and elections in the 2000s.

Note that before either the parliamentary contest or the first round of the presidential elections could be held in June 2015, authorities in Burundi opted to postpone the vote in both cases due to prevailing unrest over the attempted coup and the president's bid to hold onto power. All expectations were that the elections would have to be held before Aug. 26, 2015, when the existing presidential term was set to expire.

To that end, Burundi's electoral commission announced that the parliamentary elections should be held on June 29, 2015, with the presidential election to follow on July 15, 2015. This new timeline did little to assuage the anger of opposition parties and activists, who again noted that a delayed schedule would not address the essential problem of Nkurunziza's candidacy. Not surprisingly, several opposition leaders soon called for a boycott of the presidential vote, while activists urged a return to the streets for mass protests.

Meanwhile, Burundi continued to be rocked by unrest, manifest in the third week of June 2015 by

a fresh burst of clashes between security forces and activists. The violence resulted with the deaths of scores of people and injuries to some 500 others, as well as mass displacement of citizens as people fled amidst fears of election violence. The unrest in Burundi was -- as before -- in response to President Nkurunziza's bid to contest a third term.

At the end of June 2015, on the eve of the parliamentary contest, gunmen set fire to ballots and other election materials in Burundi while the opposition reminded the country of its election boycott. These developments spurred United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon as well as the government of the United States to call for a delay in the elections. But the government dismissed these calls and insisted on moving forward with the elections, while promising victory for the ruling party.

In the aftermath of the parliamentary contest, which were criticized by the international community, for not being hospitable to a fair vote, the outcome was hardly mysterious. With an opposition boycott, the president's ruling CNDD-FDD party was expected to control parliament. To that end, it was soon announced that the ruling party won 77 out of 100 elected seats in parliament. Meanwhile, violent clashes erupted in Burundi, with several deaths reported.

Judicial Branch:

Supreme Court or Cour Supreme; Constitutional Court; Courts of Appeal (there are three in separate locations); Tribunals of First Instance (17 at the province level and 123 small local tribunals)

Administrative Divisions:

17 provinces; Bubanza, Bujumbura Mairie, Bujumbura Rurale, Bururi, Cankuzo, Cibitoke, Gitega, Karuzi, Kayanza, Kirundo, Makamba, Muramvya, Muyinga, Mwaro, Ngozi, Rutana, Ruyigi

Constitution:

February 28, 2005; ratified by popular referendum

Legal System:

Based on German and Belgian civil codes and customary law; does not accept compulsory ICJ jurisdiction

Political Parties and Leaders:

Governing parties:

governing parties:

Burundi Democratic Front or FRODEBU [Leonce NGENDAKUMANA]

National Council for the Defense of Democracy - Front for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD-FDD [Jeremie NGENDAKUMANA]

Union for National Progress (Union pour le Progress Nationale) or UPRONA [Bonaventure NIYOYANKANA]

Note:

A multiparty system was introduced after 1998, included are:

National Council for the Defense of Democracy or CNDD [Leonard NYANGOMA]

National Resistance Movement for the Rehabilitation of the Citizen or MRC-Rurenzangemero [Epitace BANYAGANAKANDI]

Party for National Redress or PARENA [Jean-Baptiste BAGAZA]

Note:

Pressure groups include the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People - National Liberation Front (Palipehutu - FNL); in the recent times, it was regarded as the only insurgent group still fighting the government, however, in 2006, the FNL entered the peace process.

Suffrage:

Age of eligibility to vote not known; right to vote universal

Principal Government Officials

Government of Burundi

Pres. Pierre NKURUNZIZA

First Vice Pres. Prosper BAZOMBAZA

Second Vice Pres. Gervais RUFYIKIRI

Min. of Agriculture & Livestock Odette KAYITESI

Min. of of Basic Education, Secondary Education, Handicrafts, Training, & Literacy Severin BUZINGO

Min. of Civil Service, Labor, & Social Security Annonciate SENDAZIRASA

Min. of Commerce, Trade, Industry, Posts, & Tourism Marie Rose NIZIGIYIMANA
Min. of Communal Development Dieudonne GITERUZI
Min. of East African Community Affairs Hafsa MOSSI
Min. of Energy & Mines Come MANIRAKIZA
Min. of External Relations & Intl. Cooperation Laurent KAVAKURE
Min. of Finance, Plans, & Development Tabu Abdallah MANIRAKIZA
Min. of Good Governance & Privatization Ernest MBERAMIHETO
Min. of Higher Education & Scientific Research Julien NIMUBONA
Min. of Interior Edouard NDUWIMANA
Min. of Justice & Keeper of the Seals Pascal BARANDAGIYE
Min. of National Defense & War Veterans Pontien GACIYUBWENGE, Maj. Gen.
Min. of National Solidarity, Human Rights, & Gender Clotilde NIRAGIRA
Min. of Public Health & Fight Against AIDS Sabine NTAKARUTIMANA, Dr.
Min. of Public Security Gabriel NIZIGAMA
Min. of Telecommunications, Information, Communication, & Relations With Parliament
Tharcisse NKEZABAHIZI
Min. of Transport, Public Works, & Equipment Virginie CIZA
Min. of Water, Environment, Territorial Admin., & Urban Planning Jean-Marie
NIBIRANTIJE
Min. of Youth, Sports, & Culture Jean-Jacques NYENIMIGABO
Attorney Gen. Pascal BARANDAGIYE
Governor, Central Bank Jean CIZA
Ambassador to the US Angele NIUHIRE
Permanent Representative to the UN, New York Albert SHINGIRO

-- as of 2015

[Leader Biography](#)

Leader Biography

[Editor's Note](#)

New elections under the aegis of the peace agreement were held in mid-2005. FDD leader and former university lecturer Pierre Nkurunziza was appointed president by newly- elected parliamentarians in August 2005. The electoral commission said that Nkurunziza was elected by 91.62 percent in 2010 elections, which were uncontested due to the withdrawal of several opposition candidates.

Biography

Pierre Nkurunziza, was born in 1963 in the capital city of Burundi, Bujumbura. He attended elementary school in the province of Nogozi and secondary school in Kitenga. He graduated from the University of Burundi in 1990 with specializations in sports and education. Following his time in university, Nkurunziza became a university lecturer and was working in that capacity when civil war erupted in the 1990s.

The mid-1990s marked the time in which he became involved with the Hutu rebels of Burundi. Indeed, it was only after he was attacked that he became a soldier for the former Hutu rebels ("Conseil National for la Défense de la Démocratie - Forces pour la Défense de la Démocratie" or FDD). He has maintained that it was only because he was forced into the ever-intensifying ethnic conflict plaguing the country.

That said, every perspective has a counter-view. Some of Nkurunziza's Tutsi opponents have suggested that Nkurunziza should be brought to justice for crimes they allege that he committed as a rebel leader during the civil war, and for which a Burundian court sentenced him to death back in 1998. (He was later granted amnesty in the peace agreement.)

Nkurunziza rose through the ranks to become Deputy Secretary General and later Chairman. In 2005, he was elected as leader of Burundi in the aftermath of the conflict. As noted above, he was re-elected to power in 2010.

In many senses, Nkurunziza's life followed in the footsteps of his father. His father was also involved in politics -- having been elected to parliament in 1965 and serving as governor for two provinces. Ultimately, his father was a victim of ethnic violence and died in 1972.

Foreign Relations

General Relations

Burundi's relations with its neighbors have often been affected by security concerns. Hundreds of thousands of Burundian refugees have at various times crossed into Rwanda, Tanzania, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Hundreds of thousands of Burundians fled to neighboring countries during the civil war. Most of them, more than 750,000 since 1993, are in Tanzania. Burundi maintains close relations with all neighbors in the Great Lakes region, including Rwanda, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Burundi is a member of various international and regional organizations, including the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the African Union, the African Development Bank, COMESA, the free-tariff zone of eastern and southern Africa, and the East Africa Community (EAC).

The European Parliament condemned the African Great Lakes Region conflicts, but division within the European Union (EU) prevented the deployment of a multi-national peacekeeping force. The EU decided to continue its financial support of development programs in Burundi.

Sanctions against Burundi were imposed after Buyoya's 1996 coup. On Oct. 12, 1999 a relief convoy driving towards Muze was attacked. Nine people were killed including the World Food Programme's logistics chief, Saskia von Meijenfheldt, the United Nations (U.N.) Children's Fund representative Luis Zuniga and the director of the Mossa Sugar Company, Alexis Rwagatore. The U.N. responded by suspending humanitarian aid out of fear for the safety of U.N. personnel. Most bilateral donors continued to honor the 1996 sanctions.

In the late 1990s, France announced a grant of \$3 million for reconstruction in war-torn areas and programs to promote human rights and justice. Soon after, according to the organization Human Rights Watch, the World Bank pledged \$12 million in reconstruction financing. These relatively small donor infusions were considered strategic reconstruction assistance and not development funds. On Jan. 23, 2000, the European Union and the U.N. decided to publicly suspend their sanctions against Burundi.

The conflict in Burundi resulted in the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping in 2004, whose role changed recently to that of reconstruction.

Regional Relations

On Feb. 21, 2000, the Organization for African Unity (OAU) voted to continue their economic sanctions imposed on Burundi after the 1996 coup d'etat. Sanctions were likely to be lifted if progress was made during the current Arusha peace talks.

The government of Burundi was not directly involved in the fighting in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Congo DRC). However, the FDD and the Bahutu Forces of Burundi (FHB) militias supported Congolese government troops. In return, Congolese President Laurent Kabila (now deceased) had been supplying the FDD with arms to fight the Lusaka agreement and President Buyoya (now no longer in power) back home. In addition, Rwandan government involvement in the Congo has increased tensions on the Rwanda-Burundi border despite Batutsi-dominated leadership in both countries.

In January 2002, Burundi and Congo DRC announced that Burundi would remove troops from Congo DRC in exchange for Congo DRC's ceasing its support of Burundian rebels in the Congo.

In spring of 2007, Burundi, along with Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of Congo, reconstituted its regional economic bloc known as Great Lakes Economic Community. Also, by mid-2007, Burundi, along with Rwanda, was officially invited to join the East African Community, whose existing membership included Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. The group, which was founded in 1999, is largely characterized by a customs union that took effect in recent years. However, there have been discussions about including political elements to the group.

Special Report:

East African countries come together to form regional common market

In November 2009, leaders from Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi were set to meet in Nairobi to sign a common market treaty. The East African Community was proposed a

decade ago with efforts moving forward towards its adoption. Once the agreement was signed, it was expected that the East African Community would come into being by mid-2010.

Other Significant Relations

United States

The United States (U.S.) government's goals in Burundi are to help the people of Burundi realize a just and lasting peace based upon democratic principles and sustainable economic development. The United States encourages political stability, ongoing democratic reforms, political openness, respect for human rights, and economic development in Burundi. In the long term, the United States seeks to strengthen the process of internal reconciliation and democratization within all the states of the region to promote a stable, democratic community of nations that will work toward mutual social, economic, and security interests on the continent.

Relations between the Buyoya administration and the U.S. government suffered after the creation of the regroupment camps. Still, the U.S. was committed to support negotiations between the warring parties in Burundi and the new government in Burundi presented new opportunities for cooperation in 2003.

According to the Africa Policy Information Center (APIC), the wider international community, including the United States and key European states, supported the idea of an externally imposed peace in Burundi. While Western governments have shown no willingness to commit troops or significant economic investments, they have greeted the efforts of regional leaders to impose a solution on Burundi through a combination of economic pressure and negotiation

The United States supported the Arusha peace process, providing financial support through our assessed contributions to a United Nations peacekeeping force established in 2004, whose role changed recently to that of reconstruction.

Since Domitien Ndayizeye became president in April 2003, there were no discernible changes in Burundi's foreign policy. In 2005 and through 2013, the election of President Pierre Nkurunziza has not indicated any marked policy shifts.

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, www.countrywatch.com; see Bibliography for list of research sources.

National Security

External Threats

For much of its modern history, Burundi has been enveloped by an ethnic conflict between Tutsis and Hutus that transcends its borders. The situation worsened in 1993 when a civil war broke out in Burundi. Neighboring Rwanda, historically linked to Burundi and also comprised of Tutsis and Hutus, has been similarly afflicted. In 1994, ethnic Hutu rebels slaughtered approximately 800,000 people there over a 100-day period. The subsequent influx of hundreds of thousands of refugees into Burundi served as a further destabilizing situation.

At present, the peace agenda has control of developments within Burundi's Hutu-dominated government, but militants continue to operate throughout the country and beyond its borders. Various ethnic groups, including the Tutsis, Hutus, Lendus and Hemas, as well as political rebels and government forces, continue to fight throughout the Great Lakes region, an area that transcends the borders of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Uganda. (See section below on insurgencies)

Crime

The United States State Department reports a high crime rate in Burundi's capital, Bujumbura, and throughout the country in general. Unemployed men armed with automatic weapons roam the country perpetuating robberies, assaults and murders on a weekly and even nightly basis. The roads leading out of Bujumbura are particularly dangerous, the site of frequent armed ambushes.

Insurgencies

As is the case neighboring Rwanda, an intense and violent conflict between the Tutsis and Hutus has characterized much of Burundi's modern history. Prior to the outbreak of hostilities, the two ethnic groups shared a long tradition of relatively peaceful co-existence. Originally from Ethiopia, the semi-nomadic Tutsis joined the Hutus in Central Africa approximately 600 years ago. In short time, the lesser numbered Tutsis soon established control over the largely agrarian Hutus. A Tutsi monarchy sat at the top of the feudal system that evolved. Colonial rule did little to alter the existing relationship between the two ethnic groups. Despite the historically unequal distribution of wealth and power, however, there was relatively little strife between the Hutus and Tutsis throughout the pre-colonial period.

The situation began to change during colonial rule. The territory of Ruanda-Urundi – the modern countries of Rwanda and Burundi– fell under Belgian control in 1916. Initially, Belgiumruled the region indirectly through the Tutsi aristocracy. In the face of Tutsi resistance, Belgiumbegan to encourage the Hutu majority to take a more active role in the government in the 1950s. In 1959 Hutu rebels overthrew the Tutsi democracy. More than 160,000 Tutsis fled to neighboring countries. In 1962 Burundi and Rwandagained their independence.

Relations between the Tutsi and the Hutus grew increasingly strained in the post-colonial period. Although the Tutsi monarchy assumed power in Burundi, it made an effort to incorporate Hutus in the new government. Burundi’s prime minister, a Hutu, was assassinated in 1965, however, setting a cycle of Hutu resistance and subsequent government suppression into motion. Under the auspices of transforming Burundiinto a republic, a de factor military regime seized power in 1966. Ethnic tension and civil unrest continued throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s.

In 1972, an aborted Hutu rebellion prompted many Burundians to leave the country. Subsequent Tutsi-dominated military regimes seized power in 1976 and in 1987, the latter under the authority of Major Pierre Buyoya. During 1988, increasingly strained relations between the ruling Tutsis and the majority Hutus gave way to violent confrontations between the army, the Hutu opposition, and Tutsi hardliners. Hundreds of thousands of people were killed and tens of thousands of refugees fled into neighboring countries.

The conflict intensified in the early 1990s. Buyoya gradually implemented democratic reforms and Burundielected its first Hutu president, Melchior Ndadaye, in 1993. Elements of the Tutsi-dominated armed forces assassinated him in October of that same year, however, propelling the country into a civil war, which ultimately killed tens of thousands and displaced hundreds of thousands more. Cyprien Ntaryamira was elected president in January 1994. Both ethnic Hutus, he and the President of Rwanda, Juvenal Habyarimana, were killed in a plane crash four months later. In Burundi, the incident exacerbated the internal violence and unrest. In neighboring Rwanda, the Hutu majority began slaughtering Tutsis and Hutu moderates in what became known as the Rwandan genocide. The influx of hundreds of thousands of Rwandan refugees and the ongoing conflict between Hutus and Tutsis served to further destabilize Burundi.

In November 1995, the leaders of Burundi, Rwanda, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (at that time, Zaire) announced a collaborative effort to foster a negotiated peace in Burundi. The Arusha peace process evolved from that initiative. Pierre Buyoya’s 1996 return to power in Burundithreatened to derail it, however. He declared himself president of a transitional republic and proceeded to usurp power and hamper the emergence of democracy in Burundi. Regional condemnation of his actions led neighboring countries to impose economic sanctions on Burundi.

Meanwhile, Burundi’s army continued to battle Hutu militias. In 1999 regional leaders named

Nelson Mandela facilitator of the Arusha peace process. Under his direction, representatives of the principal Hutu (G-7) and Tutsi (G-10) political parties signed the Arusha Accords in August 2000. However, due to ongoing disagreement between elements with the Hutu and Tutsi factions, the armed rebellion continued.

In November 2001, a three-year transitional government was created. Representing the G-10, Pierre Buyoya assumed the presidency once again and, representing the G-7, Domitien Ndayizeye, became the transitional vice president. Per the agreement that created the transitional government, Ndayizeye assumed the presidency in May 2003. His term was to last for the remaining 18 months of the transitional government's rule. Local and national elections were scheduled to take place in November 2004.

In October 2004, a joint session of the National Assembly and Senate adopted a previously approved draft constitution as an interim constitution. That constitution provided for an extension of transitional institutions until elections were scheduled. In February 2005, Burundians overwhelmingly approved a post-transitional constitution in a popular referendum, setting the stage for local and national elections. These elections took place later in 2005 and placed majority Hutus in positions of power, albeit in a system with provisions for minority Tutsis. At the helm was Pierre Nkurunziza as the new president.

Meanwhile, fighting between Burundi's military and rebel forces continued throughout the country. Hutu rebels continued to perpetuate attacks in the province surrounding the capital, Bujumbura. Various ethnic groups, including the Tutsis, Hutus, Lendus and Hemas, as well as political rebels and various government forces, continued to fight throughout the Great Lakes region, an area that transcends the borders of Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Uganda.

By 2006, the only major insurgent group known to be involved in concerted efforts against the government was the Party for the Liberation of the Hutu People - National Liberation Front (Palipehutu - FNL). By the close of the year, however, the FNL had signed on to the peace agreement. News about an attempted coup d'etat in that same year nevertheless reinvigorated anxieties about the stability of the new government.

Terrorism

Insurgent groups that operate in and around Burundi have perpetuated attacks against civilians. Most of the violence is linked to a longstanding ethnic conflict between Hutus and Tutsis that has enveloped the entire region. Outside of that conflict, Burundi is not a known base of operations for international terrorist organizations.

Defense Forces

Military Data

Military Branches:

Royal Cambodian Armed Forces: Royal Cambodian Army, Royal Khmer Navy, Royal Cambodian Air Force

Eligible age to enter service:

18 for compulsory and voluntary military service

Mandatory Service Terms:

N/A

Manpower in general population-fit for military service:

Males age 16-49: 2,638,167

Females age 16-49: 2,965,328

Manpower reaching eligible age annually:

Males: 151,143

Females: 154,542

Military Expenditures-Percent of GDP:

2%

Chapter 3

Economic Overview

Economic Overview

Overview

Resource-poor and landlocked in Sub-Saharan Africa, Burundi is one of the poorest and least developed countries in the world. The mainstay of the economy is agriculture, contributing to 35 percent of GDP and employing more than 90 percent of the population. Coffee and tea account for 90 percent of Burundi's export earnings, which are vulnerable to adverse weather conditions and fluctuations in world coffee and tea prices.

Burundi is now emerging from more than a decade of civil conflict, which had a significant impact on the country's economy. In May 2008 the government and the last active rebel group (FNL) signed a ceasefire agreement, and in December 2008 a power-sharing agreement was signed with FNL, which is now recognized as a political party. However, security remains fragile, and instability and violence have prevailed to date. Despite a difficult post-conflict environment, Burundi has made steady progress in its macroeconomic performance under the IMF-supported PRGF (Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility) program. Based on that progress, the World Bank and the IMF approved debt relief for Burundi under the MDRI (Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative) in January 2009. By May 2011, Burundi's year-on-year inflation rate fell to 7.5 percent in May compared with 8.4 percent in April, partly due to lower costs of housing, water, energy and household items.

Overall, real GDP growth was estimated to have climbed in 2011. After decelerating to 15 percent by year's end, headline inflation rose sharply in March 2012 to 24.5 percent due to a rise in rents, utility tariffs, and higher food prices. It had eased slightly to 22.7 percent by May 2012. To limit the impact of inflation on the poor, the government eliminated taxes on food products on May 1 until the end of 2012. In April 2012, African finance ministers were facing a host of spillover effects from the euro-zone crisis, namely a decline in aid. "Fifty percent of our budget comes from abroad," Burundi's finance minister, Tabu Abdallah Manirakiza, was quoted as saying in a Reuters article. The hit to aid, combined with rising oil prices, has hurt his country's economy, he said. "The two shocks are having a very negative impact on the budget and economic growth," he was quoted as saying in the Reuters article. In June 2012, Burundi announced plans to cut spending after finding US\$64 million deficit on expected domestic and external revenue for the year that resulted from tax waivers on food and fuel and a major donor suspending aid. Overall, economic growth was less than forecast in 2012 due to lower overall demand and sluggish investment in key sectors. With the consolidation of peace, structural and social reforms have made headway, but investors, especially in the private sector, are still wary. Going forward, the key challenge facing the

country is to maintain macroeconomic stability and achieve sustained growth, which depends on accelerating structural reforms. Besides sustaining the momentum on fiscal governance reforms, the government should continue efforts to reform the coffee sector to improve its competitiveness. Also, EAC (East Africa Community) membership since 2007 should also spur structural reforms to improve the business environment.

Burundi's GDP grew steadily on an annual basis from 2006 to 2013. In December 2013, the IMF projected that Burundi's growth would improve slightly, supported by agriculture, particularly a rebound in coffee production, and construction activity linked to the implementation of major infrastructure projects, including fiber optics, hydropower, and roads. Heavy floods that occurred in 2013 damaged major transport routes, and had the potential to contribute to an uptick in inflation.

Then, in April 2014, the World Bank approved a US\$100 million Jijiand Mulembwe hydropower project in Burundi aimed at boosting electricity supply for jobs, growth and competitiveness. The goal also was to provide Burundians with affordable, clean, reliable, and sustainable energy. Included in the project would be two hydropower stations with a combined 48 megawatts capacity. In Burundi, only four percent of the ten million-large population currently has access to electricity, marking some of the lowest access rates anywhere in the world, according to the World Bank. The project will nearly double the installed generation capacity in Burundi. In October 2014, Burundi had the dubious distinction of topping the Global Hunger Index for the third year in a row.

In early October 2015, Belgium said it would halt some aid to the government of Burundi in protest of President Pierre Nkurunziza's disputed third term as leader. (Burundi gained independence from Belgium in 1962.) The country said it would halt aid programs benefiting the government and instead fund programs to help the country's citizens.

“Aid that we know for sure will benefit the population will be kept,” Alexander De Croo, minister for development aid, was quoted by Reuters as saying.

Economic Performance

Despite rising world food and fuel prices, real GDP growth accelerated from 2007 to 2008 mainly because of a good coffee harvest and more donor-financed investment projects. But growth slowed in 2009 due to falling external demand and world coffee prices as a result of the global economic crisis. before rebounding slightly in 2010.

According to CountryWatch estimated calculations for 2014:

Real GDP growth rate was: 4.5 percent

Inflation was measured at: 11.6 percent

The fiscal deficit/surplus as percent of GDP (%) was: -3.5 percent

Updated in 2015

**Please note that the figures in our Economic Performance section are estimates or forecasts based on IMF-based data that are formulated using CountryWatch models of analysis.*

Supplementary Sources: International Monetary Fund, African Development Bank and Reuters

Nominal GDP and Components

Nominal GDP and Components					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Nominal GDP (LCU billions)	2,970.65	3,566.43	4,221.30	4,784.90	4,785.98
Nominal GDP Growth Rate (%)	19.085	20.056	18.362	13.351	0.0224
Consumption (LCU billions)	2,160.52	2,708.22	3,208.79	3,680.10	4,145.86
Government Expenditure (LCU billions)	831.609	863.400	932.500	1,007.10	1,134.56
Gross Capital Formation (LCU billions)	819.566	1,011.90	1,213.42	1,330.80	701.911
Exports of Goods & Services (LCU billions)	277.866	319.200	312.200	371.700	400.913
Imports of Goods & Services (LCU billions)	1,118.91	1,336.30	1,445.60	1,604.80	1,597.26

Population and GDP Per Capita

Population and GDP Per Capita					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Population, total (million)	8.569	8.775	8.985	9.201	9.422
Population growth (%)	2.402	2.404	2.393	2.404	2.402
Nominal GDP per Capita (LCU 1000s)	346,674.06	406,430.66	469,816.67	520,041.63	507,957.65

Real GDP and Inflation

Real GDP and Inflation					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Real Gross Domestic Product (LCU billions 2005 base)	1,560.20	1,608.99	1,704.22	1,787.19	1,659.14
Real GDP Growth Rate (%)	3.787	3.127	5.918	4.869	-7.1652
GDP Deflator (2005=100.0)	190.402	221.656	247.697	267.733	288.462
Inflation, GDP Deflator (%)	14.740	16.415	11.748	8.089	7.742

Government Spending and Taxation

Government Spending and Taxation					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Government Fiscal Budget (billions)	1,189.46	1,263.66	1,325.58	1,442.14	1,452.05
Fiscal Budget Growth Rate (percentage)	16.440	6.238	4.900	8.793	0.6876
National Tax Rate Net of Transfers (%)	36.087	31.852	29.687	26.692	24.363
Government Revenues Net of Transfers (LCU billions)	1,072.02	1,135.97	1,253.18	1,277.20	1,166.03
Government Surplus(-) Deficit(+) (LCU billions)	-117.4490	-127.6950	-72.3970	-164.9340	-286.0250
Government Surplus(+) Deficit(-) (%GDP)	-3.9536	-3.5805	-1.7150	-3.4470	-5.9763

Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment

Money Supply, Interest Rates and Unemployment					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Money and Quasi-Money (M2) (LCU billions)	710.367	819.626	918.557	1,030.81	1,031.04
Money Supply Growth Rate (%)	5.532	15.381	12.070	12.220	0.0224
Lending Interest Rate (%)	13.232	14.320	15.148	15.668	16.754
Unemployment Rate (%)	8.799	9.425	9.392	9.343	8.528

Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate

Foreign Trade and the Exchange Rate					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Official Exchange Rate (LCU/\$US)	1,252.91	1,420.89	1,550.24	1,546.51	1,611.44
Trade Balance NIPA (\$US billions)	-0.6713	-0.7158	-0.7311	-0.7973	-0.7424
Trade Balance % of GDP	-28.3118	-28.5187	-26.8495	-25.7706	-24.9970
Total Foreign Exchange Reserves (\$US billions)	0.2954	0.3088	0.3293	0.3171	0.3686

Data in US Dollars

Data in US Dollars					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Nominal GDP (\$US billions)	2.371	2.510	2.723	3.094	2.970
Exports (\$US billions)	0.2218	0.2246	0.2014	0.2403	0.2488
Imports (\$US billions)	0.8930	0.9405	0.9325	1.038	0.9912

Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units

Energy Consumption and Production Standard Units					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Petroleum Consumption (TBDP)	1.460	1.456	1.500	1.543	1.587
Petroleum Production (TBDP)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Petroleum Net Exports (TBDP)	-1.4600	-1.4560	-1.5000	-1.5433	-1.5866
Natural Gas Consumption (bcf)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Natural Gas Production (bcf)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Natural Gas Net Exports (bcf)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Consumption (1000s st)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Production (1000s st)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Net Exports (1000s st)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Nuclear Production (bil kwh)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hydroelectric Production (bil kwh)	0.1500	0.2000	0.2090	0.2178	0.2287
Renewables Production (bil kwh)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Energy Consumption and Production QUADS

Energy Consumption and Production QUADS					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Petroleum Consumption (Quads)	0.0031	0.0031	0.0032	0.0033	0.0034
Petroleum Production (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Petroleum Net Exports (Quads)	-0.0031	-0.0031	-0.0032	-0.0033	-0.0034
Natural Gas Consumption (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Natural Gas Production (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Natural Gas Net Exports (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Consumption (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Production (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Net Exports (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Nuclear Production (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Hydroelectric Production (Quads)	0.0015	0.0020	0.0021	0.0022	0.0023
Renewables Production (Quads)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

World Energy Price Summary

World Energy Price Summary					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Petroleum-WTI (\$/bbl)	95.054	94.159	97.943	93.112	48.709
Natural Gas-Henry Hub (\$/mmbtu)	3.999	2.752	3.729	4.369	2.614
Coal Thermal-Australian (\$/mt)	121.448	96.364	84.562	70.130	57.511

CO2 Emissions

CO2 Emissions					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Petroleum Based (mm mt C)	0.0696	0.0695	0.0716	0.0736	0.0757
Natural Gas Based (mm mt C)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Coal Based (mm mt C)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Total CO2 Emissions (mm mt C)	0.0696	0.0695	0.0716	0.0736	0.0757

Agriculture Consumption and Production

Agriculture Consumption and Production					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Corn Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)	140.773	189.003	174.481	137.652	130.593
Corn Production (1000 metric tons)	128.245	140.109	161.755	129.784	120.960
Corn Net Exports (1000 metric tons)	-12.5281	-48.8944	-12.7257	-7.8674	-9.6333
Soybeans Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)	3.300	5.840	3.514	3.648	3.366
Soybeans Production (1000 metric tons)	3.304	2.071	3.493	3.589	3.351
Soybeans Net Exports (1000 metric tons)	0.0043	-3.7688	-0.0213	-0.0590	-0.0149
Rice Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)	91.579	64.698	41.688	67.425	62.331
Rice Production (1000 metric tons)	91.477	64.619	41.436	67.351	62.897
Rice Net Exports (1000 metric tons)	-0.1025	-0.0791	-0.2520	-0.0740	0.5658

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Coffee Total Consumption (metric tons)	24,515.00	62,114.00	24,564.00	17,022.91	16,531.37
Coffee Production (metric tons)	40,600.36	81,150.77	35,628.69	26,640.05	24,133.61
Coffee Net Exports (metric tons)	16,085.36	19,036.77	11,064.69	9,617.14	7,602.24
Cocoa Beans Total Consumption (metric tons)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cocoa Beans Production (metric tons)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cocoa Beans Net Exports (metric tons)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Wheat Total Consumption (1000 metric tons)	20.187	38.556	53.555	94.107	81.661
Wheat Production (1000 metric tons)	9.765	4.218	6.413	5.647	4.699
Wheat Net Exports (1000 metric tons)	-10.4217	-34.3378	-47.1421	-88.4601	-76.9619

World Agriculture Pricing Summary

World Agriculture Pricing Summary					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Corn Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton)	291.684	298.417	259.389	192.881	169.750
Soybeans Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton)	540.667	591.417	538.417	491.771	390.417
Rice Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton)	458.558	525.071	473.989	425.148	386.033
Coffee Pricing Summary (\$/kilogram)	5.976	4.111	3.076	4.424	3.526
Cocoa Beans Pricing Summary (\$/kilogram)	2.980	2.392	2.439	3.062	3.135
Wheat Pricing Summary (\$/metric ton)	316.264	313.242	312.248	284.895	203.177

Metals Consumption and Production

Metals Consumption and Production					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Copper Consumption (1000 mt)	0.3200	0.3172	0.3172	0.3172	0.3172
Copper Production (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Copper Net Exports (1000 mt)	-0.3200	-0.3172	-0.3172	-0.3172	-0.3172
Zinc Consumption (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Zinc Production (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Zinc Exports (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Lead Consumption (1000 mt)	0.3440	0.3440	0.5250	0.4043	0.4043
Lead Production (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Lead Exports (1000 mt)	-0.3440	-0.3440	-0.5250	-0.4043	-0.4043
Tin Consumption (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Tin Production (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Tin Exports (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Nickel Consumption (1000 mt)	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004	0.0004
Nickel Production (1000 mt)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Nickel Exports (1000 mt)	-0.0004	-0.0004	-0.0004	-0.0004	-0.0004
Gold Consumption (kg)	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Gold Production (kg)	372.685	473.556	477.668	524.250	523.893
Gold Exports (kg)	372.685	473.556	477.668	524.250	523.893
Silver Consumption (mt)	286.800	286.800	286.800	286.800	286.800
Silver Production (mt)	212.024	222.469	226.066	233.949	215.006
Silver Exports (mt)	-74.7764	-64.3308	-60.7341	-52.8507	-71.7944

World Metals Pricing Summary

World Metals Pricing Summary					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Copper (\$/mt)	8,828.19	7,962.35	7,332.10	6,863.40	5,510.46
Zinc (\$/mt)	2,193.90	1,950.41	1,910.26	2,160.97	1,931.68
Tin (\$/mt)	26,053.68	21,125.99	22,282.80	21,898.87	16,066.63
Lead (\$/mt)	2,400.81	2,064.64	2,139.79	2,095.46	1,787.82
Nickel (\$/mt)	22,910.36	17,547.55	15,031.80	16,893.38	11,862.64
Gold (\$/oz)	1,569.21	1,669.52	1,411.46	1,265.58	1,160.66
Silver (\$/oz)	35.224	31.137	23.850	19.071	15.721

Economic Performance Index

Economic Performance Index

The Economic Performance rankings are calculated by CountryWatch's editorial team, and are based on criteria including sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus, unemployment and structural imbalances. Scores are assessed from 0 to 100 using this aforementioned criteria as well as CountryWatch's proprietary economic research data and models.

	Bank stability risk	Monetary/ Currency stability	Government Finances	Empl./ Unempl.	Econ.GNP growth or decline/ forecast
	0 - 100	0 - 100	0 - 100	0 - 100	%
North Americas					
Canada	92	69	35	38	3.14%
United States	94	76	4	29	3.01%
Western Europe					
Austria	90	27	30	63	1.33%
Belgium	88	27	19	23	1.15%
Cyprus	81	91	16	80	-0.69%
Denmark	97	70	45	78	1.20%
Finland	89	27	41	33	1.25%

France	87	27	18	27	1.52%
Germany	86	27	22	21	1.25%
Greece	79	27	5	24	-2.00%
Iceland	90	17	2	34	-3.04%
Italy	85	27	37	24	0.84%
Ireland	92	27	11	10	-1.55%
Luxembourg	99	27	28	66	2.08%
Malta	77	27	41	51	0.54%
Netherlands	91	27	26	74	1.30%
Norway	98	44	10	76	1.08%
Portugal	77	27	13	20	0.29%
Spain	83	27	9	3	-0.41%
Sweden	94	72	54	32	1.23%
Switzerland	97	86	55	77	1.53%
United Kingdom	85	12	9	37	1.34%
Central and Eastern Europe					
Albania	44	60	33	6	2.30%
Armenia	45	59	49	30	1.80%

Azerbaijan	56	4	84	99	2.68%
Belarus	59	21	83	98	2.41%
Bosnia and Herzegovina	34	68	69	N/A	0.50%
Bulgaria	58	75	88	49	0.20%
Croatia	69	68	94	9	0.18%
Czech Republic	80	89	29	70	1.67%
Estonia	72	90	66	92	0.80%
Georgia	36	60	53	56	2.00%
Hungary	70	66	26	54	-0.16%
Latvia	67	100	65	44	-3.97%
Lithuania	65	91	87	79	-1.65%
Macedonia (FYR)	53	69	56	2	2.03%
Moldova	23	36	81	67	2.50%
Poland	74	74	38	12	2.72%
Romania	62	56	70	62	0.75%
Russia	73	18	90	8	4.00%
Serbia	48	49	52	5	1.97%

Montenegro	39	27	73	1	-1.70%
Slovak Republic	80	62	30	14	4.06%
Slovenia	81	27	36	65	1.12%
Ukraine	41	11	57	N/A	3.68%
Africa					
Algeria	57	18	96	7	4.55%
Angola	49	1	97	N/A	7.05%
Benin	19	91	20	N/A	3.22%
Botswana	68	58	76	N/A	6.33%
Burkina Faso	16	91	13	N/A	4.41%
Burundi	2	91	6	N/A	3.85%
Cameroon	26	91	91	N/A	2.58%
Cape Verde	52	87	4	N/A	4.96%
Central African Republic	9	91	32	N/A	3.18%
Chad	22	91	89	N/A	4.42%
Congo	52	87	87	N/A	12.13%
Côte d'Ivoire	25	91	82	28	2.98%
Dem. Republic					

Congo	4	91	47	N/A	5.44%
Djibouti	31	76	50	N/A	4.47%
Egypt	37	20	24	69	5.01%
Equatorial Guinea	82	91	85	N/A	0.94%
Eritrea	1	3	1	18	1.81%
Ethiopia	6	45	8	N/A	6.96%
Gabon	64	91	96	N/A	5.36%
Gambia	8	48	86	N/A	4.82%
Ghana	9	11	69	N/A	4.50%
Guinea	10	7	91	N/A	3.03%
Guinea-Bissau	5	91	46	N/A	3.47%
Kenya	20	41	59	N/A	4.11%
Lesotho	13	40	12	N/A	2.98%
Liberia	12	73	74	N/A	5.92%
Libya	73	2	94	N/A	5.22%
Madagascar	4	22	24	N/A	-1.02%
Malawi	7	25	55	N/A	5.96%
Mali	20	91	82	N/A	5.12%

Mauritania	15	13	93	N/A	4.58%
Mauritius	65	52	56	55	4.10%
Morocco	37	72	48	26	3.23%
Mozambique	12	23	71	N/A	6.45%
Namibia	40	39	62	N/A	1.70%
Niger	10	91	21	N/A	4.41%
Nigeria	30	6	61	N/A	6.98%
Rwanda	21	40	68	N/A	5.39%
Sao Tome & Principe	1	61	100	N/A	3.40%
Senegal	24	91	63	N/A	3.44%
Seychelles	60	67	97	N/A	4.01%
Sierra Leone	5	10	39	N/A	4.77%
Somalia	2	38	59	N/A	3.19%
South Africa	61	37	70	N/A	2.59%
Sudan	16	5	73	N/A	5.52%
Swaziland	32	44	79	N/A	1.09%
Tanzania	15	45	32	N/A	6.17%
Togo	8	91	92	N/A	2.56%

Tunisia	50	61	44	39	4.00%
Uganda	11	17	54	N/A	5.59%
Zambia	29	20	49	N/A	5.84%
Zimbabwe	0	8	16	N/A	2.24%
South and Central America					
Argentina	66	3	80	36	3.50%
Belize	47	76	80	N/A	1.00%
Bolivia	32	51	61	81	3.99%
Brazil	71	47	78	11	5.50%
Chile	78	25	92	73	4.72%
Columbia	47	52	34	47	2.25%
Costa Rica	60	42	39	57	3.45%
Ecuador	43	76	75	64	2.51%
El Salvador	35	76	67	N/A	1.04%
Guatemala	46	59	58	N/A	2.52%
Honduras	27	47	58	N/A	2.00%
Mexico	69	42	52	61	4.07%
Nicaragua	23	49	42	N/A	1.75%

Panama	66	76	72	45	5.00%
Paraguay	35	46	66	16	5.27%
Peru	59	66	75	22	6.33%
Suriname	58	26	81	59	4.02%
Uruguay	70	26	27	N/A	5.71%
Venezuela	55	1	28	13	-2.63%
Caribbean					
Antigua & Barbuda	72	76	15	N/A	-2.01%
Bahamas	74	76	45	87	-0.50%
Barbados	67	76	33	15	-0.50%
Bermuda	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cuba	45	76	18	95	0.25%
Dominica	53	76	65	N/A	1.40%
Dominican Republic	54	39	43	4	3.50%
Grenada	63	76	48	N/A	0.80%
Guyana	28	56	17	N/A	4.36%
Haiti	11	27	89	N/A	-8.50%
Jamaica	42	9	85	19	-0.28%

St Lucia	55	76	67	N/A	1.14%
St Vincent & Grenadines	49	76	95	N/A	0.50%
Trinidad & Tobago	82	37	77	72	2.13%
Middle East					
Bahrain	84	76	62	91	3.48%
Iran	51	19	40	58	3.01%
Iraq	48	9	8	N/A	7.27%
Israel	87	62	12	48	3.20%
Jordan	41	51	3	N/A	4.10%
Kuwait	96	4	99	N/A	3.10%
Lebanon	63	54	2	N/A	6.00%
Oman	76	16	88	N/A	4.71%
Qatar	99	16	83	N/A	18.54%
Saudi Arabia	76	8	98	N/A	3.70%
Syria	61	24	40	N/A	5.00%
Turkey	75	23	27	60	5.20%
United Arab Emirates	96	24	98	94	1.29%

Yemen	28	2	78	N/A	7.78%
Asia					
Afghanistan	17	70	74	N/A	8.64%
Bangladesh	13	43	25	N/A	5.38%
Bhutan	24	55	5	N/A	6.85%
Brunei	78	19	99	75	0.48%
Cambodia	18	67	42	N/A	4.77%
China	54	90	19	68	11.03%
Hong Kong	89	76	14	82	5.02%
India	31	38	34	35	8.78%
Indonesia	42	46	37	31	6.00%
Japan	88	89	6	71	1.90%
Kazakhstan	62	13	76	42	2.40%
Korea North	18	65	23	N/A	1.50%
Korea South	83	63	22	85	4.44%
Kyrgyz Republic	24	15	84	88	4.61%
Laos	17	54	7	N/A	7.22%
Macao	91	76	14	82	3.00%

Malaysia	68	65	44	90	4.72%
Maldives	44	55	17	N/A	3.45%
Mongolia	33	5	77	93	7.22%
Myanmar	3	41	72	N/A	5.26%
Nepal	3	14	25	N/A	2.97%
Pakistan	19	15	31	41	3.00%
Papua New Guinea	75	50	11	N/A	7.96%
Philippines	30	48	53	43	3.63%
Singapore	93	75	63	40	5.68%
Sri Lanka	38	22	10	N/A	5.50%
Taiwan	84	88	35	89	6.50%
Tajikistan	6	6	60	97	4.00%
Thailand	56	64	90	96	5.46%
Turkmenistan	51	53	68	N/A	12.00%
Uzbekistan	40	10	60	100	8.00%
Vietnam	25	12	20	N/A	6.04%
Pacific					
Australia	96	63	31	46	2.96%

Fiji	46	53	3	N/A	2.06%
Marshall Islands	27	76	46	N/A	1.08%
Micronesia (Fed. States)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Caledonia	96	73	51	52	2.00%
New Zealand	98	73	51	52	2.00%
Samoa	34	88	64	N/A	-2.77%
Solomon Islands	14	71	1	N/A	3.36%
Tonga	26	57	38	N/A	0.60%
Vanuatu	33	58	47	N/A	3.80%

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

This material was produced in 2010; it is subject to updating in 2012.

div style='margin-top:40%;padding-top:40%>

Chapter 4

Investment Overview

Foreign Investment Climate

Background

Burundi is a landlocked, resource-poor country with an underdeveloped manufacturing sector. The economy is predominantly agricultural which accounts for about 35% of GDP and employs more than 90% of the population. Burundi's primary exports are coffee and tea, which account for 90% of foreign exchange earnings, though exports are a relatively small share of GDP. Burundi's export earning - and its ability to pay for imports - rests primarily on weather conditions and international coffee and tea prices. The Tutsi minority, 14% of the population, dominates the coffee trade. An ethnic-based war that lasted for over a decade resulted in more than 200,000 deaths, forced more than 48,000 refugees into Tanzania, and displaced 140,000 others internally. Only one in two children go to school, and approximately one in 15 adults has HIV/AIDS. Food, medicine, and electricity remain in short supply. Political stability and the end of the civil war have improved aid flows and economic activity has increased, but underlying weaknesses - a high poverty rate, poor education rates, a weak legal system, and low administrative capacity - risk undermining planned economic reforms. Burundi will continue to remain heavily dependent on aid from bilateral and multilateral donors; the delay of funds after a corruption scandal cut off bilateral aid in 2007 reduced government's revenues and its ability to pay salaries. Burundi joined the East African Community, which should boost Burundi's regional trade ties. Burundi's main challenge to economic growth will be maintaining sufficient fiscal discipline and peace during the upcoming national elections in 2010 (see "Political Conditions" for details).

Foreign Investment Assessment

The government generally encourages foreign investment, granting priority status to projects that stand to increase exports from Burundi and those that employ nationals. Investment policies re covered under the 1979 Investment Code, amended in 1989. Foreign investors face major obstacles in Burundi, including rampant poverty, a lack of infrastructure, political instability, and a high HIV/AIDS infection rate.

Industries

Light consumer goods such as blankets, shoes, soap; assembly of imported components; public works construction; food processing

Import Commodities

Capital goods, petroleum products, foodstuffs

Import Partners

Kenya 14.6%, Tanzania 11.5%, Uganda 5.7%, France 5.1%, Zambia 5.1%, China 4.5%, India 4.5%, Japan 4.5% (2003)

Export Commodities

Coffee, tea, sugar, cotton, hides

Export Partners

Switzerland 31.6%, UK 15.8%, Netherlands 5.3%, Rwanda 5.3%

Ports and Harbors

Bujumbura

Telephone System

Generally rudimentary; country code: 257

Internet Users

14,000 in recent years

Labor Force

2.99 million; agriculture 93.6%, industry 2.3%, services 4.1%

Judicial System

Burundi's legal system is based on German and Belgian civil codes and customary law. Burundi has not accepted compulsory ICJ jurisdiction

Corruption Perception Ranking

See Corruption Perception index reported by Transparency International elsewhere in this report, from least to most corrupt countries. Typically, Burundi is regarded as one of the world's more corrupt countries, according to this index.

Cultural Considerations

Foreign visitors should be cognizant of and sensitive to ethnic differences. Most of Burundi's population is divided among Bahutus (Hutus) and Batutsis (Tutsis).

Country Website (s)

www.burundi-gov.org/

Foreign Investment Index

Foreign Investment Index

The Foreign Investment Index is a proprietary index measuring attractiveness to international investment flows. The Foreign Investment Index is calculated using an established methodology by CountryWatch's Editor-in-Chief and is based on a given country's economic stability (sustained economic growth, monetary stability, current account deficits, budget surplus), economic risk (risk of non-servicing of payments for goods or services, loans and trade-related finance, risk of sovereign default), business and investment climate (property rights, labor force and laws,

regulatory transparency, openness to foreign investment, market conditions, and stability of government). Scores are assigned from 0-10 using the aforementioned criteria. A score of 0 marks the lowest level of foreign investment viability, while a score of 10 marks the highest level of foreign investment viability, according to this proprietary index.

Country	Assessment
Afghanistan	2
Albania	4.5
Algeria	6
Andorra	9
Angola	4.5-5
Antigua	8.5
Argentina	5
Armenia	5
Australia	9.5
Austria	9-9.5
Azerbaijan	5
Bahamas	9
Bahrain	7.5

Bangladesh	4.5
Barbados	9
Belarus	4
Belgium	9
Belize	7.5
Benin	5.5
Bhutan	4.5
Bolivia	4.5
Bosnia-Herzegovina	5
Botswana	7.5-8
Brazil	8
Brunei	7
Bulgaria	5.5
Burkina Faso	4
Burma (Myanmar)	4.5
Burundi	4
Cambodia	4.5
Cameroon	5

Canada	9.5
Cape Verde	6
Central African Republic	3
Chad	4
Chile	9
China	7.5
China: Hong Kong	8.5
China: Taiwan	8.5
Colombia	7
Comoros	4
Congo DRC	4
Congo RC	5
Costa Rica	8
Cote d'Ivoire	4.5
Croatia	7
Cuba	4.5
Cyprus	7
Czech Republic	8.5

Denmark	9.5
Djibouti	4.5
Dominica	6
Dominican Republic	6.5
East Timor	4.5
Ecuador	5.5
Egypt	4.5-5
El Salvador	6
Equatorial Guinea	4.5
Eritrea	3.5
Estonia	8
Ethiopia	4.5
Fiji	5
Finland	9
Former Yugoslav Rep. of Macedonia	5
France	9-9.5
Gabon	5.5
Gambia	5

Georgia	5
Germany	9-9.5
Ghana	5.5
Greece	5
Grenada	7.5
Guatemala	5.5
Guinea	3.5
Guinea-Bissau	3.5
Guyana	4.5
Haiti	4
Holy See (Vatican)	n/a
Hong Kong (China)	8.5
Honduras	5.5
Hungary	8
Iceland	8-8.5
India	8
Indonesia	5.5
Iran	4

Iraq	3
Ireland	8
Israel	8.5
Italy	8
Jamaica	5.5
Japan	9.5
Jordan	6
Kazakhstan	6
Kenya	5
Kiribati	5.5
Korea, North	1
Korea, South	9
Kosovo	4.5
Kuwait	8.5
Kyrgyzstan	4.5
Laos	4
Latvia	7
Lebanon	5

Lesotho	5.5
Liberia	3.5
Libya	3
Liechtenstein	9
Lithuania	7.5
Luxembourg	9-9.5
Madagascar	4.5
Malawi	4.5
Malaysia	8.5
Maldives	6.5
Mali	5
Malta	9
Marshall Islands	5
Mauritania	4.5
Mauritius	7.5-8
Mexico	6.5-7
Micronesia	5
Moldova	4.5-5

Monaco	9
Mongolia	5
Montenegro	5.5
Morocco	7.5
Mozambique	5
Namibia	7.5
Nauru	4.5
Nepal	4
Netherlands	9-9.5
New Zealand	9.5
Nicaragua	5
Niger	4.5
Nigeria	4.5
Norway	9-9.5
Oman	8
Pakistan	4
Palau	4.5-5
Panama	7

Papua New Guinea	5
Paraguay	6
Peru	6
Philippines	6
Poland	8
Portugal	7.5-8
Qatar	9
Romania	6-6.5
Russia	6
Rwanda	4
Saint Kitts and Nevis	8
Saint Lucia	8
Saint Vincent and Grenadines	7
Samoa	7
San Marino	8.5
Sao Tome and Principe	4.5-5
Saudi Arabia	7
Senegal	6

Serbia	6
Seychelles	5
Sierra Leone	4
Singapore	9.5
Slovak Republic (Slovakia)	8.5
Slovenia	8.5-9
Solomon Islands	5
Somalia	2
South Africa	8
Spain	7.5-8
Sri Lanka	5.5
Sudan	4
Suriname	5
Swaziland	4.5
Sweden	9.5
Switzerland	9.5
Syria	2.5
Tajikistan	4

Taiwan (China)	8.5
Tanzania	5
Thailand	7.5-8
Togo	4.5-5
Tonga	5.5-6
Trinidad and Tobago	8-8.5
Tunisia	6
Turkey	6.5-7
Turkmenistan	4
Tuvalu	7
Uganda	5
Ukraine	4.5-5
United Arab Emirates	8.5
United Kingdom	9
United States	9
Uruguay	6.5-7
Uzbekistan	4
Vanuatu	6

Venezuela	5
Vietnam	5.5
Yemen	3
Zambia	4.5-5
Zimbabwe	3.5

Editor's Note:

As of 2015, the global economic crisis (emerging in 2008) had affected many countries across the world, resulting in changes to their rankings. Among those countries affected were top tier economies, such as the [United Kingdom](#), [Iceland](#), [Switzerland](#) and [Austria](#). However, in all these cases, their rankings have moved back upward in the last couple of years as anxieties have eased. Other top tier countries, such as [Spain](#), [Portugal](#), [Ireland](#), and [Italy](#), suffered some effects due to debt woes and the concomitant effect on the euro zone. Greece, another euro zone nation, was also downgraded due to its sovereign debt crisis; however, Greece's position on the precipice of default incurred a sharper downgrade than the other four euro zone countries mentioned above. Cyprus' exposure to Greek bank yielded a downgrade in its case. Slovenia and [Latvia](#) have been slightly downgraded due to a mix of economic and political concerns but could easily be upgraded in a future assessment, should these concerns abate. Meanwhile, the crisis in eastern [Ukraine](#) fueled downgrades in that country and neighboring [Russia](#).

Despite the "trifecta of tragedy" in [Japan](#) in 2011 -- the earthquake, the ensuing tsunami, and the resulting nuclear crisis -- and the appreciable destabilization of the economic and political terrain therein, this country has only slightly been downgraded. Japan's challenges have been assessed to be transient, the government remains accountable, and there is little risk of default. Both [India](#) and China retain their rankings; [India](#) holds a slightly higher ranking than [China](#) due to its record of democratic representation and accountability.

There were shifts in opposite directions for [Mali](#) and [Nigeria](#) versus the [Central African Republic](#), [Burkina Faso](#), and [Burundi](#). [Mali](#) was slightly upgraded due to its efforts to return to constitutional order following the 2012 coup and to neutralize the threat of separatists and Islamists. Likewise, a new government in [Nigeria](#) generated a slight upgrade as the country attempts to confront corruption, crime, and terrorism. But the [Central African Republic](#) was downgraded due to the

takeover of the government by Seleka rebels and the continued decline into lawlessness in that country. Likewise, the attempts by the leaders of [Burundi](#) and [Burkina Faso](#) to hold onto power by by-passing the constitution raised eyebrows and resulted in downgrades.

Political unrest in [Libya](#) and [Algeria](#) have contributed to a decision to marginally downgrade these countries as well. [Syria](#) incurred a sharper downgrade due to the devolution into de facto civil war and the dire security threat posed by Islamist terrorists. [Iraq](#) saw a similar downgrade as a result of the takeover of wide swaths of territory and the threat of genocide at the hands of Islamist terrorists. [Yemen](#), likewise, has been downgraded due to political instability at the hands of secessionists, terrorists, Houthi rebels, and the intervention of external parties. Conversely, [Egypt](#) and [Tunisia](#) saw slight upgrades as their political environments stabilize.

At the low end of the spectrum, devolving security conditions and/or economic crisis have resulted in countries like [Pakistan](#), [Afghanistan](#), [Somalia](#), and [Zimbabwe](#) maintaining their low ratings.

The [United States](#) continues to retain its previous slight downgrade due to the enduring threat of default surrounding the debt ceiling in that country, matched by a conflict-ridden political climate. In the case of [Mexico](#), there is limited concern about default, but increasing alarm over the security situation in that country and the government's ability to contain it. In [Argentina](#), a default to bond holders resulted in a downgrade to that country. Finally, a small but significant upgrade was attributed to [Cuba](#) due to its recent pro-business reforms and its normalization of ties with the United States.

Source:

CountryWatch Inc. www.countrywatch.com

Updated:

2015

Corruption Perceptions Index

Corruption Perceptions Index

Transparency International: [Corruption Perceptions Index](#)

Editor's Note:

Transparency International's [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) is a composite index which ranks countries in terms of the degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials. This index indicates the views of national and international business people and analysts about the levels of corruption in each country. The highest (and best) level of transparency is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

Rank	Country/Territory	CPI 2009 Score	Surveys Used	Confidence Range
1	New Zealand	9.4	6	9.1 - 9.5
2	Denmark	9.3	6	9.1 - 9.5
3	Singapore	9.2	9	9.0 - 9.4
3	Sweden	9.2	6	9.0 - 9.3
5	Switzerland	9.0	6	8.9 - 9.1
6	Finland	8.9	6	8.4 - 9.4
6	Netherlands	8.9	6	8.7 - 9.0
8	Australia	8.7	8	8.3 - 9.0
8	Canada	8.7	6	8.5 - 9.0
8	Iceland	8.7	4	7.5 - 9.4
11	Norway	8.6	6	8.2 - 9.1
12	Hong Kong	8.2	8	7.9 - 8.5
12	Luxembourg	8.2	6	7.6 - 8.8

14	Germany	8.0	6	7.7 - 8.3
14	Ireland	8.0	6	7.8 - 8.4
16	Austria	7.9	6	7.4 - 8.3
17	Japan	7.7	8	7.4 - 8.0
17	United Kingdom	7.7	6	7.3 - 8.2
19	United States	7.5	8	6.9 - 8.0
20	Barbados	7.4	4	6.6 - 8.2
21	Belgium	7.1	6	6.9 - 7.3
22	Qatar	7.0	6	5.8 - 8.1
22	Saint Lucia	7.0	3	6.7 - 7.5
24	France	6.9	6	6.5 - 7.3
25	Chile	6.7	7	6.5 - 6.9
25	Uruguay	6.7	5	6.4 - 7.1
27	Cyprus	6.6	4	6.1 - 7.1
27	Estonia	6.6	8	6.1 - 6.9
27	Slovenia	6.6	8	6.3 - 6.9
30	United Arab Emirates	6.5	5	5.5 - 7.5
31	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	6.4	3	4.9 - 7.5

32	Israel	6.1	6	5.4 - 6.7
32	Spain	6.1	6	5.5 - 6.6
34	Dominica	5.9	3	4.9 - 6.7
35	Portugal	5.8	6	5.5 - 6.2
35	Puerto Rico	5.8	4	5.2 - 6.3
37	Botswana	5.6	6	5.1 - 6.3
37	Taiwan	5.6	9	5.4 - 5.9
39	Brunei Darussalam	5.5	4	4.7 - 6.4
39	Oman	5.5	5	4.4 - 6.5
39	Korea (South)	5.5	9	5.3 - 5.7
42	Mauritius	5.4	6	5.0 - 5.9
43	Costa Rica	5.3	5	4.7 - 5.9
43	Macau	5.3	3	3.3 - 6.9
45	Malta	5.2	4	4.0 - 6.2
46	Bahrain	5.1	5	4.2 - 5.8
46	Cape Verde	5.1	3	3.3 - 7.0
46	Hungary	5.1	8	4.6 - 5.7
49	Bhutan	5.0	4	4.3 - 5.6

49	Jordan	5.0	7	3.9 - 6.1
49	Poland	5.0	8	4.5 - 5.5
52	Czech Republic	4.9	8	4.3 - 5.6
52	Lithuania	4.9	8	4.4 - 5.4
54	Seychelles	4.8	3	3.0 - 6.7
55	South Africa	4.7	8	4.3 - 4.9
56	Latvia	4.5	6	4.1 - 4.9
56	Malaysia	4.5	9	4.0 - 5.1
56	Namibia	4.5	6	3.9 - 5.1
56	Samoa	4.5	3	3.3 - 5.3
56	Slovakia	4.5	8	4.1 - 4.9
61	Cuba	4.4	3	3.5 - 5.1
61	Turkey	4.4	7	3.9 - 4.9
63	Italy	4.3	6	3.8 - 4.9
63	Saudi Arabia	4.3	5	3.1 - 5.3
65	Tunisia	4.2	6	3.0 - 5.5
66	Croatia	4.1	8	3.7 - 4.5
66	Georgia	4.1	7	3.4 - 4.7

66	Kuwait	4.1	5	3.2 - 5.1
69	Ghana	3.9	7	3.2 - 4.6
69	Montenegro	3.9	5	3.5 - 4.4
71	Bulgaria	3.8	8	3.2 - 4.5
71	FYR Macedonia	3.8	6	3.4 - 4.2
71	Greece	3.8	6	3.2 - 4.3
71	Romania	3.8	8	3.2 - 4.3
75	Brazil	3.7	7	3.3 - 4.3
75	Colombia	3.7	7	3.1 - 4.3
75	Peru	3.7	7	3.4 - 4.1
75	Suriname	3.7	3	3.0 - 4.7
79	Burkina Faso	3.6	7	2.8 - 4.4
79	China	3.6	9	3.0 - 4.2
79	Swaziland	3.6	3	3.0 - 4.7
79	Trinidad and Tobago	3.6	4	3.0 - 4.3
83	Serbia	3.5	6	3.3 - 3.9
84	El Salvador	3.4	5	3.0 - 3.8
84	Guatemala	3.4	5	3.0 - 3.9

84	India	3.4	10	3.2 - 3.6
84	Panama	3.4	5	3.1 - 3.7
84	Thailand	3.4	9	3.0 - 3.8
89	Lesotho	3.3	6	2.8 - 3.8
89	Malawi	3.3	7	2.7 - 3.9
89	Mexico	3.3	7	3.2 - 3.5
89	Moldova	3.3	6	2.7 - 4.0
89	Morocco	3.3	6	2.8 - 3.9
89	Rwanda	3.3	4	2.9 - 3.7
95	Albania	3.2	6	3.0 - 3.3
95	Vanuatu	3.2	3	2.3 - 4.7
97	Liberia	3.1	3	1.9 - 3.8
97	Sri Lanka	3.1	7	2.8 - 3.4
99	Bosnia and Herzegovina	3.0	7	2.6 - 3.4
99	Dominican Republic	3.0	5	2.9 - 3.2
99	Jamaica	3.0	5	2.8 - 3.3
99	Madagascar	3.0	7	2.8 - 3.2
99	Senegal	3.0	7	2.5 - 3.6

99	Tonga	3.0	3	2.6 - 3.3
99	Zambia	3.0	7	2.8 - 3.2
106	Argentina	2.9	7	2.6 - 3.1
106	Benin	2.9	6	2.3 - 3.4
106	Gabon	2.9	3	2.6 - 3.1
106	Gambia	2.9	5	1.6 - 4.0
106	Niger	2.9	5	2.7 - 3.0
111	Algeria	2.8	6	2.5 - 3.1
111	Djibouti	2.8	4	2.3 - 3.2
111	Egypt	2.8	6	2.6 - 3.1
111	Indonesia	2.8	9	2.4 - 3.2
111	Kiribati	2.8	3	2.3 - 3.3
111	Mali	2.8	6	2.4 - 3.2
111	Sao Tome and Principe	2.8	3	2.4 - 3.3
111	Solomon Islands	2.8	3	2.3 - 3.3
111	Togo	2.8	5	1.9 - 3.9
120	Armenia	2.7	7	2.6 - 2.8
120	Bolivia	2.7	6	2.4 - 3.1

120	Ethiopia	2.7	7	2.4 - 2.9
120	Kazakhstan	2.7	7	2.1 - 3.3
120	Mongolia	2.7	7	2.4 - 3.0
120	Vietnam	2.7	9	2.4 - 3.1
126	Eritrea	2.6	4	1.6 - 3.8
126	Guyana	2.6	4	2.5 - 2.7
126	Syria	2.6	5	2.2 - 2.9
126	Tanzania	2.6	7	2.4 - 2.9
130	Honduras	2.5	6	2.2 - 2.8
130	Lebanon	2.5	3	1.9 - 3.1
130	Libya	2.5	6	2.2 - 2.8
130	Maldives	2.5	4	1.8 - 3.2
130	Mauritania	2.5	7	2.0 - 3.3
130	Mozambique	2.5	7	2.3 - 2.8
130	Nicaragua	2.5	6	2.3 - 2.7
130	Nigeria	2.5	7	2.2 - 2.7
130	Uganda	2.5	7	2.1 - 2.8
139	Bangladesh	2.4	7	2.0 - 2.8

139	Belarus	2.4	4	2.0 - 2.8
139	Pakistan	2.4	7	2.1 - 2.7
139	Philippines	2.4	9	2.1 - 2.7
143	Azerbaijan	2.3	7	2.0 - 2.6
143	Comoros	2.3	3	1.6 - 3.3
143	Nepal	2.3	6	2.0 - 2.6
146	Cameroon	2.2	7	1.9 - 2.6
146	Ecuador	2.2	5	2.0 - 2.5
146	Kenya	2.2	7	1.9 - 2.5
146	Russia	2.2	8	1.9 - 2.4
146	Sierra Leone	2.2	5	1.9 - 2.4
146	Timor-Leste	2.2	5	1.8 - 2.6
146	Ukraine	2.2	8	2.0 - 2.6
146	Zimbabwe	2.2	7	1.7 - 2.8
154	Côte d'Ivoire	2.1	7	1.8 - 2.4
154	Papua New Guinea	2.1	5	1.7 - 2.5
154	Paraguay	2.1	5	1.7 - 2.5
154	Yemen	2.1	4	1.6 - 2.5

158	Cambodia	2.0	8	1.8 - 2.2
158	Central African Republic	2.0	4	1.9 - 2.2
158	Laos	2.0	4	1.6 - 2.6
158	Tajikistan	2.0	8	1.6 - 2.5
162	Angola	1.9	5	1.8 - 1.9
162	Congo Brazzaville	1.9	5	1.6 - 2.1
162	Democratic Republic of Congo	1.9	5	1.7 - 2.1
162	Guinea-Bissau	1.9	3	1.8 - 2.0
162	Kyrgyzstan	1.9	7	1.8 - 2.1
162	Venezuela	1.9	7	1.8 - 2.0
168	Burundi	1.8	6	1.6 - 2.0
168	Equatorial Guinea	1.8	3	1.6 - 1.9
168	Guinea	1.8	5	1.7 - 1.8
168	Haiti	1.8	3	1.4 - 2.3
168	Iran	1.8	3	1.7 - 1.9
168	Turkmenistan	1.8	4	1.7 - 1.9
174	Uzbekistan	1.7	6	1.5 - 1.8
175	Chad	1.6	6	1.5 - 1.7

176	Iraq	1.5	3	1.2 - 1.8
176	Sudan	1.5	5	1.4 - 1.7
178	Myanmar	1.4	3	0.9 - 1.8
179	Afghanistan	1.3	4	1.0 - 1.5
180	Somalia	1.1	3	0.9 - 1.4

Methodology:

As noted above, the highest (and best) level of transparency with the least perceived corruption is indicated by the number, 10. The lower (and worse) levels of transparency are indicated by lower numbers.

According to Transparency International, the [Corruption Perceptions Index](#) (CPI) table shows a country's ranking and score, the number of surveys used to determine the score, and the confidence range of the scoring.

The rank shows how one country compares to others included in the index. The CPI score indicates the perceived level of public-sector corruption in a country/territory.

The CPI is based on 13 independent surveys. However, not all surveys include all countries. The surveys used column indicates how many surveys were relied upon to determine the score for that country.

The confidence range indicates the reliability of the CPI scores and tells us that allowing for a margin of error, we can be 90% confident that the true score for this country lies within this range.

Note:

Kosovo, which separated from the Yugoslav successor state of [Serbia](#), is not listed above. No calculation is available for [Kosovo](#) at this time, however, a future corruption index by Transparency International may include the world's newest country in its tally. Taiwan has been listed above despite its contested status; while Taiwan claims sovereign status, [China](#) claims ultimate jurisdiction over Taiwan. Hong Kong, which is also under the rubric of Chinese

sovereignty, is listed above. Note as well that Puerto Rico, which is a [United States](#) domain, is also included in the list above. These inclusions likely have to do with the size and fairly autonomous status of their economies.

Source:

Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index; available at URL: <http://www.transparency.org>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

Competitiveness Ranking

Competitiveness Ranking

Editor's Note:

The Global Competitiveness Report's competitiveness ranking is based on the Global Competitiveness Index (GCI), which was developed for the World Economic Forum. The GCI is based on a number of competitiveness considerations, and provides a comprehensive picture of the competitiveness landscape in countries around the world. The competitiveness considerations are: institutions, infrastructure, macroeconomic environment, health and primary education, higher education and training, goods market efficiency, labour market efficiency, financial market development, technological readiness, market size, business sophistication, and innovation. The rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey.

Country/Economy	GCI 2010 Rank	GCI 2010 Score	GCI 2009 Rank	Change 2009-2010
Switzerland	1	5.63	1	0
Sweden	2	5.56	4	2
Singapore	3	5.48	3	0

United States	4	5.43	2	-2
Germany	5	5.39	7	2
Japan	6	5.37	8	2
Finland	7	5.37	6	-1
Netherlands	8	5.33	10	2
Denmark	9	5.32	5	-4
Canada	10	5.30	9	-1
Hong Kong SAR	11	5.30	11	0
United Kingdom	12	5.25	13	1
Taiwan, China	13	5.21	12	-1
Norway	14	5.14	14	0
France	15	5.13	16	1
Australia	16	5.11	15	-1
Qatar	17	5.10	22	5
Austria	18	5.09	17	-1
Belgium	19	5.07	18	-1
Luxembourg	20	5.05	21	1
Saudi Arabia	21	4.95	28	7

Korea, Rep.	22	4.93	19	-3
New Zealand	23	4.92	20	-3
Israel	24	4.91	27	3
United Arab Emirates	25	4.89	23	-2
Malaysia	26	4.88	24	-2
China	27	4.84	29	2
Brunei Darussalam	28	4.75	32	4
Ireland	29	4.74	25	-4
Chile	30	4.69	30	0
Iceland	31	4.68	26	-5
Tunisia	32	4.65	40	8
Estonia	33	4.61	35	2
Oman	34	4.61	41	7
Kuwait	35	4.59	39	4
Czech Republic	36	4.57	31	-5
Bahrain	37	4.54	38	1
Thailand	38	4.51	36	-2
Poland	39	4.51	46	7

Cyprus	40	4.50	34	-6
Puerto Rico	41	4.49	42	1
Spain	42	4.49	33	-9
Barbados	43	4.45	44	1
Indonesia	44	4.43	54	10
Slovenia	45	4.42	37	-8
Portugal	46	4.38	43	-3
Lithuania	47	4.38	53	6
Italy	48	4.37	48	0
Montenegro	49	4.36	62	13
Malta	50	4.34	52	2
India	51	4.33	49	-2
Hungary	52	4.33	58	6
Panama	53	4.33	59	6
South Africa	54	4.32	45	-9
Mauritius	55	4.32	57	2
Costa Rica	56	4.31	55	-1
Azerbaijan	57	4.29	51	-6

Brazil	58	4.28	56	-2
Vietnam	59	4.27	75	16
Slovak Republic	60	4.25	47	-13
Turkey	61	4.25	61	0
Sri Lanka	62	4.25	79	17
Russian Federation	63	4.24	63	0
Uruguay	64	4.23	65	1
Jordan	65	4.21	50	-15
Mexico	66	4.19	60	-6
Romania	67	4.16	64	-3
Colombia	68	4.14	69	1
Iran	69	4.14	n/a	n/a
Latvia	70	4.14	68	-2
Bulgaria	71	4.13	76	5
Kazakhstan	72	4.12	67	-5
Peru	73	4.11	78	5
Namibia	74	4.09	74	0
Morocco	75	4.08	73	-2

Botswana	76	4.05	66	-10
Croatia	77	4.04	72	-5
Guatemala	78	4.04	80	2
Macedonia, FYR	79	4.02	84	5
Rwanda	80	4.00	n/a	n/a
Egypt	81	4.00	70	-11
El Salvador	82	3.99	77	-5
Greece	83	3.99	71	-12
Trinidad and Tobago	84	3.97	86	2
Philippines	85	3.96	87	2
Algeria	86	3.96	83	-3
Argentina	87	3.95	85	-2
Albania	88	3.94	96	8
Ukraine	89	3.90	82	-7
Gambia, The	90	3.90	81	-9
Honduras	91	3.89	89	-2
Lebanon	92	3.89	n/a	n/a
Georgia	93	3.86	90	-3

Moldova	94	3.86	n/a	n/a
Jamaica	95	3.85	91	-4
Serbia	96	3.84	93	-3
Syria	97	3.79	94	-3
Armenia	98	3.76	97	-1
Mongolia	99	3.75	117	18
Libya	100	3.74	88	-12
Dominican Republic	101	3.72	95	-6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	102	3.70	109	7
Benin	103	3.69	103	0
Senegal	104	3.67	92	-12
Ecuador	105	3.65	105	0
Kenya	106	3.65	98	-8
Bangladesh	107	3.64	106	-1
Bolivia	108	3.64	120	12
Cambodia	109	3.63	110	1
Guyana	110	3.62	104	-6
Cameroon	111	3.58	111	0

Nicaragua	112	3.57	115	3
Tanzania	113	3.56	100	-13
Ghana	114	3.56	114	0
Zambia	115	3.55	112	-3
Tajikistan	116	3.53	122	6
Cape Verde	117	3.51	n/a	n/a
Uganda	118	3.51	108	-10
Ethiopia	119	3.51	118	-1
Paraguay	120	3.49	124	4
Kyrgyz Republic	121	3.49	123	2
Venezuela	122	3.48	113	-9
Pakistan	123	3.48	101	-22
Madagascar	124	3.46	121	-3
Malawi	125	3.45	119	-6
Swaziland	126	3.40	n/a	n/a
Nigeria	127	3.38	99	-28
Lesotho	128	3.36	107	-21
Côte d'Ivoire	129	3.35	116	-13

Nepal	130	3.34	125	-5
Mozambique	131	3.32	129	-2
Mali	132	3.28	130	-2
Timor-Leste	133	3.23	126	-7
Burkina Faso	134	3.20	128	-6
Mauritania	135	3.14	127	-8
Zimbabwe	136	3.03	132	-4
Burundi	137	2.96	133	-4
Angola	138	2.93	n/a	n/a
Chad	139	2.73	131	-8

Methodology:

The competitiveness rankings are calculated from both publicly available data and the Executive Opinion Survey, a comprehensive annual survey conducted by the World Economic Forum together with its network of Partner Institutes (leading research institutes and business organizations) in the countries covered by the Report.

Highlights according to WEF --

- The [United States](#) falls two places to fourth position, overtaken by [Sweden](#) and [Singapore](#) in the rankings of the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report 2010-2011
- The People's Republic of [China](#) continues to move up the rankings, with marked improvements in several other Asian countries
- [Germany](#) moves up two places to fifth place, leading the Eurozone countries
- [Switzerland](#) tops the rankings

Source:

World Economic Forum; available at URL: <http://www.weforum.org>

Updated:

2011 using most recent ranking available; reviewed in 2015.

Taxation

Corporate tax

There is a corporate tax of 35 percent on taxable income.

Sales tax

There is a sales tax of 17 percent.

Other taxes

- social security contributions 3.9 percent of gross salaries
- health insurance contributions three percent of gross salaries

Stock Market

There is currently no stock market in Burundi.

Partner Links

Partner Links

Chapter 5

Social Overview

People

Population

With more than nine million inhabitants across the country, Burundi's urban population has grown at a rate of 2.3 percent annually, though it still represents only eight percent of the population. The population growth rate for the whole country is 3.6 percent. More than two-thirds of Burundians live in the southwest and northwest provinces.

Ethnicity

The population of Burundi is generally divided into two major ethnic groups: the Bahutus and the Batutsis. The Bahutus comprise around 85 percent of the total population. The Batutsi minority -- many of whom tend to be well-educated -- makes up 14 percent of the population. The Batutsi minority, in the past, dominated the Burundian government and military. The Twa (pygmy) people make up about one percent of the population.

Considerable emphasis has been placed on the differences of ethnicity and economic activities in an effort to explain Bahutu and Batutsi differences. The primordial explanation focuses on the difference between Hamitic Batutsi and Bantu Bahutus. Occupational explanations focus on the fact that Batutsis tend to be herders whereas Bahutus tend to be agriculturalists.

These ethnic and occupational differences are not necessarily so rigid. As scholar Rene Lemarchand argues, "ethnic entrepreneurs" take advantage of the linguistic and geographic overlaps between the ethnic identities to forge alternate identities that meet their needs. In this way, differences between Bahutus and Batutsis have vacillated in extremity over time as influenced by both internal and external factors. Lemarchand points out that clan and feudal divides still dominate the political landscape and in fact take us farther than ethnicity in explaining the complex relationships of Burundian society.

Religion

In general, religious affiliation can be broken down in the following way. Sixty-seven percent of Burundi's inhabitants are Catholic, only ten percent are Muslim, and twenty-three percent adhere to indigenous beliefs. The syncretic blending of religious beliefs makes for a significant overlap between these categories.

Language and Literacy

Kirundi and French are the official languages of Burundi, however a dialect of KiSwahili is also spoken and English is taught in some schools. An estimated 59.3 percent of the population, ages 15 and older, are literate -- generally, the rate of literacy for men is higher (at 67.3 percent) than that of women (at 52.2 percent).

Note that 8.3 percent of GDP is spent on educational expenditures in this country.

Health and Welfare

Burundians have an average life expectancy at birth of only 58.29 years for the total population, with slightly lower life expectancy for men (at 56.65 years) than women (at 59.98 percent), according to recent estimates. The infant mortality rate is 63.38 deaths per 1,000 live births. The fertility rate is 6.25 children born per woman. The rate of HIV/AIDS infection is 2 percent, with 110,000 people living with the disease in recent years.

The risk of infectious diseases in this country is very high. Food or waterborne diseases include bacterial and protozoal diarrhea, hepatitis A, and typhoid fever; vectorborne diseases include malaria; water contact diseases include schistosomiasis; and animal contact diseases include rabies.

Note that 13.1 percent of GDP is spent on health expenditures in this country.

Human Development

One notable indicator used to measure a country's quality of life is the Human Development Index (HDI), which is compiled annually since 1990 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main areas of human development: longevity, knowledge and education, as well as economic standard of living. In a ranking of 169 countries, the HDI placed Burundi in the low human development category -- near the very end of the ranking -- at 166th place.

Note: Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI, which is calculated and updated annually, offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators.

Written by Dr. Denise Youngblood Coleman, Editor in Chief, www.countrywatch.com; supplementary sources: Lemarchand, Rene; see Bibliography for general list of research sources.

Human Development Index

Human Development Index

Human Development Index (Ranked Numerically)

The [Human Development Index](#) (HDI) is used to measure quality of life in countries across the world. The HDI has been compiled since 1990 by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on a regular basis. The HDI is a composite of several indicators, which measure a country's achievements in three main arenas of human development: longevity, education, and economic standard of living. Although the concept of human development is complicated and cannot be properly captured by values and indices, the HDI offers a wide-ranging assessment of human development in certain countries, not based solely upon traditional economic and financial indicators. For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this review.

Very High Human Development	High Human Development	Medium Human Development	Low Human Development
1. Norway	43. Bahamas	86. Fiji	128. Kenya
2. Australia	44. Lithuania	87. Turkmenistan	129. Bangladesh

3. New Zealand	45. Chile	88. Dominican Republic	130. Ghana
4. United States	46. Argentina	89. China	131. Cameroon
5. Ireland	47. Kuwait	90. El Salvador	132. Myanmar (Burma)
6. Liechtenstein	48. Latvia	91. Sri Lanka	133. Yemen
7. Netherlands	49. Montenegro	92. Thailand	134. Benin
8. Canada	50. Romania	93. Gabon	135. Madagascar
9. Sweden	51. Croatia	94. Suriname	136. Mauritania
10. Germany	52. Uruguay	95. Bolivia	137. Papua New Guinea
11. Japan	53. Libya	96. Paraguay	138. Nepal
12. South Korea	54. Panama	97. Philippines	139. Togo
13. Switzerland	55. Saudi Arabia	98. Botswana	140. Comoros
14. France	56. Mexico	99. Moldova	141. Lesotho
15. Israel	57. Malaysia	100. Mongolia	142. Nigeria
16. Finland	58. Bulgaria	101. Egypt	143. Uganda
17. Iceland	59. Trinidad and Tobago	102. Uzbekistan	144. Senegal
18. Belgium	60. Serbia	103. Micronesia	145. Haiti
19. Denmark	61. Belarus	104. Guyana	146. Angola

20. Spain	62. Costa Rica	105. Namibia	147. Djibouti
21. Hong King	63. Peru	106. Honduras	148. Tanzania
22. Greece	64. Albania	107. Maldives	149. Cote d'Ivoire
23. Italy	65. Russian Federation	108. Indonesia	150. Zambia
24. Luxembourg	66. Kazakhstan	109. Kyrgyzstan	151. Gambia
25. Austria	67. Azerbaijan	110. South Africa	152. Rwanda
26. United Kingdom	68. Bosnia and Herzegovina	111. Syria	153. Malawi
27. Singapore	69. Ukraine	112. Tajikistan	154. Sudan
28. Czech Republic	70. Iran	113. Vietnam	155. Afghanistan
29. Slovenia	71. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	114. Morocco	156. Guinea
30. Andorra	72. Mauritius	115. Nicaragua	157. Ethiopia
31. Slovakia	73. Brazil	116. Guatemala	158. Sierra Leone
32. United Arab Emirates	74. Georgia	117. Equatorial Guinea	159. Central African Republic
33. Malta	75. Venezuela	118. Cape Verde	160. Mali
34. Estonia	76. Armenia	119. India	161. Burkina Faso

35. Cyprus	77. Ecuador	120. East Timor	162. Liberia
36. Hungary	78. Belize	121. Swaziland	163. Chad
37. Brunei	79. Colombia	122. Laos	164. Guinea-Bissau
38. Qatar	80. Jamaica	123. Solomon Islands	165. Mozambique
39. Bahrain	81. Tunisia	124. Cambodia	166. Burundi
40. Portugal	82. Jordan	125. Pakistan	167. Niger
41. Poland	83. Turkey	126. Congo RC	168. Congo DRC
42. Barbados	84. Algeria	127. Sao Tome and Principe	169. Zimbabwe
	85. Tonga		

Methodology:

For more information about the methodology used to calculate the HDI, please see the "Source Materials" in the appendices of this Country Review.

Reference:

As published in United Nations Development Programme's Human Development Report 2010.

Source:

United Nations Development Programme's [Human Development Index](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/) available at URL: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Updated:

Uploaded in 2011 using ranking available; reviewed in 2015

Life Satisfaction Index

Life Satisfaction Index

Life Satisfaction Index

Created by Adrian G. White, an Analytic Social Psychologist at the University of Leicester, the "Satisfaction with Life Index" measures subjective life satisfaction across various countries. The data was taken from a metastudy (see below for source) and associates the notion of subjective happiness or life satisfaction with qualitative parameters such as health, wealth, and access to basic education. This assessment serves as an alternative to other measures of happiness that tend to rely on traditional and quantitative measures of policy on quality of life, such as GNP and GDP. The methodology involved the responses of 80,000 people across the globe.

Rank	Country	Score
1	Denmark	273.4
2	Switzerland	273.33
3	Austria	260
4	Iceland	260
5	The Bahamas	256.67
6	Finland	256.67
7	Sweden	256.67

8	Iran	253.33
9	Brunei	253.33
10	Canada	253.33
11	Ireland	253.33
12	Luxembourg	253.33
13	Costa Rica	250
14	Malta	250
15	Netherlands	250
16	Antiguaand Barbuda	246.67
17	Malaysia	246.67
18	New Zealand	246.67
19	Norway	246.67
20	Seychelles	246.67
21	Saint Kitts and Nevis	246.67
22	United Arab Emirates	246.67
23	United States	246.67
24	Vanuatu	246.67
25	Venezuela	246.67

26	Australia	243.33
27	Barbados	243.33
28	Belgium	243.33
29	Dominica	243.33
30	Oman	243.33
31	Saudi Arabia	243.33
32	Suriname	243.33
33	Bahrain	240
34	Colombia	240
35	Germany	240
36	Guyana	240
37	Honduras	240
38	Kuwait	240
39	Panama	240
40	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	240
41	United Kingdom	236.67
42	Dominican Republic	233.33
43	Guatemala	233.33

44	Jamaica	233.33
45	Qatar	233.33
46	Spain	233.33
47	Saint Lucia	233.33
48	Belize	230
49	Cyprus	230
50	Italy	230
51	Mexico	230
52	Samoa	230
53	Singapore	230
54	Solomon Islands	230
55	Trinidad and Tobago	230
56	Argentina	226.67
57	Fiji	223.33
58	Israel	223.33
59	Mongolia	223.33
60	São Tomé and Príncipe	223.33
61	El Salvador	220

62	France	220
63	Hong Kong	220
64	Indonesia	220
65	Kyrgyzstan	220
66	Maldives	220
67	Slovenia	220
68	Taiwan	220
69	East Timor	220
70	Tonga	220
71	Chile	216.67
72	Grenada	216.67
73	Mauritius	216.67
74	Namibia	216.67
75	Paraguay	216.67
76	Thailand	216.67
77	Czech Republic	213.33
78	Philippines	213.33
79	Tunisia	213.33

80	Uzbekistan	213.33
81	Brazil	210
82	China	210
83	Cuba	210
84	Greece	210
85	Nicaragua	210
86	Papua New Guinea	210
87	Uruguay	210
88	Gabon	206.67
89	Ghana	206.67
90	Japan	206.67
91	Yemen	206.67
92	Portugal	203.33
93	Sri Lanka	203.33
94	Tajikistan	203.33
95	Vietnam	203.33
96	Bhutan	200
97	Comoros	196.67

98	Croatia	196.67
99	Poland	196.67
100	Cape Verde	193.33
101	Kazakhstan	193.33
102	South Korea	193.33
103	Madagascar	193.33
104	Bangladesh	190
105	Republic of the Congo	190
106	The Gambia	190
107	Hungary	190
108	Libya	190
109	South Africa	190
110	Cambodia	186.67
111	Ecuador	186.67
112	Kenya	186.67
113	Lebanon	186.67
114	Morocco	186.67
115	Peru	186.67

116	Senegal	186.67
117	Bolivia	183.33
118	Haiti	183.33
119	Nepal	183.33
120	Nigeria	183.33
121	Tanzania	183.33
122	Benin	180
123	Botswana	180
124	Guinea-Bissau	180
125	India	180
126	Laos	180
127	Mozambique	180
128	Palestinian Authority	180
129	Slovakia	180
130	Myanmar	176.67
131	Mali	176.67
132	Mauritania	176.67
133	Turkey	176.67

134	Algeria	173.33
135	Equatorial Guinea	173.33
136	Romania	173.33
137	Bosnia and Herzegovina	170
138	Cameroon	170
139	Estonia	170
140	Guinea	170
141	Jordan	170
142	Syria	170
143	Sierra Leone	166.67
144	Azerbaijan	163.33
145	Central African Republic	163.33
146	Republic of Macedonia	163.33
147	Togo	163.33
148	Zambia	163.33
149	Angola	160
150	Djibouti	160
151	Egypt	160

152	Burkina Faso	156.67
153	Ethiopia	156.67
154	Latvia	156.67
155	Lithuania	156.67
156	Uganda	156.67
157	Albania	153.33
158	Malawi	153.33
159	Chad	150
160	Côte d'Ivoire	150
161	Niger	150
162	Eritrea	146.67
163	Rwanda	146.67
164	Bulgaria	143.33
165	Lesotho	143.33
166	Pakistan	143.33
167	Russia	143.33
168	Swaziland	140
169	Georgia	136.67

170	Belarus	133.33
171	Turkmenistan	133.33
172	Armenia	123.33
173	Sudan	120
174	Ukraine	120
175	Moldova	116.67
176	Democratic Republic of the Congo	110
177	Zimbabwe	110
178	Burundi	100

Commentary:

European countries, such as [Denmark](#), [Iceland](#), [Finland](#), [Sweden](#), [Switzerland](#), [Austria](#) resided at the top of the ranking with highest levels of self-reported life satisfaction. Conversely, European countries such as [Latvia](#), [Lithuania](#), [Moldova](#), [Belarus](#) and [Ukraine](#) ranked low on the index. African countries such as Democratic Republic of Congo, [Zimbabwe](#) and [Burundi](#) found themselves at the very bottom of the ranking, and indeed, very few African countries could be found in the top 100. [Japan](#) was at the mid-way point in the ranking, however, other Asian countries such as [Brunei](#) and [Malaysia](#) were in the top tier, while [Pakistan](#) was close to the bottom with a low level of self-identified life satisfaction. As a region, the Middle East presented a mixed bag with Saudi Arabians reporting healthy levels of life satisfaction and Egyptians near the bottom of the ranking. As a region, Caribbean countries were ranked highly, consistently demonstrating high levels of life satisfaction. The findings showed that health was the most crucial determining factor in life satisfaction, followed by prosperity and education.

Source:

White, A. (2007). A Global Projection of Subjective Well-being: A Challenge To Positive

Psychology? Psychtalk 56, 17-20. The data was extracted from a meta-analysis by Marks, Abdallah, Simms & Thompson (2006).

Uploaded:

Based on study noted above in "Source" ; reviewed in 2015

Happy Planet Index

Happy Planet Index

The Happy Planet Index (HPI) is used to measure human well-being in conjunction with environmental impact. The HPI has been compiled since 2006 by the New Economics Foundation. The index is a composite of several indicators including subjective life satisfaction, life expectancy at birth, and ecological footprint per capita.

As noted by NEFA, the HPI "reveals the ecological efficiency with which human well-being is delivered." Indeed, the index combines environmental impact with human well-being to measure the environmental efficiency with which, country by country, people live long and happy lives. The countries ranked highest by the HPI are not necessarily the ones with the happiest people overall, but the ones that allow their citizens to live long and fulfilling lives, without negatively impacting this opportunity for either future generations or citizens of other countries. Accordingly, a country like the [United States](#) will rank low on this list due to its large per capital ecological footprint, which uses more than its fair share of resources, and will likely cause planetary damage.

It should be noted that the HPI was designed to be a counterpoint to other well-established indices of countries' development, such as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which measures overall national wealth and economic development, but often obfuscates the realities of countries with stark variances between the rich and the poor. Moreover, the objective of most of the world's people is not to be wealthy but to be happy. The HPI also differs from the [Human Development Index](#) (HDI), which measures quality of life but not ecology, since it [HPI] also includes sustainability as a key indicator.

Rank	Country	HPI
1	Costa Rica	76.1
2	Dominican Republic	71.8
3	Jamaica	70.1
4	Guatemala	68.4
5	Vietnam	66.5
6	Colombia	66.1
7	Cuba	65.7
8	El Salvador	61.5
9	Brazil	61.0
10	Honduras	61.0
11	Nicaragua	60.5
12	Egypt	60.3
13	Saudi Arabia	59.7
14	Philippines	59.0
15	Argentina	59.0
16	Indonesia	58.9
17	Bhutan	58.5

18	Panama	57.4
19	Laos	57.3
20	China	57.1
21	Morocco	56.8
22	Sri Lanka	56.5
23	Mexico	55.6
24	Pakistan	55.6
25	Ecuador	55.5
26	Jordan	54.6
27	Belize	54.5
28	Peru	54.4
29	Tunisia	54.3
30	Trinidad and Tobago	54.2
31	Bangladesh	54.1
32	Moldova	54.1
33	Malaysia	54.0
34	Tajikistan	53.5
35	India	53.0

36	Venezuela	52.5
37	Nepal	51.9
38	Syria	51.3
39	Burma	51.2
40	Algeria	51.2
41	Thailand	50.9
42	Haiti	50.8
43	Netherlands	50.6
44	Malta	50.4
45	Uzbekistan	50.1
46	Chile	49.7
47	Bolivia	49.3
48	Armenia	48.3
49	Singapore	48.2
50	Yemen	48.1
51	Germany	48.1
52	Switzerland	48.1
53	Sweden	48.0

54	Albania	47.9
55	Paraguay	47.8
56	Palestinian Authority	47.7
57	Austria	47.7
58	Serbia	47.6
59	Finland	47.2
60	Croatia	47.2
61	Kyrgyzstan	47.1
62	Cyprus	46.2
63	Guyana	45.6
64	Belgium	45.4
65	Bosnia and Herzegovina	45.0
66	Slovenia	44.5
67	Israel	44.5
68	South Korea	44.4
69	Italy	44.0
70	Romania	43.9
71	France	43.9

72	Georgia	43.6
73	Slovakia	43.5
74	United Kingdom	43.3
75	Japan	43.3
76	Spain	43.2
77	Poland	42.8
78	Ireland	42.6
79	Iraq	42.6
80	Cambodia	42.3
81	Iran	42.1
82	Bulgaria	42.0
83	Turkey	41.7
84	Hong Kong	41.6
85	Azerbaijan	41.2
86	Lithuania	40.9
87	Djibouti	40.4
88	Norway	40.4
89	Canada	39.4

90	Hungary	38.9
91	Kazakhstan	38.5
92	Czech Republic	38.3
93	Mauritania	38.2
94	Iceland	38.1
95	Ukraine	38.1
96	Senegal	38.0
97	Greece	37.6
98	Portugal	37.5
99	Uruguay	37.2
100	Ghana	37.1
101	Latvia	36.7
102	Australia	36.6
103	New Zealand	36.2
104	Belarus	35.7
105	Denmark	35.5
106	Mongolia	35.0
107	Malawi	34.5

108	Russia	34.5
109	Chad	34.3
110	Lebanon	33.6
111	Macedonia	32.7
112	Republic of the Congo	32.4
113	Madagascar	31.5
114	United States	30.7
115	Nigeria	30.3
116	Guinea	30.3
117	Uganda	30.2
118	South Africa	29.7
119	Rwanda	29.6
120	Democratic Republic of the Congo	29.0
121	Sudan	28.5
122	Luxembourg	28.5
123	United Arab Emirates	28.2
124	Ethiopia	28.1
125	Kenya	27.8

126	Cameroon	27.2
127	Zambia	27.2
128	Kuwait	27.0
129	Niger	26.9
130	Angola	26.8
131	Estonia	26.4
132	Mali	25.8
133	Mozambique	24.6
134	Benin	24.6
135	Togo	23.3
136	Sierra Leone	23.1
137	Central African Republic	22.9
138	Burkina Faso	22.4
139	Burundi	21.8
140	Namibia	21.1
141	Botswana	20.9
142	Tanzania	17.8
143	Zimbabwe	16.6

Source: This material is derived from the Happy Planet Index issued by the New Economics Foundation (NEF).

Methodology: The methodology for the calculations can be found at URL: <http://www.happyplanetindex.org/>

Status of Women

Overview

Women in Burundi face a variety of daily obstacles and are regarded as second-class citizens in their own country. Legal discrimination, domestic violence, and poor economic conditions are all areas in which women endure hardship and suffering.

There is legal discrimination against women in the realm of land ownership. Specifically, women in Burundi are unable to inherit land from either their father or spouse. As such, women are completely dependent on males from birth until death. This dependence allows males the ability to have disciplinary rights over women and treat them as property.

As a group, women also lack decision-making opportunities independent of the males in their lives. Therefore, many women are unable to develop the skills needed to make decisions in the political, economic, and social arenas which would create the foundation for future advancement. As such, the lack of opportunity breeds psychological and systemic obstacles for women, which prevent them from improving their status within society. The result is a country where women can be classified as a clearly subordinate group.

While primary school enrollment has remained steady, the lack of girls in secondary or university-level education environments further functions to keep women subordinate to men. Women are expected to either marry early, or stay home and help their mothers care for younger children. Therefore, many women do not recognize the importance of education past the sixth grade.

Domestic violence is a significant issue. Poor women make up over 60 percent of the domestic violence cases reported. Many cases, especially those involving rape, go unreported due to the

vilification of the victim by both the perpetrator and society.

In the 1990s, Burundi was in a state of civil war. Thousands of civilians, many of them women, have been killed as a result. For female survivors, few opportunities for advancement exist. Many are forced into prostitution to economically support themselves and family members.

Gender Related Development Index (GDI) Rank:

132nd out of 140

Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) Rank:

Not Ranked

Female Population:

3.7 million

Female Life Expectancy at birth:

59.98 years

Total Fertility Rate:

6.2

Maternal Mortality Ratio:

1,000

Total Number of Women Living with HIV/AIDS:

68,000-91,000

Ever Married Women, Ages 15-19 (%):

7%

Mean Age at Time of Marriage:

22

Contraceptive Use Among Married Women, Any Method (%):

16%

Female Adult Literacy Rate:

52.2%

Combined Female Gross enrollment ratio for Primary, Secondary and Tertiary schools:

31%

Female-Headed Households (%):

25%

Economically Active Females (%):

81.7%

Female Contributing Family Workers (%):

N/A

Female Estimated Earned Income:

\$545

Seats in Parliament held by women (%):

Lower or Single House: 18.4%

Upper House or Senate: 18.9%

Year Women Received the Right to Vote:

1961

Year Women Received the Right to Stand for Election:

1961

*The Gender Development Index (GDI) is a composite index which measures the average achievement in a country. While very similar to the Human Development Index in its use of the same variables, the GDI adjusts the average achievement of each country in terms of life expectancy, enrollment in schools, income, and literacy in accordance to the disparities between males and females.

*The Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) is a composite index measuring gender inequality in three of the basic dimensions of empowerment; economic participation and decision-making, political participation and decision-making, and power over economic resources.

*Total Fertility Rate (TFR) is defined as the average number of babies born to women during their reproductive years. A TFR of 2.1 is considered the replacement rate; once a TFR of a population reaches 2.1 the population will remain stable assuming no immigration or emigration takes place. When the TFR is greater than 2.1 a population will increase and when it is less than 2.1 a population will eventually decrease, although due to the age structure of a population it will take years before a low TFR is translated into lower population.

*Maternal Mortality Rate is the number of deaths to women per 100,000 live births that resulted from conditions related to pregnancy and or delivery related complications.

*Economically Active Females are the share of the female population, ages 15 and above, whom supply, or are able to supply, labor for the production of goods and services.

*Female Contributing Family Workers are those females who work without pay in an economic

enterprise operated by a relative living in the same household.

*Estimated Earned Income is measured according to Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) in US dollars.

Global Gender Gap Index

Global Gender Gap Index

Editor's Note:

The Global Gender Gap Index by the World Economic Forum ranks most of the world's countries in terms of the division of resources and opportunities among males and females. Specifically, the ranking assesses the gender inequality gap in these four arenas:

1. Economic participation and opportunity (salaries and high skilled employment participation levels)
2. Educational attainment (access to basic and higher level education)
3. Political empowerment (representation in decision-making structures)
4. Health and survival (life expectancy and sex ratio)

	2010 rank	2010 score	2010 rank among 2009 countries	2009 rank	2009 score	2008 rank	2008 score	2007 rank
Country								
Iceland	1	0.8496	1	1	0.8276	4	0.7999	4
Norway	2	0.8404	2	3	0.8227	1	0.8239	2

Finland	3	0.8260	3	2	0.8252	2	0.8195	3
Sweden	4	0.8024	4	4	0.8139	3	0.8139	1
New Zealand	5	0.7808	5	5	0.7880	5	0.7859	5
Ireland	6	0.7773	6	8	0.7597	8	0.7518	9
Denmark	7	0.7719	7	7	0.7628	7	0.7538	8
Lesotho	8	0.7678	8	10	0.7495	16	0.7320	26
Philippines	9	0.7654	9	9	0.7579	6	0.7568	6
Switzerland	10	0.7562	10	13	0.7426	14	0.7360	40
Spain	11	0.7554	11	17	0.7345	17	0.7281	10
South Africa	12	0.7535	12	6	0.7709	22	0.7232	20
Germany	13	0.7530	13	12	0.7449	11	0.7394	7
Belgium	14	0.7509	14	33	0.7165	28	0.7163	19
United Kingdom	15	0.7460	15	15	0.7402	13	0.7366	11
Sri Lanka	16	0.7458	16	16	0.7402	12	0.7371	15
Netherlands	17	0.7444	17	11	0.7490	9	0.7399	12
Latvia	18	0.7429	18	14	0.7416	10	0.7397	13
United States	19	0.7411	19	31	0.7173	27	0.7179	31

Canada	20	0.7372	20	25	0.7196	31	0.7136	18
Trinidad and Tobago	21	0.7353	21	19	0.7298	19	0.7245	46
Mozambique	22	0.7329	22	26	0.7195	18	0.7266	43
Australia	23	0.7271	23	20	0.7282	21	0.7241	17
Cuba	24	0.7253	24	29	0.7176	25	0.7195	22
Namibia	25	0.7238	25	32	0.7167	30	0.7141	29
Luxembourg	26	0.7231	26	63	0.6889	66	0.6802	58
Mongolia	27	0.7194	27	22	0.7221	40	0.7049	62
Costa Rica	28	0.7194	28	27	0.7180	32	0.7111	28
Argentina	29	0.7187	29	24	0.7211	24	0.7209	33
Nicaragua	30	0.7176	30	49	0.7002	71	0.6747	90
Barbados	31	0.7176	31	21	0.7236	26	0.7188	n/a
Portugal	32	0.7171	32	46	0.7013	39	0.7051	37
Uganda	33	0.7169	33	40	0.7067	43	0.6981	50
Moldova	34	0.7160	34	36	0.7104	20	0.7244	21
Lithuania	35	0.7132	35	30	0.7175	23	0.7222	14
Bahamas	36	0.7128	36	28	0.7179	n/a	n/a	n/a
Austria	37	0.7091	37	42	0.7031	29	0.7153	27

Guyana	38	0.7090	38	35	0.7108	n/a	n/a	n/a
Panama	39	0.7072	39	43	0.7024	34	0.7095	38
Ecuador	40	0.7072	40	23	0.7220	35	0.7091	44
Kazakhstan	41	0.7055	41	47	0.7013	45	0.6976	32
Slovenia	42	0.7047	42	52	0.6982	51	0.6937	49
Poland	43	0.7037	43	50	0.6998	49	0.6951	60
Jamaica	44	0.7037	44	48	0.7013	44	0.6980	39
Russian Federation	45	0.7036	45	51	0.6987	42	0.6994	45
France	46	0.7025	46	18	0.7331	15	0.7341	51
Estonia	47	0.7018	47	37	0.7094	37	0.7076	30
Chile	48	0.7013	48	64	0.6884	65	0.6818	86
Macedonia, FYR	49	0.6996	49	53	0.6950	53	0.6914	35
Bulgaria	50	0.6983	50	38	0.7072	36	0.7077	25
Kyrgyz Republic	51	0.6973	51	41	0.7058	41	0.7045	70
Israel	52	0.6957	52	45	0.7019	56	0.6900	36
Croatia	53	0.6939	53	54	0.6944	46	0.6967	16
Honduras	54	0.6927	54	62	0.6893	47	0.6960	68

Colombia	55	0.6927	55	56	0.6939	50	0.6944	24
Singapore	56	0.6914	56	84	0.6664	84	0.6625	77
Thailand	57	0.6910	57	59	0.6907	52	0.6917	52
Greece	58	0.6908	58	85	0.6662	75	0.6727	72
Uruguay	59	0.6897	59	57	0.6936	54	0.6907	78
Peru	60	0.6895	60	44	0.7024	48	0.6959	75
China	61	0.6881	61	60	0.6907	57	0.6878	73
Botswana	62	0.6876	62	39	0.7071	63	0.6839	53
Ukraine	63	0.6869	63	61	0.6896	62	0.6856	57
Venezuela	64	0.6863	64	69	0.6839	59	0.6875	55
Czech Republic	65	0.6850	65	74	0.6789	69	0.6770	64
Tanzania	66	0.6829	66	73	0.6797	38	0.7068	34
Romania	67	0.6826	67	70	0.6805	70	0.6763	47
Malawi	68	0.6824	68	76	0.6738	81	0.6664	87
Paraguay	69	0.6804	69	66	0.6868	100	0.6379	69
Ghana	70	0.6782	70	80	0.6704	77	0.6679	63
Slovak Republic	71	0.6778	71	68	0.6845	64	0.6824	54

Vietnam	72	0.6776	72	71	0.6802	68	0.6778	42
Dominican Republic	73	0.6774	73	67	0.6859	72	0.6744	65
Italy	74	0.6765	74	72	0.6798	67	0.6788	84
Gambia, The	75	0.6762	75	75	0.6752	85	0.6622	95
Bolivia	76	0.6751	76	82	0.6693	80	0.6667	80
Brueni Darussalem	77	0.6748	77	94	0.6524	99	0.6392	n/a
Albania	78	0.6726	78	91	0.6601	87	0.6591	66
Hungary	79	0.6720	79	65	0.6879	60	0.6867	61
Madagascar	80	0.6713	80	77	0.6732	74	0.6736	89
Angola	81	0.6712	81	106	0.6353	114	0.6032	110
Bangladesh	82	0.6702	82	93	0.6526	90	0.6531	100
Malta	83	0.6695	83	88	0.6635	83	0.6634	76
Armenia	84	0.6669	84	90	0.6619	78	0.6677	71
Brazil	85	0.6655	85	81	0.6695	73	0.6737	74
Cyprus	86	0.6642	86	79	0.6706	76	0.6694	82
Indonesia	87	0.6615	87	92	0.6580	93	0.6473	81
Georgia	88	0.6598	88	83	0.6680	82	0.6654	67

Tajikistan	89	0.6598	89	86	0.6661	89	0.6541	79
El Salvador	90	0.6596	90	55	0.6939	58	0.6875	48
Mexico	91	0.6577	91	98	0.6503	97	0.6441	93
Zimbabwe	92	0.6574	92	95	0.6518	92	0.6485	88
Belize	93	0.6536	93	87	0.6636	86	0.6610	94
Japan	94	0.6524	94	101	0.6447	98	0.6434	91
Mauritius	95	0.6520	95	96	0.6513	95	0.6466	85
Kenya	96	0.6499	96	97	0.6512	88	0.6547	83
Cambodia	97	0.6482	97	104	0.6410	94	0.6469	98
Malaysia	98	0.6479	98	100	0.6467	96	0.6442	92
Maldives	99	0.6452	99	99	0.6482	91	0.6501	99
Azerbaijan	100	0.6446	100	89	0.6626	61	0.6856	59
Senegal	101	0.6414	101	102	0.6427	n/a	n/a	n/a
Suriname	102	0.6407	102	78	0.6726	79	0.6674	56
United Arab Emirates	103	0.6397	103	112	0.6198	105	0.6220	105
Korea, Rep.	104	0.6342	104	115	0.6146	108	0.6154	97
Kuwait	105	0.6318	105	105	0.6356	101	0.6358	96
Zambia	106	0.6293	106	107	0.6310	106	0.6205	101

Tunisia	107	0.6266	107	109	0.6233	103	0.6295	102
Fiji	108	0.6256	108	103	0.6414	n/a	n/a	n/a
Guatemala	109	0.6238	109	111	0.6209	112	0.6072	106
Bahrain	110	0.6217	110	116	0.6136	121	0.5927	115
Burkina Faso	111	0.6162	111	120	0.6081	115	0.6029	117
India	112	0.6155	112	114	0.6151	113	0.6060	114
Mauritania	113	0.6152	113	119	0.6103	110	0.6117	111
Cameroon	114	0.6110	114	118	0.6108	117	0.6017	116
Nepal	115	0.6084	115	110	0.6213	120	0.5942	125
Lebanon*	116	0.6084	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Qatar	117	0.6059	116	125	0.5907	119	0.5948	109
Nigeria	118	0.6055	117	108	0.6280	102	0.6339	107
Algeria	119	0.6052	118	117	0.6119	111	0.6111	108
Jordan	120	0.6048	119	113	0.6182	104	0.6275	104
Ethiopia	121	0.6019	120	122	0.5948	122	0.5867	113
Oman	122	0.5950	121	123	0.5938	118	0.5960	119
Iran	123	0.5933	122	128	0.5839	116	0.6021	118
Syria	124	0.5926	123	121	0.6072	107	0.6181	103

Egypt	125	0.5899	124	126	0.5862	124	0.5832	120
Turkey	126	0.5876	125	129	0.5828	123	0.5853	121
Morocco	127	0.5767	126	124	0.5926	125	0.5757	122
Benin	128	0.5719	127	131	0.5643	126	0.5582	123
Saudi Arabia	129	0.5713	128	130	0.5651	128	0.5537	124
Côte d'Ivoire*	130	0.5691	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mali	131	0.5680	129	127	0.5860	109	0.6117	112
Pakistan	132	0.5465	130	132	0.5458	127	0.5549	126
Chad	133	0.5330	131	133	0.5417	129	0.5290	127
Yemen	134	0.4603	132	134	0.4609	130	0.4664	128
Belarus	n/a	n/a	n/a	34	0.7141	33	0.7099	23
Uzbekistan	n/a	n/a	n/a	58	0.6913	55	0.6906	41

*new country 2010

Commentary:

According to the report's index, Nordic countries, such as [Iceland](#), [Norway](#), [Finland](#), and [Sweden](#) have continued to dominate at the top of the ranking for gender equality. Meanwhile, [France](#) has

seen a notable decline in the ranking, largely as a result of decreased number of women holding ministerial portfolios in that country. In the Americas, the [United States](#) has risen in the ranking to top the region, predominantly as a result of a decreasing wage gap, as well as higher number of women holding key positions in the current Obama administration. [Canada](#) has continued to remain as one of the top ranking countries of the Americas, followed by the small Caribbean island nation of Trinidad and Tobago, which has the distinction of being among the top three countries of the Americans in the realm of gender equality. [Lesotho](#) and South African ranked highly in the index, leading not only among African countries but also in global context. Despite [Lesotho](#) still lagging in the area of life expectancy, its high ranking was attributed to high levels of female participation in the labor force and female literacy. The [Philippines](#) and [Sri Lanka](#) were the top ranking countries for gender equality for Asia, ranking highly also in global context. The [Philippines](#) has continued to show strong performance in all strong performance on all four dimensions (detailed above) of the index. Finally, in the Arab world, the [United Arab Emirates](#) held the highest-rank within that region of the world; however, its placement near the bottom of the global list highlights the fact that Arab countries are generally poor performers when it comes to the matter of gender equality in global scope.

Source:

This data is derived from the latest edition of The Global Gender Gap Report by the World Economic Forum.

Available at URL:

<http://www.weforum.org/en/Communities/Women%20Leaders%20and%20Gender%20Parity/Gende>

Updated:

Based on latest available data as set forth in chart; reviewed in 2014

Culture and Arts

Etiquette

Cultural Dos and Taboos

1. The left hand is taboo. Never give, take or eat anything with the left hand.
2. Men and women should dress modestly. Avoid wearing shorts and mini-skirts in public, especially villages.
3. Expect to bargain in the market place.
4. Never photograph people without their permission. Never photograph anything concerning the military government.
5. Be cognizant of -- and sensitive to -- ethnic differences. In Burundi, most of the population is divided among Bahutus (Hutus) and Batutsis (Tutsis).

Travel Information

Please Note: This is a generalized travel guide and it is intended to coalesce several resources, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination. As such, it does not include travel warnings for specific "hot spot" destinations.

For travel alerts and warnings, please see the United States Department of State's listings available at URL:

<http://travel.state.gov/content/passports/english/alertswarnings.html>

Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Djibouti, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Guinea, Honduras, Iraq, Iran, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, North Korea, Pakistan, Palestinian Territories of West Bank and Gaza, Philippines areas of Sulu Archipelago, Mindanao, and southern Sulu Sea, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Ukraine, Venezuela, and Yemen.

International Travel Guide

Checklist for Travelers

- 1.** Take out travel insurance to cover hospital treatment or medical evacuation. Overseas medical costs are expensive to most international travelers, where one's domestic, nationalized or even private health insurance plans will not provide coverage outside one's home country. Learn about "reciprocal insurance plans" that some international health care companies might offer.
- 2.** Make sure that one's travel insurance is appropriate. If one intends to indulge in adventurous activities, such as parasailing, one should be sure that one is fully insured in such cases. Many traditional insurance policies do not provide coverage in cases of extreme circumstances.
- 3.** Take time to learn about one's destination country and culture. Read and learn about the place one is traveling. Also check political, economic and socio-cultural developments at the destination by reading country-specific travel reports and fact sheets noted below.
- 4.** Get the necessary visas for the country (or countries) one intends to visit - but be aware that a visa does not guarantee entry. A number of useful sites regarding visa and other entry requirements are noted below.
- 5.** Keep in regular contact with friends and relatives back at home by phone or email, and be sure to leave a travel itinerary.
- 6.** Protect one's personal information by making copies of one's passport details, insurance policy, travelers checks and credit card numbers. Taking copies of such documents with you, while leaving another collection copies with someone at home is also good practice for travelers. Taking copies of one's passport photograph is also recommended.
- 7.** Stay healthy by taking all possible precautions against illness. Also, be sure to take extra supplies of prescription drugs along for the trip, while also taking time to pack general pharmaceutical supplies, such as aspirin and other such painkillers, bandages, stomach ailment medication, anti-inflammatory medication and anti-bacterial medication.
- 8.** Do not carry illicit drugs. Understand that the punishment for possession or use of illegal drugs in some countries may be capital punishment. Make sure your prescription drugs are legal in the countries you plan to visit.
- 9.** Know the laws of one's destination country and culture; be sure to understand the repercussions of breaking those laws and regulations. Often the transparency and freedoms of the juridical system at home is not consistent with that of one's destination country. Become aware of these complexities and subtleties before you travel.
- 10.** For longer stays in a country, or where the security situation is volatile, one should register one's self and traveling companions at the local embassy or consulate of one's country of citizenship.
- 11.** Women should take care to be prepared both culturally and practically for traveling in a different country and culture. One should be sure to take sufficient supplies of personal feminine products and prescription drugs. One should also learn about local cultural standards for women, including norms of dressing. Be aware that it is simply inappropriate and unsafe for women to

travel alone in some countries, and take the necessary precautions to avoid risk-filled situations.

12. If one is traveling with small children, one should pack extra supplies, make arrangements with the travel carrier for proper seating that would adequately accommodate children, infants or toddlers. Note also that whether one is male or female, traveling with children means that one's hands are thus not free to carry luggage and bags. Be especially aware that this makes one vulnerable to pickpockets, thieves and other sorts of crime.

13. Make proper arrangements for accommodations, well in advance of one's arrival at a destination. Some countries have limited accommodation, while others may have culturally distinctive facilities. Learning about these practicalities before one travels will greatly aid the enjoyment of one's trip.

14. Travel with different forms of currency and money (cash, traveler's checks and credit cards) in anticipation that venues may not accept one or another form of money. Also, ensuring that one's financial resources are not contained in one location, or by one person (if one is traveling with others) can be a useful measure, in the event that one loses a wallet or purse.

15. Find out about transportation in the destination country. In some places, it might be advisable to hire a local driver or taxi guide for safety reasons, while in other countries, enjoying one's travel experience may well be enhanced by renting a vehicle and seeing the local sights and culture independently. Costs may also be prohibitive for either of these choices, so again, prior planning is suggested.

Tips for Travelers

On the evening of Dec. 4, 2000, two people were injured when a Sabena passenger flight was fired upon and hit by machine gun rounds as it was landing at Bujumbura's International Airport. Earlier that same day, a rebel faction released a press statement warning foreigners to leave Burundi for their safety.

Burundi has been involved in a civil war since 1993. Fighting can be intense and has increasingly involved attacks on the capital, Bujumbura. On Oct. 12, 1999, two expatriate employees of United Nations organizations were shot execution-style during an ambush in Muzye, Rutana Province. On Nov. 23, 1999, a hand grenade was thrown into the central market in downtown Bujumbura, killing five and injuring 14 others.

Extremist groups are active throughout the Great Lakes region, and some have committed or threatened violence against foreign citizens and interests. One such extremist group that operates out of northeastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) specifically targeted and killed U.S. citizens in March 1999 in southwestern Uganda. Several international non-governmental organizations have been targeted and robbed by armed assailants in their offices, on the road, and in their homes.

Foreign citizens in Burundi should establish and maintain contact with their embassy and consider

their own personal security in determining whether to remain in the country.

The Government of Burundi maintains a curfew for Bujumbura, currently from midnight to 5 a.m.

A passport, visa, and evidence of immunization against yellow fever and meningococcal meningitis are required. Only those travelers resident in countries where there is no Burundian Embassy are eligible for entry stamps, without a visa, at the airport upon arrival. These entry stamps are not a substitute for a visa, which must be obtained from the Burundi Immigration Service within 24 hours of arrival. Travelers without a visa are not permitted to leave the country. Travelers should obtain the latest information and details from the nearest Burundian embassy or consulate.

Travelers who wish to travel to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) with visas and/or entry/exit stamps from Burundi, Rwanda or Uganda may experience difficulties at DRC airports or other ports of entry. Some travelers with those visas or exit/entry stamps have been detained for questioning in DRC.

In light of continuing ethnic and political tensions, all areas of Burundi are potentially unstable. Fighting between rebel forces and the Burundian military continues to be a problem in the interior and in the outskirts of the capital. The outlying suburbs of Bujumbura and vehicles on the roadways are regularly attacked by Burundian rebels. In late 2000, government forces and rebels clashed repeatedly just outside of the capital. Rebels continue to operate in the province surrounding the capital and local authorities cannot guarantee safety.

Street crime in Burundi's capital poses a high risk for visitors. Crime includes muggings, purse-snatching, pickpocketing, burglary, and auto break-ins. Criminals operate individually or in small groups. There have been reports of muggings of persons jogging or walking alone in all sections of Bujumbura, and especially on public roads bordering Lake Tanganyika. In late 2000, expatriate employees of several international non-governmental organizations were the victims of armed robberies in their offices, homes, and on the road. Moreover, there has been a spate of motorcycle-jackings by armed assailants.

Medical facilities are limited in Burundi. Medicines and prescription drugs are in short supply, if not completely unavailable. Sterility of equipment is questionable, and treatment is unreliable.

Doctors and hospitals often expect immediate cash payment for health services. Uninsured travelers who require medical care overseas may face extreme difficulties.

Check with your own insurance company to confirm whether your policy applies overseas, including provision for medical evacuation and for adequacy of coverage. Serious medical problems requiring hospitalization and/or medical evacuation to your home country can be very expensive. Ascertain whether payment will be made to the overseas hospital or doctor or whether you will be reimbursed later for expenses you incur. Some insurance policies also include coverage

for psychiatric treatment and for disposition of remains in the event of death.

While in a foreign country, you may encounter road conditions that differ significantly from those in your home country. The information below concerning Burundi is provided for general reference only and may not be totally accurate in a particular location or circumstance.

Safety of Public Transportation: Poor
Urban Road Conditions/Maintenance: Poor
Rural Road Conditions/Maintenance: Poor
Availability of Roadside Assistance: Poor - Nonexistent

While in a foreign country, you are subject to that country's laws and regulations. Persons violating Burundian law, even unknowingly, may be expelled, arrested or imprisoned. Penalties for possession, use, or trafficking in illegal drugs in Burundi are strict and convicted offenders can expect jail sentences and heavy fines.

Note: This information is directly quoted from the United States Department of State Consular Information Sheet.

Sources: *United States Department of State Consular Information Sheet*

Business Culture: Information for Business Travelers

For more general information on etiquette in Burundi, see our Cultural Etiquette page.

Online Resources Regarding Entry Requirements and Visas

Online Resources Regarding Entry Requirements and Visas

Foreign Entry Requirements for Americans from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html

Visa Services for Non-Americans from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/visa_1750.html

Visa Bulletins from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/frvi/bulletin/bulletin_1360.html

Visa Waivers from the United States Department of State
http://travel.state.gov/visa/temp/without/without_1990.html - new

Passport and Visa Information from the Government of the United Kingdom
<http://www.bia.homeoffice.gov.uk/>

Visa Information from the Government of Australia
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/visas/index.html>

Passport Information from the Government of Australia
<https://www.passports.gov.au/Web/index.aspx>

Passport Information from the Government of Canada
http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/passport_passeport-eng.asp

Visa Information from the Government of Canada
http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/visas-eng.asp

Online Visa Processing by Immigration Experts by VisaPro
<http://www.visapro.com>

Sources: United States Department of State, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Canada Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Useful Online Resources for Travelers

Country-Specific Travel Information from United States
http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/cis/cis_1765.html

Travel Advice by Country from Government of United Kingdom
<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

General Travel Advice from Government of Australia
<http://www.smarttraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/General>

Travel Bulletins from the Government of Australia
<http://www.smarttraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/TravelBulletins/>

Travel Tips from Government of Australia

<http://www.smartraveller.gov.au/tips/index.html>

Travel Checklist by Government of Canada

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/preparation_information/checklist_sommaire-eng.asp

Travel Checklist from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/staying-safe/checklist>

Your trip abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/brochures/brochures_1225.html

A safe trip abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/safety/safety_1747.html

Tips for expatriates abroad from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/residing/residing_1235.html

Tips for students from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/living/studying/studying_1238.html <http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/broc>

Medical information for travelers from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/tips/health/health_1185.html

US Customs Travel information

<http://www.customs.gov/xp/cgov/travel/>

Sources: United States Department of State; United States Customs Department, United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Government of Australia; Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Other Practical Online Resources for Travelers

Foreign Language Phrases for Travelers

<http://www.travlang.com/languages/>

<http://www.omniglot.com/language/phrases/index.htm>

World Weather Forecasts

<http://www.intellicast.com/>

<http://www.wunderground.com/>

<http://www.worldweather.org/>

Worldwide Time Zones, Map, World Clock

<http://www.timeanddate.com/>

<http://www.worldtimezone.com/>

International Airport Codes

<http://www.world-airport-codes.com/>

International Dialing Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/dialcode.htm>

<http://www.countrycallingcodes.com/>

International Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/phones.htm>

International Mobile Phone Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/mobilephones.htm>

International Internet Café Search Engine

<http://cybercaptive.com/>

Global Internet Roaming

<http://www.kropla.com/roaming.htm>

World Electric Power Guide

<http://www.kropla.com/electric.htm>

<http://www.kropla.com/electric2.htm>

World Television Standards and Codes

<http://www.kropla.com/tv.htm>

International Currency Exchange Rates

<http://www.xe.com/ucc/>

Banking and Financial Institutions Across the World

<http://www.123world.com/banks/index.html>

International Credit Card or Automated Teller Machine (ATM) Locator

<http://visa.via.infonow.net/locator/global/>

<http://www.mastercard.com/us/personal/en/cardholderservices/atmlocations/index.html>

International Chambers of Commerce

<http://www.123world.com/chambers/index.html>

World Tourism Websites

<http://123world.com/tourism/>

Diplomatic and Consular Information

United States Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.usembassy.gov/>

United Kingdom Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/about-the-fco/embassies-and-posts/find-an-embassy-overseas/>

Australia's Diplomatic Posts Around the World

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/missions/>

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/embassies.html>

Canada's Embassies and High Commissions

<http://www.international.gc.ca/ciw-cdm/embassies-ambassades.aspx>

Resources for Finding Embassies and other Diplomatic Posts Across the World

<http://www.escapeartist.com/embassy1/embassy1.htm>

Safety and Security

Travel Warnings by Country from Government of Australia

<http://www.smarttraveller.gov.au/zw-cgi/view/Advice/>

Travel Warnings and Alerts from United States Department of State

http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/tw/tw_1764.html

http://travel.state.gov/travel/cis_pa_tw/pa/pa_1766.html

Travel Reports and Warnings by Government of Canada

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/menu-eng.asp

http://www.voyage.gc.ca/countries_pays/updates_mise-a-jour-eng.asp

Travel Warnings from Government of United Kingdom

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/>

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/travelling-and-living-overseas/travel-advice-by-country/?action=noTravelAll#noTravelAll>

Sources: United Kingdom Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the United States Department of State, the Government of Canada: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Government of Australia: Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Other Safety and Security Online Resources for Travelers

United States Department of State Information on Terrorism

<http://www.state.gov/s/ct/>

Government of the United Kingdom Resource on the Risk of Terrorism

<http://www.fco.gov.uk/servlet/Front?pagename=OpenMarket/Xcelerate/ShowPage&c=Page&cid=1044011304926>

Government of Canada Terrorism Guide

<http://www.international.gc.ca/crime/terrorism-terrorisme.aspx?lang=eng>

Information on Terrorism by Government of Australia

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/icat/index.html>

FAA Resource on Aviation Safety

<http://www.faasafety.gov/>

In-Flight Safety Information for Air Travel (by British Airways crew trainer, Anna Warman)

<http://www.warman.demon.co.uk/anna/inflight.html>

Hot Spots: Travel Safety and Risk Information

<http://www.airsecurity.com/hotspots/HotSpots.asp>

Information on Human Rights

<http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/>

Sources: The United States Department of State, the United States Customs Department, the Government of Canada, the Government of United Kingdom, the Government of Australia, the Federal Aviation Authority, Anna Warman's In-flight Website, Hot Spots Travel and Risk Information

Diseases/Health Data

Please Note: Most of the entry below constitutes a generalized health advisory, which a traveler might find useful, regardless of a particular destination.

As a supplement, however, reader will also find below a list of countries flagged with current health notices and alerts issued by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Please note that travel to the following countries, based on these 3 levels of warnings, is ill-advised, or should be undertaken with the utmost precaution:

Level 3 (highest level of concern; avoid non-essential travel) --

Guinea - Ebola

Liberia - Ebola

Nepal - Earthquake zone

Sierra Leone - Ebola

Level 2 (intermediate level of concern; use utmost caution during travel) --

Cameroon - Polio

Somalia - Polio

Vanuatu - Tropical Cyclone zone

Throughout Middle East and Arabia Peninsula - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)

Level 1 (standard level of concern; use practical caution during travel) -

Australia - Ross River disease

Bosnia-Herzegovina - Measles

Brazil - Dengue Fever

Brazil - Malaria

Brazil - Zika

China - H7N9 Avian flu
Cuba - Cholera
Egypt - H5N1 Bird flu
Ethiopia - Measles
Germany - Measles
Japan - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)
Kyrgyzstan - Measles
Malaysia -Dengue Fever
Mexico - Chikungunya
Mexico - Hepatitis A
Nigeria - Meningitis
Philippines - Measles
Scotland - Mumps
Singapore - Hand, foot, and mouth disease (HFMD)
South Korea - MERS ((Middle East Respiratory Syndrome)
Throughout Caribbean - Chikungunya
Throughout Central America - Chikungunya
Throughout South America - Chikungunya
Throughout Pacific Islands - Chikungunya

**For specific information related to these health notices and alerts please see the CDC's listing available at URL:
<http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/travel/notices>**

Health Information for Travelers to Burundi

Several cases of African trypanosomiasis (African sleeping sickness) have been reported from this region recently, including cases among tourists visiting game parks. For more information and recommendations on trypanosomiasis, see Travelers' Health Information on African Trypanosomiasis (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases/aftrypano.htm>).

Also, please check the Outbreaks section for important updates on this region, including information on the Epidemic of Meningococcal Disease in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/outbreaks.htm>).

Food and waterborne diseases are the number one cause of illness in travelers. Travelers' diarrhea can be caused by viruses, bacteria, or parasites, which are found throughout the region and can contaminate food or water. Infections may cause diarrhea and vomiting (*E. coli*, *Salmonella*, cholera, and parasites), fever (typhoid fever and toxoplasmosis), or liver damage (hepatitis). Make sure your food and drinking water are safe. (See below.)

Malaria is a preventable infection that can be fatal if left untreated. Prevent infection by taking prescription antimalarial drugs and protecting yourself against mosquito bites (see below). Most travelers to malaria risk areas in this region should take mefloquine to prevent malaria. You can be infected with malaria in all areas of this region except the cities of Addis Ababa, Ismara, and Nairobi, the islands of Reunion and Seychelles, and in highland areas above 2,500 meters. For more detailed information about the risk in specific locations, see Malaria in East Africa (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/regionalmalaria/eafrica.htm>).

A certificate of yellow fever vaccine may be required for entry into certain of these countries. For detailed information, see Comprehensive Yellow Fever Vaccination Requirements (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/yelfever.htm>).

Dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, onchocerciasis, trypanosomiasis (sleeping sickness), and Rift Valley fever are diseases carried by insects that also occur in this region. Protecting yourself against insect bites will help to prevent these diseases.

Schistosomiasis, a parasitic infection, is found in fresh water in the region, including Lake Malawi. Do not swim in fresh water (except in well-chlorinated swimming pools) in these countries. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel Safe page at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/safety.htm>.)

Because motor vehicle crashes are a leading cause of injury among travelers, walk and drive defensively. Avoid nighttime travel if possible and always use seat belts.

CDC Recommends the Following Vaccines (as Appropriate for Age):

See your doctor at least 4-6 weeks before your trip to allow time for shots to take effect.

- Hepatitis A or immune globulin (IG).
- Hepatitis B, if you might be exposed to blood (for example, health-care workers), have sexual contact with the local population, stay longer than 6 months, or be exposed through medical treatment.
- Meningococcal (meningitis) vaccine, if you plan to visit the western half of Ethiopia (see meningitis map at URL <http://www.cdc.gov/travel/meninmap.htm>) from December through June.
- Rabies, if you might be exposed to wild or domestic animals through your work or recreation.
- Typhoid, particularly if you are visiting developing countries in this region.
- Yellow fever, if you travel anywhere outside urban areas.
- As needed, booster doses for tetanus-diphtheria, measles, and a one-time dose of polio vaccine for adults. Hepatitis B vaccine is now recommended for all infants and for children ages 11-12 years who did not receive the series as infants.

To Stay Healthy, Do:

- Wash hands often with soap and water.
- Drink only bottled or boiled water, or carbonated (bubbly) drinks in cans or bottles. Avoid tap water, fountain drinks, and ice cubes. If this is not possible, make water safer by BOTH filtering through an "absolute 1-micron or less" filter AND adding iodine tablets to the filtered water. "Absolute 1-micron filter" are found in camping/outdoor supply stores.
- Eat only thoroughly cooked food or fruits and vegetables you have peeled yourself. Remember: boil it, cook it, peel it, or forget it.
- If you travel to an area where there is risk for malaria, take your malaria prevention medication before, during, and after travel, as directed. (See your doctor for a prescription.)
- Protect yourself from insects by remaining in well-screened areas, using repellents (applied sparingly at 4-hour intervals) and permethrin-impregnated mosquito nets, and wearing long-sleeved shirts and long pants from dusk through dawn.
- To prevent fungal and parasitic infections, keep feet clean and dry, and do not go barefoot.
- Always use latex condoms to reduce the risk of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

To Avoid Getting Sick:

- Don't eat food purchased from street vendors.
- Don't drink beverages with ice.
- Don't eat dairy products unless you know they have been pasteurized.
- Don't share needles with anyone.
- Don't handle animals (especially monkeys, dogs, and cats), to avoid bites and serious diseases (including rabies and plague). (For more information, please see the Animal-Associated Hazards on the Making Travel Safe page.)
- Don't swim in fresh water, including Lake Malawi. Salt water is usually safer. (For more information, please see the Swimming Precautions on the Making Travel Safe page.)

What You Need To Bring with You:

- Long-sleeved shirt and long pants to wear while outside whenever possible, to prevent illnesses carried by insects (e.g., malaria, dengue, filariasis, leishmaniasis, and onchocerciasis).
- Insect repellent containing DEET (diethylmethyltoluamide), in 30%-35% strength for adults and 6%-10% for children. Unless you are staying in air-conditioned or well-screened housing, purchase a bed net impregnated with the insecticide permethrin. (Bed nets can be purchased in camping or military supply stores.)
- Over-the-counter antidiarrheal medicine to take if you have diarrhea.
- Iodine tablets and water filters to purify water if bottled water is not available. See Do's above for more detailed information about water filters.

- Sunblock, sunglasses, hat.
- Prescription medications: make sure you have enough to last during your trip, as well as a copy of the prescription(s).

After You Return Home:

If you have visited an area where there is risk for malaria, continue taking your malaria medication weekly for 4 weeks after you leave the area.

If you become ill after your trip-even as long as a year after you return-tell your doctor where you have traveled.

For More Information:

Ask your doctor or check the CDC web sites for more information about how to protect yourself against diseases that occur in East Africa, such as:

For information about diseases-

Carried by Insects

Dengue, Malaria

Carried in Food or Water

Cholera, *Escherichia coli*, diarrhea, Hepatitis A, Schistosomiasis, Typhoid Fever

Person-to-Person Contact

Hepatitis B, HIV/AIDS

For more information about these and other diseases, please check the Diseases (<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/diseases.htm>) section and the Health Topics A - Z (<http://www.cdc.gov/health/diseases.htm>).

Note:

Burundi is located in the East Africa health region.

Sources:

The Center for Disease Control Destinations Website:

<http://www.cdc.gov/travel/indianrg.htm>

Chapter 6

Environmental Overview

Environmental Issues

General Overview:

Because there is no comprehensive environmental synopsis on Burundi, many details in regards to problems of soil erosion, deforestation, and population density and growth, among other issues, are not available.

Burundi 's environmental situation is complicated by the political strife it has experienced in the last decade. Of particular concern is the lack of an institutional infrastructure, legislation, and training opportunities, with which to address environmental issues.

Current Issues:

- Soil erosion, as a result of overgrazing and the expansion of agriculture into marginal lands
- Deforestation (little forested land remains because of uncontrolled cutting of trees for fuel)
- Habitat loss threatens wildlife populations

Total Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Mtc):

0.8

Country Rank (GHG output):

151st

Natural Hazards:

- Flooding

-Landslides

Environmental Policy

Regulation and Jurisdiction:

The regulation and protection of the environment in Burundi is under the jurisdiction of the following:

- Ministry of Territorial Management and Environment
- Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
- Ministry of Development Planning and Reconstruction

Major Non-Governmental Organizations:

N/A

International Environmental Accords:

Party to:

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change
- Climate Change-Kyoto Protocol
- Desertification
- Endangered Species
- Hazardous Wastes
- Ozone Layer Protection

Signed but not ratified:

- Law of the Sea

Kyoto Protocol Status (year ratified):

2001

Greenhouse Gas Ranking

Greenhouse Gas Ranking

GHG Emissions Rankings

Country Rank	Country
1	United States
2	China
4	Russia
5	Japan
6	India
7	Germany
8	United Kingdom

9	Canada
10	Korea, South
11	Italy
12	Mexico
13	France
14	South Africa
15	Iran
16	Indonesia
17	Australia
18	Spain
19	Brazil
20	Saudi Arabia
21	Ukraine
22	Poland
23	Taiwan
24	Turkey
25	Thailand
26	Netherlands

27	Kazakhstan
28	Malaysia
29	Egypt
30	Venezuela
31	Argentina
32	Uzbekistan
33	Czech Republic
34	Belgium
35	Pakistan
36	Romania
37	Greece
38	United Arab Emirates
39	Algeria
40	Nigeria
41	Austria
42	Iraq
43	Finland
44	Philippines

45	Vietnam
46	Korea, North
47	Israel
48	Portugal
49	Colombia
50	Belarus
51	Kuwait
52	Hungary
53	Chile
54	Denmark
55	Serbia & Montenegro
56	Sweden
57	Syria
58	Libya
59	Bulgaria
60	Singapore
61	Switzerland
62	Ireland

63	Turkmenistan
64	Slovakia
65	Bangladesh
66	Morocco
67	New Zealand
68	Oman
69	Qatar
70	Azerbaijan
71	Norway
72	Peru
73	Cuba
74	Ecuador
75	Trinidad & Tobago
76	Croatia
77	Tunisia
78	Dominican Republic
79	Lebanon
80	Estonia

81	Yemen
82	Jordan
83	Slovenia
84	Bahrain
85	Angola
86	Bosnia & Herzegovina
87	Lithuania
88	Sri Lanka
89	Zimbabwe
90	Bolivia
91	Jamaica
92	Guatemala
93	Luxembourg
94	Myanmar
95	Sudan
96	Kenya
97	Macedonia
98	Mongolia

99	Ghana
100	Cyprus
101	Moldova
102	Latvia
103	El Salvador
104	Brunei
105	Honduras
106	Cameroon
107	Panama
108	Costa Rica
109	Cote d'Ivoire
110	Kyrgyzstan
111	Tajikistan
112	Ethiopia
113	Senegal
114	Uruguay
115	Gabon
116	Albania

117	Nicaragua
118	Botswana
119	Paraguay
120	Tanzania
121	Georgia
122	Armenia
123	Congo, RC
124	Mauritius
125	Nepal
126	Mauritius
127	Nepal
128	Mauritania
129	Malta
130	Papua New Guinea
131	Zambia
132	Suriname
133	Iceland
134	Togo

135	Benin
136	Uganda
137	Bahamas
138	Haiti
139	Congo, DRC
140	Guyana
141	Mozambique
142	Guinea
143	Equatorial Guinea
144	Laos
145	Barbados
146	Niger
147	Fiji
148	Burkina Faso
149	Malawi
150	Swaziland
151	Belize
152	Afghanistan

153	Sierra Leone
154	Eritrea
155	Rwanda
156	Mali
157	Seychelles
158	Cambodia
159	Liberia
160	Bhutan
161	Maldives
162	Antigua & Barbuda
163	Djibouti
164	Saint Lucia
165	Gambia
166	Guinea-Bissau
167	Central African Republic
168	Palau
169	Burundi
170	Grenada

171	Lesotho
172	Saint Vincent & the Grenadines
173	Solomon Islands
174	Samoa
175	Cape Verde
176	Nauru
177	Dominica
178	Saint Kitts & Nevis
179	Chad
180	Tonga
181	Sao Tome & Principe
182	Comoros
183	Vanuatu
185	Kiribati
Not Ranked	Andorra
Not Ranked	East Timor
Not Ranked	Holy See
Not Ranked	Hong Kong

Not Ranked	Liechtenstein
Not Ranked	Marshall Islands
Not Ranked	Micronesia
Not Ranked	Monaco
Not Ranked	San Marino
Not Ranked	Somalia
Not Ranked	Tuvalu

* European Union is ranked 3rd

Cook Islands are ranked 184th

Niue is ranked 186th

Global Environmental Snapshot

Introduction

The countries of the world face many environmental challenges in common. Nevertheless, the nature and intensity of problem vary from region to region, as do various countries' respective capacities, in terms of affluence and infrastructure, to remediate threats to environmental quality.

Consciousness of perils affecting the global environment came to the fore in the last third or so of the 20th century has continued to intensify well into the new millennium. According to the United Nations Environment Programme, considerable environmental progress has been made at the level of institutional developments, international cooperation accords, and public participation. Approximately two-dozen international environmental protection accords with global implications have been promulgated since the late 1970s under auspices of the United Nations and other international organizations, together with many additional regional agreements. Attempts to address and rectify environmental problems take the form of legal frameworks, economic instruments,

environmentally sound technologies and cleaner production processes as well as conservation efforts. Environmental impact assessments have increasingly been applied across the globe.

Environmental degradation affects the quality, or aesthetics, of human life, but it also displays potential to undermine conditions necessary for the sustainability of human life. Attitudes toward the importance of environmental protection measures reflect ambivalence derived from this bifurcation. On one hand, steps such as cleaning up pollution, dedicating parkland, and suchlike, are seen as embellishments undertaken by wealthy societies already assured they can successfully perform those functions deemed, ostensibly, more essential-for instance, public health and education, employment and economic development. On the other hand, in poorer countries, activities causing environmental damage-for instance the land degradation effects of unregulated logging, slash-and-burn agriculture, overgrazing, and mining-can seem justified insofar as such activities provide incomes and livelihoods.

Rapid rates of resource depletion are associated with poverty and high population growth, themselves correlated, whereas consumption per capita is much higher in the most developed countries, despite these nations' recent progress in energy efficiency and conservation. It is impossible to sequester the global environmental challenge from related economic, social and political challenges.

First-tier industrialized countries have recently achieved measurable decreases in environmental pollution and the rate of resource depletion, a success not matched in middle income and developing countries. It is believed that the discrepancy is due to the fact that industrialized countries have more developed infrastructures to accommodate changes in environmental policy, to apply environmental technologies, and to invest in public education. The advanced industrialized countries incur relatively lower costs in alleviating environmental problems, in comparison to developing countries, since in the former even extensive environmental programs represent a rather minuscule percentage of total expenditures. Conversely, budget constraints, lagged provision of basic services to the population, and other factors such as debt service and militarization may preclude institution of minimal environmental protection measures in the poorest countries.

A synopsis for the current situation facing each region of the world follows:

Regional Synopsis: Africa

The African continent, the world's second-largest landmass, encompasses many of the world's least developed countries. By global standards, urbanization is comparatively low but rising at a rapid rate. More heavily industrialized areas at the northern and southern ends of the continent experience the major share of industrial pollution. In other regions the most serious environmental problems typically stem from inefficient subsistence farming methods and other forms of land

degradation, which have affected an increasingly extensive area under pressure of a widely impoverished, fast-growing population. Africa's distribution of natural resources is very uneven. It is the continent at greatest risk of desertification, especially in the Sahel region at the edge of the Sahara but also in other dry-range areas. Yet at the same time, Africa also harbors some of the earth's richest and most diverse biological zones.

Key Points:

Up to half a billion hectares of African land are moderately to severely degraded, an occurrence reflecting short-fallow shifting cultivation and overgrazing as well as a climatic pattern of recurrent droughts.

Soil degradation is severe along the expanse directly south of the Sahara, from the west to the east coasts. Parts of southern Africa, central-eastern Africa, and the neighboring island of Madagascar suffer from serious soil degradation as well.

Africa contains about 17 percent of the world's forest cover, concentrated in the tropical belt of the continent. Many of the forests, however, are severely depleted, with an estimated 70 percent showing some degree of degradation.

Population growth has resulted in continuing loss of arable land, as inefficient subsistence farming techniques affect increasingly extensive areas. Efforts to implement settled, sustainable agriculture have met with some recent success, but much further progress in this direction is needed. Especially in previously uninhabited forestlands, concern over deforestation is intensifying.

By contrast, the African savanna remains the richest grassland in the world, supporting a substantial concentration of animal and plant life. Wildlife parks are sub-Saharan Africa's greatest tourist attraction, and with proper management-giving local people a stake in conservation and controlling the pace of development-could greatly enhance African economies.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of northern, southern and eastern Africa are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in Mauritania and Madagascar is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these two countries currently under threat.

With marine catch trends increasing from 500,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 3,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Water resource vulnerability is a major concern in northeastern Africa, and a moderate concern across the rest of the continent. An exception is central Africa, which has plentiful water supplies.

Many Africans lack adequate access to resources, not just (if at all) because the resources are unevenly distributed geographically, but also through institutional failures such as faulty land tenure systems or political upheaval. The quality of Africa's natural resources, despite their spotty distribution, is in fact extraordinarily rich. The infrastructure needed to protect and benefit from this natural legacy, however, is largely lacking.

Regional Synopsis: Asia and the Pacific

Asia-earth's largest landmass-and the many large and nearly innumerable small islands lying off its Pacific shore display extraordinarily contrasting landscapes, levels of development, and degrees of environmental stress. In the classification used here, the world's smallest continent, Australia, is also included in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Asia-Pacific region is home to 9 of the world's 14 largest urban areas, and as energy use for utilities, industry and transport increases in developing economies, urban centers are subject to worsening air quality. Intense population density in places such as Bangladesh or Hong Kong is the quintessential image many people have of Asia, yet vast desert areas such as the Gobi and the world's highest mountain range, the Himalayas, span the continent as well. Forested areas in Southeast Asia and the islands of Indonesia and the Philippines were historically prized for their tropical hardwood, but in many places this resource is now severely depleted. Low-lying small island states are extremely vulnerable to the effects of global warming, both rising sea levels and an anticipated increase in cyclones.

Key Points:

Asian timber reserves are forecast to be depleted in the next 40 years. Loss of natural forest is irreversible in some areas, but plantation programs to restore tree cover may ameliorate a portion of the resulting land degradation.

Increased usage of fossil fuels in China and other parts of southern Asia is projected to result in a marked increase in emissions, especially in regard to carbon dioxide. The increased usage of energy has led to a marked upsurge in air pollution across the region.

Acidification is an emerging problem regionally, with sulfur dioxide emissions expected to triple by 2010 if the current growth rate is sustained. China, Thailand, India, and Korea seem to be suffering from particularly high rates of acid deposition. By contrast, Asia's most highly developed economy, Japan, has effected substantial improvements in its environmental indicators.

Water pollution in the Pacific is an urgent concern since up to 70 percent of the water discharged

into the region's waters receives no treatment. Additionally, the disposal of solid wastes, in like manner, poses a major threat in a region with many areas of high population density.

The Asia-Pacific region is the largest expanse of the world's land that is adversely affected by soil degradation.

The region around Australia reportedly suffers the largest degree of ozone depletion.

The microstates of the Pacific suffer land loss due to global warming, and the consequent rise in the levels of ocean waters. A high-emissions scenario and anthropogenic climate impact at the upper end of the currently predicted range would probably force complete evacuation of the lowest-elevation islands sometime in this century.

The species-rich reefs surrounding Southeast Asia are highly vulnerable to the deleterious effects of coastal development, land-based pollution, over-fishing and exploitative fishing methods, as well as marine pollution from oil spills and other activities.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of China and south-east Asia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity in India, Japan, Australia, the Philippines, Indonesia and parts of Malaysia is even further compromised with over 20 percent of the mammal species in these countries currently under threat.

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern in areas surrounding the Indian subcontinent.

Regional Synopsis: Central Asia

The Central Asian republics, formerly in the Soviet Union, experience a range of environmental problems as the result of poorly executed agricultural, industrial, and nuclear programs during the Soviet era. Relatively low population densities are the norm, especially since upon the breakup of the U.S.S.R. many ethnic Russians migrated back to European Russia. In this largely semi-arid region, drought, water shortages, and soil salinization pose major challenges.

Key Points:

The use of agricultural pesticides, such as DDT and other chemicals, has contributed to the contamination of soil and groundwater throughout the region.

Land and soil degradation, and in particular, increased salinization, is mostly attributable to faulty irrigation practices.

Significant desertification is also a problem in the region.

Air pollution is prevalent, mostly due to use of low octane automobile fuel.

Industrial pollution of the Caspian Sea and the Aral Sea, as a result of industrial effluents as well as mining and metal production, presents a challenge to the countries bordering these bodies of water.

One of the most severe environmental problems in the region is attributable to the several billion tons of hazardous materials stored in landfills across Central Asia.

Uzbekistan's particular problem involves the contraction of the Aral Sea, which has decreased in size by a third, as a consequence of river diversions and poor irrigation practices. The effect has been the near-total biological destruction of that body of water.

Kazakhstan, as a consequence of being the heartland of the former Soviet Union's nuclear program, has incurred a high of cancerous malignancies, biogenetic abnormalities and radioactive contamination.

While part of the Soviet Union, the republics in the region experienced very high levels of greenhouse gas emissions, as a consequence of rapid industrialization using cheap but dirty energy sources, especially coal.

By contrast, however, there have recently been substantial reductions in the level of greenhouse gas emissions, especially those attributable to coal burning, with further decreases anticipated over the next decade. These changes are partially due to the use of cleaner energy technologies, such as natural gas, augmented by governmental commitment to improving environmental standards.

Regional Synopsis: Europe

Western Europe underwent dramatic transformation of its landscape, virtually eliminating large-scale natural areas, during an era of rapid industrialization, which intensified upon its recovery from World War II. In Eastern Europe and European Russia, intensive land development has been less prevalent, so that some native forests and other natural areas remain. Air and water pollution from use of dirty fuels and industrial effluents, however, are more serious environmental problems in Eastern than in Western Europe, though recent trends show improvement in many indicators. Acid rain has inflicted heavy environmental damage across much of Europe, particularly on forests.

Europe and North America are the only regions in which water usage for industry exceeds that for agriculture, although in Mediterranean nations agriculture is the largest water consumer.

Key Points:

Europe contributes 36 percent of the world's chlorofluorocarbon emissions, 30 percent of carbon dioxide emissions, and 25 percent of sulfur dioxide emissions.

Sulfur and nitrogen oxide emissions are the cause of 30 to 50 percent of Central and Eastern Europe's deforestation.

Acid rain has been an environmental concern for decades and continues to be a challenge in parts of Western Europe.

Overexploitation of up to 60 percent of Europe's groundwater presents a problem in industrial and urban areas.

With marine catch trends increasing from 5,000,000 metric tons in the 1950s to over 20,000,000 metric tons by 2000, there was increasing concern about the reduction in fisheries and marine life, should this trend continue unabated.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of western Europe, Eastern Europe and Russia are currently threatened, while the biological diversity on the Iberian Peninsula is even further compromised with over 40 percent of the mammal species in this region currently under threat. As a result, there has been a 10 percent increase in protected areas of Europe.

A major environmental issue for Europe involves the depletion of various already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Some estimates suggest that up to 50 percent of the continent's fish species may be considered endangered species. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species.

Fortunately, in the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Recently, most European countries have adopted cleaner production technologies, and alternative methods of waste disposal, including recycling.

The countries of Eastern Europe have made air quality a major environmental priority. This is exemplified by the Russian Federation's addition to the 1995 "Berlin Mandate" (transnational legislation based on resolutions of the Rio Earth Summit) compelling nations to promote "carbon

sinks" to absorb greenhouse gases.

On a relative basis, when compared with the degree of industrial emissions emitted by many Eastern European countries until the late 1980s, there has been some marked increase in air quality in the region, as obsolete plants are closed and a transition to cleaner fuels and more efficient energy use takes place.

Regional Synopsis: The Middle and Near East

Quite possibly, the Middle East will exemplify the adage that, as the 20th century was a century fixated on oil, the 21st century will be devoted to critical decisions about water. Many (though far from all) nations in the Middle East rank among those countries with the largest oil and gas reserves, but water resources are relatively scarce throughout this predominantly dry region. Effects of global warming may cause moderately high elevation areas that now typically receive winter "snowpack" to experience mainly rain instead, which would further constrain dry-season water availability. The antiquities and religious shrines of the region render it a great magnet for tourism, which entails considerable economic growth potential but also intensifies stresses on the environment.

Key Points:

Water resource vulnerability is a serious concern across the entire region. The increased usage of, and further demand for water, has exacerbated long-standing water scarcity in the region. For instance, river diversions and industrial salt works have caused the Dead Sea to shrink by one-third from its original surface area, with further declines expected.

The oil industry in the region contributes to water pollution in the Persian Gulf, as a result of oil spills, which have averaged 1.2 million barrels of oil spilt per year (some sources suggest that this figure is understated). The consequences are severe because even after oil spills have been cleaned up, environmental damage to the food webs and ecosystems of marine life will persist for a prolonged period.

The region's coastal zone is considered one of the most fragile and endangered ecosystems of the world. Land reclamation, shoreline construction, discharge of industrial effluents, and tourism (such as diving in the Red Sea) contribute to widespread coastal damage.

Significant numbers of mammal species in parts of the Middle East are currently threatened.

Since the 1980s, 11 percent of the region's natural forest has been depleted.

Regional Synopsis: Latin America and the Caribbean

The Latin American and Caribbean region is characterized by exceedingly diverse landforms that have generally seen high rates of population growth and economic development in recent decades. The percentage of inhabitants residing in urban areas is quite high at 73.4 percent; the region includes the megacities of Mexico City, Sao Paulo, and Rio de Janeiro. The region also includes the world's second-highest mountain range, the Andes; significant expanses of desert and grassland; the coral reefs of the Caribbean Sea; and the world's largest contiguous tropical forest in the Amazon basin. Threats to the latter from subsistence and commercial farming, mineral exploitation and timbering are well publicized. Nevertheless, of eight countries worldwide that still retain at least 70 percent of their original forest cover, six are in Latin America. The region accounts for nearly half (48.3 percent) of the world's greenhouse gas emissions derived from land clearing, but as yet a comparatively minuscule share (4.3 percent) of such gases from industrial sources.

Key Points:

Although Latin America is one of the most biologically diverse regions of the world, this biodiversity is highly threatened, as exemplified by the projected extinction of up to 100,000 species in the next few decades. Much of this loss will be concentrated in the Amazon area, although the western coastline of South America will also suffer significant depletion of biological diversity. The inventory of rainforest species with potentially useful commercial or medical applications is incomplete, but presumed to include significant numbers of such species that may become extinct before they are discovered and identified.

Up to 50 percent of the region's grazing land has lost its soil fertility as a result of soil erosion, salinization, alkalinization and overgrazing.

The Caribbean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Pacific Ocean have all been contaminated by agricultural wastes, which are discharged into streams that flow into these major waters. Water pollution derived from phosphorous, nitrates and pesticides adversely affects fish stocks, contributes to oxygen depletion and fosters overgrowth of aquatic vegetation. Marine life will continue to be severely compromised as a result of these conditions.

Due to industrial development in the region, many beaches of eastern Latin America and the Caribbean suffer from tar deposits.

Most cities in the region lack adequate sewage treatment facilities, and rapid migration of the rural poor into the cities is widening the gap between current infrastructure capacity and the much greater level needed to provide satisfactory basic services.

The rainforest region of the Amazon Basin suffers from dangerously high levels of deforestation, which may be a significant contributory factor to global warming or "the greenhouse effect." In the late 1990s and into the new millennium, the rate of deforestation was around 20 million acres of rainforest being destroyed annually.

Deforestation on the steep rainforest slopes of Caribbean islands contributes to soil erosion and landslides, both of which then result in heavy sedimentation of nearby river systems. When these sedimented rivers drain into the sea and coral reefs, they poison the coral tissues, which are vital to the maintenance of the reef ecosystem. The result is marine degradation and nutrient depletion. Jamaica's coral reefs have never quite recovered from the effects of marine degradation.

The Southern Cone of Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay) suffers the effects of greatly increased ultraviolet-B radiation, as a consequence of more intense ozone depletion in the southern hemisphere.

Water resource vulnerability is an increasingly major concern in the northwestern portion of South America.

Regional Synopsis: North America

North American nations, in particular the United States and Canada, rank among the world's most highly developed industrial economies—a fact which has generated significant pollution problems, but also financial resources and skills that have enabled many problems to be corrected. Although efforts to promote energy efficiency, recycling, and suchlike have helped ease strains on the environment in a part of the world where per capita consumption levels are high, sprawling land development patterns and recent preferences many households have demonstrated for larger vehicles have offset these advances.

Meanwhile, a large portion of North America's original forest cover has been lost, though in many cases replaced by productive second-growth woodland. In recent years, attitudes toward best use of the region's remaining natural or scenic areas seem to be shifting toward recreation and preservation and away from resource extraction. With increasing attention on the energy scarcity in the United States, however, there is speculation that this shift may be short-lived. Indeed, the energy shortage on the west coast of the United States and associated calls for energy exploration, indicate a possible retrenchment toward resource extraction. At the same time, however, it has also served to highlight the need for energy conservation as well as alternative energy sources.

Despite generally successful anti-pollution efforts, various parts of the region continue to suffer significant air, water and land degradation from industrial, vehicular, and agricultural emissions and

runoff. Mexico, as a middle-income country, displays environmental problems characteristic of a developing economy, including forest depletion, pollution from inefficient industrial processes and dirty fuels, and lack of sufficient waste-treatment infrastructure.

Key Points:

Because of significantly greater motor vehicle usage in the United States (U.S.) than in the rest of the world, the U.S. contribution of urban air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, especially carbon dioxide, is disproportionately high in relation to its population.

Acid rain is an enduring issue of contention in the northeastern part of the United States, on the border with Canada.

Mexico's urban areas suffer extreme air pollution from carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and other toxic air pollutants. Emissions controls on vehicles are in their infancy, compared to analogous regulations in the U.S.

The cities of Mexico, including those on the U.S. border, also discharge large quantities of untreated or poorly treated sewage, though officials are currently planning infrastructure upgrades.

Deforestation is noteworthy in various regions of the U.S., especially along the northwest coastline. Old growth forests have been largely removed, but in the northeastern and upper midwestern sections of the United States, evidence suggests that the current extent of tree cover probably surpasses the figure for the beginning of the 20th century.

Extreme weather conditions in the last few years have resulted in a high level of soil erosion along the north coast of California; in addition, the coastline itself has shifted substantially due to soil erosion and concomitant landslides.

Agricultural pollution-including nitrate contamination of well water, nutrient runoff to waterways, and pesticide exposure-is significant in various areas. Noteworthy among affected places are California's Central Valley, extensive stretches of the Midwest, and land in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

Inland waterways, especially around the Great Lakes, have substantially improved their water quality, due to concentrated efforts at reducing water pollution by governmental, commercial and community representatives. Strict curbs on industrial effluents and near-universal implementation of sewage treatment are the chief factors responsible for this improvement.

A major environmental issue for Canada and the United States involves the depletion of various

already endangered or threatened species, and most significantly, the decline of fish stocks. Coastal fisheries have been over-harvested, resulting in catch limits or moratoriums on many commercially important fish species. In the last few years, these policies have started to yield measurable results with decreasing trends in marine fish catch.

Due to the decay of neighboring ecosystems in Central America and the Caribbean, the sea surrounding Florida has become increasingly sedimented, contributing to marine degradation, nutrient depletion of the ecosystem, depletion of fish stocks, and diseases to coral species in particular.

Polar Regions

Key Points:

The significant rise in sea level, amounting 10 to 25 centimeters in the last 100 years, is due to the melting of the Arctic ice sheets, and is attributed to global warming.

The Antarctic suffers from a significant ozone hole, first detected in 1976. By 1985, a British scientific team reported a 40 percent decrease in usual regeneration rates of the ozone. Because a sustained increase in the amount of ultraviolet-B radiation would have adverse consequences upon all planetary life, recent environmental measures have been put into effect, aimed at reversing ozone depletion. These measures are projected to garner significant results by 2050.

Due to air and ocean currents, the Arctic is a sink for toxic releases originally discharged thousands of miles away. Arctic wildlife and Canada's Inuit population have higher bodily levels of contaminants such as PCB and dioxin than those found in people and animals in much of the rest of the world.

Global Environmental Concepts

1. Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases

The Greenhouse Effect:

In the early 19th century, the French physicist, Jean Fourier, contended that the earth's atmosphere functions in much the same way as the glass of a greenhouse, thus describing what is now understood as the "greenhouse effect." Put simply, the "greenhouse effect" confines some of the sun's energy to the earth, preserving some of the planet's warmth, rather than allowing it to flow back into space. In so doing, all kinds of life forms can flourish on earth. Thus, the "greenhouse effect" is necessary to sustain and preserve life forms and ecosystems on earth.

In the late 19th century, a Swedish chemist, Svante Arrhenius, noticed that human activities, such as the burning of coal and other fossil fuels for heat, and the removal of forested lands for urban development, led to higher concentrations of greenhouse gases, like carbon dioxide and methane, in the atmosphere. This increase in the levels of greenhouse gases was believed to advance the "greenhouse effect" exponentially, and might be related to the trend in global warming.

In the wake of the Industrial Revolution, after industrial development took place on a large scale and the total human population burgeoned simultaneously with industrialization, the resulting increase in greenhouse gas emissions could, many scientists believe, be significant enough to have some bearing on climate. Indeed, many studies in recent years support the idea that there is a linkage between human activities and global warming, although there is less consensus on the extent to which this linkage may be relevant to environmental concerns.

That said, some scientists have argued that temperature fluctuations have existed throughout the evolution of the planet. Indeed, Dr. S. Fred Singer, the president of the Science and Environment Policy Project has noted that 3,000-year-old geological records of ocean sediment reveal changes in the surface temperature of the ocean. Hence, it is possible that climate variability is merely a normal fact of the planet's evolution. Yet even skeptics as to anthropogenic factors concur that any substantial changes in global temperatures would likely have an effect upon the earth's ecosystems, as well as the life forms that inhabit them.

The Relationship Between Global Warming and Greenhouse Gases:

A large number of climatologists believe that the increase in atmospheric concentrations of "greenhouse gas emissions," mostly a consequence of human activities such as the burning of fossil fuels, are contributing to global warming. The cause notwithstanding, the planet has reportedly warmed 0.3°C to 0.6°C over the last century. Indeed, each year during the 1990s was one of the very warmest in the 20th century, with the mean surface temperature for 1999 being the fifth warmest on record since 1880.

In early 2000, a panel of atmospheric scientists for the National Research Council concluded in a report that global warming was, indeed, a reality. While the panel, headed by Chairman John Wallace, a professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Washington, stated that it

remained unclear whether human activities have contributed to the earth's increasing temperatures, it was apparent that global warming exists.

In 2001, following a request for further study by the incoming Bush administration in the [United States](#), the National Academy of Sciences again confirmed that global warming had been in existence for the last 20 years. The study also projected an increase in temperature between 2.5 degrees and 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit by the year 2100. Furthermore, the study found the leading cause of global warming to be emissions of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, and it noted that greenhouse gas accumulations in the earth's atmosphere was a result of human activities.

Within the scientific community, the controversy regarding has centered on the difference between surface air and upper air temperatures. Information collected since 1979 suggests that while the earth's surface temperature has increased by about a degree in the past century, the atmospheric temperature five miles above the earth's surface has indicated very little increase. Nevertheless, the panel stated that this discrepancy in temperature between surface and upper air does not invalidate the conclusion that global warming is taking place. Further, the panel noted that natural events, such as volcanic eruptions, can decrease the temperature in the upper atmosphere.

The major consequences of global warming potentially include the melting of the polar ice caps, which, in turn, contribute to the rise in sea levels. Many islands across the globe have already experienced a measurable loss of land as a result. Because global warming may increase the rate of evaporation, increased precipitation, in the form of stronger and more frequent storm systems, is another potential outcome. Other consequences of global warming may include the introduction and proliferation of new infectious diseases, loss of arable land (referred to as "desertification"), destructive changes to existing ecosystems, loss of biodiversity and the isolation of species, and concomitant adverse changes in the quality of human life.

International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to

changes in climate.

2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

*** See section on "International Environmental Agreements and Associations" for information related to international policies related to limiting greenhouse gases and controlling climate change emanating from historic summits at Kyoto, Copenhagen, Doha, and Paris. ***

2. Air Pollution

Long before global warming reared its head as a significant issue, those concerned about the environment and public health noted the deleterious effects of human-initiated combustion upon the atmosphere. Killer smogs from coal burning triggered acute health emergencies in London and other places. At a lower level of intensity motor vehicle, power plant, and industrial emissions impaired long-range visibility and probably had some chronic adverse consequences on the respiratory systems of persons breathing such air.

In time, scientists began associating the sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides released from coal burning with significant acid deposition in the atmosphere, eventually falling as "acid rain." This phenomenon has severely degraded forestlands, especially in Europe and a few parts of the [United States](#). It has also impaired some aquatic ecosystems and eaten away the surface of some human artifacts, such as marble monuments. Scrubber technology and conversion to cleaner fuels have enabled the level of industrial production to remain at least constant while significantly reducing acid deposition. Technologies aimed at cleaning the air and curtailing acid rain, soot, and smog may, nonetheless, boomerang as the perils of global warming become increasingly serious. In brief, these particulates act as sort of a sun shade -- comparable to the effect of volcanic eruptions on the upper atmosphere whereby periods of active volcanism correlate with temporarily cooler weather conditions. Thus, while the carbon dioxide releases that are an inevitable byproduct of combustion continue, by scrubbing the atmosphere of pollutants, an industrial society opens itself to greater insolation (penetration of the sun's rays and consequent heating), and consequently, it is likely to experience a correspondingly greater rise in ambient temperatures.

The health benefits of removing the sources of acid rain and smog are indisputable, and no one would recommend a return to previous conditions. Nevertheless, the problematic climatic effects of continually increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases pose a major global environmental challenge, not as yet addressed adequately.

3. Ozone Depletion

The stratospheric ozone layer functions to prevent ultraviolet radiation from reaching the earth. Normally, stratospheric ozone is systematically disintegrated and regenerated through natural photochemical processes. The stratospheric ozone layer, however, has been depleted unnaturally as a result of anthropogenic (man-made) chemicals, most especially chlorine and bromide compounds such as chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), halons, and various industrial chemicals in the form of solvents, refrigerants, foaming agents, aerosol propellants, fire retardants, and fumigants. Ozone depletion is of concern because it permits a greater degree of ultraviolet-B radiation to reach the earth, which then increases the incidences of cancerous malignancies, cataracts, and human immune deficiencies. In addition, even in small doses, ozone depletion affects the ecosystem by disturbing food chains, agriculture, fisheries and other forms of biological diversity.

Transnational policies enacted to respond to the dangers of ozone depletion include the 1985 Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The Montreal Protocol was subsequently amended in London in 1990, Copenhagen in 1992 and Vienna in 1995. By 1996, 155 countries had ratified the Montreal Protocol, which sets out a time schedule for the reduction (and eventual elimination) of ozone depleting substances (OPS), and bans exports and imports of ODS from and to non-participant countries.

In general, the Protocol stipulates that developed countries must eliminate halon consumption by 1994 and CFC consumption by 1996, while developing countries must eliminate these substances by 2010. Consumption of methyl bromide, which is used as a fumigant, was to be frozen at the 1995 in developed countries, and fully eliminated in 2010, while developing countries are to freeze consumption by 2002, based on average 1995-1998 consumption levels. Methyl chloroform is to be phased out by 2005. Under the Montreal Protocol, most ODS will be completely eliminated from use by 2010.

4. Land Degradation

In recent decades, land degradation in more arid regions of the world has become a serious concern. The problem, manifest as both "desertification" and "devegetation," is caused primarily by climate variability and human activities, such as "deforestation," excessive cultivation, overgrazing, and other forms of land resource exploitation. It is also exacerbated by inadequate irrigation practices. Although the effects of droughts on drylands have been temporary in the past, today, the productivity and sustainability of these lands have been severely compromised for the long term. Indeed, in every region of the world, land degradation has become an acute issue.

Desertification and Devegetation:

"Desertification" is a process of land degradation causing the soil to deteriorate, thus losing its nutrients and fertility, and eventually resulting in the loss of vegetation, known as "devegetation." As aforementioned, "desertification" and "devegetation" are caused by human activities, yet human beings are also the greatest casualties. Because these forms of land degradation affect the ability of the soil to produce crops, they concomitantly contribute to poverty. As population increases and demographic concentrations shift, the extent of land subject to stresses by those seeking to wrest subsistence from it has inexorably risen.

In response, the United Nations has formed the Convention to Combat Desertification-aimed at implementing programs to address the underlying causes of desertification, as well as measures to prevent and minimize its effects. Of particular significance is the formulation of policies on transboundary resources, such as areas around lakes and rivers. At a broader level, the Convention has established a Conference of Parties (COP), which includes all ratifying governments, for directing and advancing international action.

To ensure more efficacious use of funding, the Convention intends to reconfigure international aid to utilize a consultative and coordinated approach in the disbursement and expenditure of donor funds. In this way, local communities that are affected by desertification will be active participants in the solution-generation process. In-depth community education projects are envisioned as part of this new international aid program, and private donor financing is encouraged. Meanwhile, as new technologies are developed to deal with the problem of desertification, they need to be distributed for application across the world. Hence, the Convention calls for international cooperation in scientific research in this regard.

Desertification is a problem of sustainable development. It is directly connected to human challenges such as poverty, social and economic well-being and environmental protection as well. Broader environmental issues, such as climate change, biological diversity, and freshwater supplies, are indirectly related, so any effort to resolve this environmental challenge must entail coordinated research efforts and joint action.

Deforestation:

Deforestation is not a recent phenomenon. For centuries, human beings have cut down trees to clear space for land cultivation, or in order to use the wood for fuel. Over the last 200 years, and most especially after World War II, deforestation increased because the logging industry became a globally profitable endeavor, and so the clearing of forested areas was accelerated for the purposes of industrial development. In the long term, this intensified level of deforestation is considered problematic because the forest is unable to regenerate itself quickly. The deforestation that has

occurred in tropical rainforests is seen as an especially serious concern, due to the perceived adverse effects of this process upon the entire global ecosystem.

The most immediate consequence of deforestation is soil degradation. Soil, which is necessary for the growth of vegetation, can be a fragile and vital property. Organically, an extensive evolution process must take place before soil can produce vegetation, yet at the same time, the effects of natural elements, such as wind and rain, can easily and quickly degrade this resource. This phenomenon is known as soil erosion. In addition, natural elements like wind and rain reduce the amount of fertile soil on the ground, making soil scarcity a genuine problem. When fertile topsoil that already exists is removed from the landscape in the process of deforestation, soil scarcity is further exacerbated. Equally significant is the fact that once land has been cleared so that the topsoil can be cultivated for crop production, not only are the nutrient reserves in the soil depleted, thus producing crops of inferior quality, but the soil structure itself becomes stressed and deteriorates further.

Another direct result of deforestation is flooding. When forests are cleared, removing the cover of vegetation, and rainfall occurs, the flow of water increases across the surface of land. When extensive water runoff takes place, the frequency and intensity of flooding increases. Other adverse effects of deforestation include the loss of wildlife and biodiversity within the ecosystem that supports such life forms.

At a broader level, tropical rainforests play a vital role in maintaining the global environmental system. Specifically, destruction of tropical rainforests affects the carbon dioxide cycle. When forests are destroyed by burning (or rotting), carbon dioxide is released into the air, thus contributing to an intensified "greenhouse effect." The increase in greenhouse gas emissions like carbon dioxide is a major contributor to global warming, according to many environmental scientists. Indeed, trees themselves absorb carbon dioxide in the process of photosynthesis, so their loss also reduces the absorption of greenhouse gases.

Tropical rainforest destruction also adversely affects the nitrogen cycle. Nitrogen is a key nutrient for both plants and animals. Plants derive nitrogen from soil, while animals obtain it via nitrogen-enriched vegetation. This element is essential for the formation of amino acids, and thereby for proteins and biochemicals that all living things need for metabolism and growth. In the nitrogen cycle, vegetation acquires these essential proteins and biochemicals, and then cyclically returns them to the atmosphere and global ecosystem. Accordingly, when tropical rainforest ecosystems are compromised, not only is vegetation removed; the atmosphere is also affected and climates are altered. At a more immediate level, the biodiversity within tropical rainforests, including wildlife and insect species and a wealth of plant varieties, is depleted. Loss of rare plants is of particular concern because certain species as yet unknown and unused could likely yield many practical benefits, for instance as medicines.

As a result of the many challenges associated with deforestation, many environmental groups and agencies have argued for government policies on the sustainable development of forests by governments across the globe. While many countries have instituted national policies and programs aimed at reducing deforestation, and substantial research has been advanced in regard to sustainable and regenerative forestry development, there has been very little progress on an international level. Generally speaking, most tropical rainforests are located in developing and less developed countries, where economic growth is often dependent upon the exploitation of tropical rainforests. Timber resources as well as wildlife hunting tend to be particularly lucrative arenas.

In places such as the Amazon, where deforestation takes place for the construction of energy plants aimed at industrialization and economic development, there is an exacerbated effect on the environment. After forests are cleared in order to construct such projects, massive flooding usually ensues. The remaining trees then rot and decay in the wake of the flooding. As the trees deteriorate, their biochemical makeup becomes more acidic, producing poisonous substances such as hydrogen sulphide and methane gases. Acidified water subsequently corrodes the mechanical equipment and operations of the plants, which are already clogged by rotting wood after the floodwaters rise.

Deforestation generally arises from an economically plausible short-term motivation, but nonetheless poses a serious global concern because the effects go beyond national boundaries. The United Nations has established the World Commission on Forest and Sustainable Development. This body's task is to determine the optimal means of dealing with the issue of deforestation, without unduly affecting normal economic development, while emphasizing the global significance of protecting tropical forest ecosystems.

5. Water Resources

For all terrestrial fauna, including humans, water is the most immediate necessity to sustain life. As the population has increased and altered an ever-greater portion of the landscape from its natural condition, demand on water resources has intensified, especially with the development of industrialization and large-scale irrigation. The supply of freshwater is inherently limited, and moreover distributed unevenly across the earth's landmasses. Moreover, not just demand for freshwater but activities certain to degrade it are becoming more pervasive. By contrast, the oceans form a sort of "last wilderness," still little explored and in large part not seriously affected by human activity. However, coastal environments - the biologically richest part of the marine ecosystem-are experiencing major depletion due to human encroachment and over-exploitation.

Freshwater:

In various regions, for instance the Colorado River in the western [United States](#), current withdrawals of river water for irrigation, domestic, and industrial use consume the entire streamflow so that almost no water flows into the sea at the river's mouth. Yet development is ongoing in many such places, implying continually rising demand for water. In some areas reliant on groundwater, aquifers are being depleted at a markedly faster rate than they are being replenished. An example is the San Joaquin Valley in California, where decades of high water withdrawals for agriculture have caused land subsidence of ten meters or more in some spots. Naturally, the uncertainty of future water supplies is particularly acute in arid and semi-arid regions. Speculation that the phenomenon of global warming will alter geographic and seasonal rainfall patterns adds further uncertainty.

Water conservation measures have great potential to alleviate supply shortages. Some city water systems are so old and beset with leaking pipes that they lose as much water as they meter. Broad-scale irrigation could be replaced by drip-type irrigation, actually enhancing the sustainability of agriculture. In many areas where heavy irrigation has been used for decades, the result is deposition of salts and other chemicals in the soil such that the land becomes unproductive for farming and must be abandoned.

Farming is a major source of water pollution. Whereas restrictions on industrial effluents and other "point sources" are relatively easy to implement, comparable measures to reform hydraulic practices at farms and other "nonpoint sources" pose a significantly knottier challenge. Farm-caused water pollution takes the following main forms:

- Nitrate pollution found in wells in intensive farming areas as a consequence of heavy fertilizer use is a threat to human health. The most serious danger is to infants, who by ingesting high-nitrate water can contract methemoglobinemia, sometimes called "blue baby syndrome," a potentially fatal condition.
- Fertilizer runoff into rivers and lakes imparts unwanted nutrients that cause algae growth and eventual loss of oxygen in the body of water, degrading its ability to support fish and other desirable aquatic life.
- Toxic agricultural chemicals - insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides - are detectable in some aquifers and waterways.

In general, it is much easier to get a pollutant into water than to retrieve it out. Gasoline additives, dry cleaning chemicals, other industrial toxins, and in a few areas radionuclides have all been found in water sources intended for human use. The complexity and long time scale of subterranean hydrological movements essentially assures that pollutants already deposited in aquifers will continue to turn up for decades to come. Sophisticated water treatment processes are available, albeit expensive, to reclaim degraded water and render it fit for human consumption. Yet

source protection is unquestionably a more desirable alternative.

In much of the developing world, and even some low-income rural enclaves of the developed world, the population lacks ready access to safe water. Surface water and shallow groundwater supplies are susceptible to contamination from untreated wastewater and failing septic tanks, as well as chemical hazards. The occurrence of waterborne disease is almost certainly greatly underreported.

Marine Resources:

Coastal areas have always been desirable places for human habitation, and population pressure on them continues to increase. Many types of water degradation that affect lakes and rivers also affect coastal zones: industrial effluents, untreated or partially treated sewage, nutrient load from agriculture figure prominently in both cases. Prospects for more extreme storms as a result of global warming, as well as the pervasiveness of poorly planned development in many coastal areas, forebode that catastrophic hurricanes and landslides may increase in frequency in the future. Ongoing rise in sea levels will force remedial measures and in some cases abandonment of currently valuable coastal property.

Fisheries over much of the globe have been overharvested, and immediate conservation measures are required to preserve stocks of many species. Many governments subsidized factory-scale fishing fleets in the 1970s and 1980s, and the resultant catch increase evidently surpassed a sustainable level. It is uncertain how much of the current decline in fish stocks stems from overharvesting and how much from environmental pollution. The deep ocean remains relatively unaffected by human activity, but continental shelves near coastlines are frequently seriously polluted, and these close-to-shore areas are the major biological nurseries for food fish and the smaller organisms they feed on.

6. Environmental Toxins

Toxic chemical pollution exploded on the public consciousness with disclosure of spectacularly polluted industrial areas such as Love Canal near Buffalo, New York. There is no question that pollutants such as organophosphates or radionucleides can be highly deleterious to health, but evidence to date suggests that seriously affected areas are a localized rather than universal problem.

While some explore the possibilities for a lifestyle that fully eschews use of modern industrial chemicals, the most prevalent remediative approach is to focus on more judicious use. The most efficient chemical plants are now able to contain nearly all toxic byproducts of their production processes within the premises, minimizing the release of such substances into the environment.

Techniques such as Integrated Pest Management (IPM) dictate limited rather than broadcast use of pesticides: application only when needed using the safest available chemical, supplemented as much as possible with nontoxic controls.

While heightened public awareness and growing technical sophistication suggest a hopeful outlook on limiting the damage from manmade environmental toxins, one must grant that previous incidents of their misuse and mishandling have already caused environmental damage that will have to be dealt with for many years to come. In the case of the most hazardous radioactive substances, the time scale for successful remediation actually extends beyond that of the recorded history of civilization. Moreover, in this era of high population density and rapid economic growth, quotidian activities such as the transport of chemicals will occasionally, seemingly inevitably result in accidents with adverse environmental consequences.

7. "Islandization" and Biodiversity

With increased awareness regarding the adverse effects of unregulated hunting and habitat depletion upon wildlife species and other aspects of biodiversity, large-scale efforts across the globe have been initiated to reduce and even reverse this trend.

In every region of the world, many species of wildlife and areas of biodiversity have been saved from extinction. Nationally, many countries have adopted policies aimed at preservation and conservation of species, and one of the most tangible measures has been the proliferation of protected habitats. Such habitats exist in the form of wildlife reserves, marine life reserves, and other such areas where biodiversity can be protected from external encroachment and exploitation.

Despite these advances in wildlife and biodiversity protection, further and perhaps more intractable challenges linger. Designated reserves, while intended to prevent further species decline, exist as closed territories, fragmented from other such enclaves and disconnected from the larger ecosystem. This environmental scenario is referred to as "islandization." Habitat reserves often serve as oversized zoos or game farms, with landscapes and wildlife that have effectively been "tamed" to suit. Meanwhile, the larger surrounding ecosystem continues to be seriously degraded and transformed, while within the islandized habitat, species that are the focus of conservation efforts may not have sufficient range and may not be able to maintain healthy genetic variability.

As a consequence, many conservationists and preservationists have demanded that substantially larger portions of land be withheld as habitat reserves, and a network of biological corridors to connect continental reserves be established. While such efforts to combat islandization have considerable support in the [United States](#), how precisely such a program would be instituted, especially across national boundaries, remains a matter of debate. International conservationists and preservationists say without a network of reserves a massive loss of biodiversity will result.

The concept of islandization illustrates why conservation and preservation of wildlife and biodiversity must consider and adopt new, broader strategies. In the past, conservation and preservation efforts have been aimed at specific species, such as the spotted owl and grizzly bear in North America, the Bengal tiger in Southeast Asia, the panda in [China](#), elephants in Africa. Instead, the new approach is to simultaneously protect many and varied species that inhabit the same ecosystem. This method, referred to as "bio-regional conservation," may more efficaciously generate longer-term and more far-reaching results precisely because it is aimed at preserving entire ecosystems, and all the living things within.

More About Biodiversity Issues:

This section is directly taken from the United Nations Environmental Program: "[Biodiversity Assessment](#)"

The Global Biodiversity Assessment, completed by 1500 scientists under the auspices of United Nations Environmental Program in 1995, updated what is known (or unknown) about global biological diversity at the ecosystem, species and genetic levels. The assessment was uncertain of the total number of species on Earth within an order of magnitude. Of its working figure of 13 million species, only 13 percent are scientifically described. Ecological community diversity is also poorly known, as is its relationship to biological diversity, and genetic diversity has been studied for only a small number of species. The effects of human activities on biodiversity have increased so greatly that the rate of species extinctions is rising to hundreds or thousands of times the background level. These losses are driven by increasing demands on species and their habitats, and by the failure of current market systems to value biodiversity adequately. The Assessment calls for urgent action to reverse these trends.

There has been a new recognition of the importance of protecting marine and aquatic biodiversity. The first quantitative estimates of species losses due to growing coral reef destruction predict that almost 200,000 species, or one in five presently contributing to coral reef biodiversity, could die out in the next 40 years if human pressures on reefs continue to increase.

Since Rio, many countries have improved their understanding of the status and importance of their biodiversity, particularly through biodiversity country studies such as those prepared under the auspices of UNEP/GEF. The [United Kingdom](#) identified 1250 species needing monitoring, of which 400 require action plans to ensure their survival. Protective measures for biodiversity, such as legislation to protect species, can prove effective. In the USA, almost 40 percent of the plants and animals protected under the Endangered Species Act are now stable or improving as a direct result of recovery efforts. Some African countries have joined efforts to protect threatened species through the 1994 Lusaka Agreement, and more highly migratory species are being protected by

specialized cooperative agreements among range states under the Bonn Agreement.

There is an emerging realization that a major part of conservation of biological diversity must take place outside of protected areas and involve local communities. The extensive agricultural areas occupied by small farmers contain much biodiversity that is important for sustainable food production. Indigenous agricultural practices have been and continue to be important elements in the maintenance of biodiversity, but these are being displaced and lost. There is a new focus on the interrelationship between agrodiversity conservation and sustainable use and development practices in smallholder agriculture, with emphasis on use of farmers' knowledge and skills as a source of information for sustainable farming.

Perhaps even more important than the loss of biodiversity is the transformation of global biogeochemical cycles, the reduction in the total world biomass, and the decrease in the biological productivity of the planet. While quantitative measurements are not available, the eventual economic and social consequences may be so significant that the issue requires further attention.

Specific sources used for this section:

Bendall, Roger. 1996. "Biodiversity: the follow up to Rio". *The Globe* 30:4-5, April 1996.

Global Environmental Change: Human and Policy Implications. 1995. Special issue on "People, Land Management and Environmental Change", Vol. 3, No. 4, September 1995.

Golubev, Genady N. (Moscow University) In litt. 29 June 1996.

Heywood, V.H. (ed.). 1995. *Global Biodiversity Assessment*. United Nations Environment Programme. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Heywood, V.H. 1996. "The Global Biodiversity Assessment". *The Globe*, 30:2-4, April 1996.

Reaka-Kudla, Marjorie. 1996. Paper presented at American Association for Advancement of Science, February 1996. Quoted in Pain, Stephanie. "Treasures lost in reef madness". New Scientist, 17 February 1996.

Uitto, Juha I., and Akiko Ono (eds). 1996. Population, Land Management and Environmental Change. The United Nations University, Tokyo.

USFWS. 1994. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service report to Congress, cited in news release 21 July 1994.

Online resources used generally in the Environmental Overview:

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

U n i t e d N a t i o n s E n v i r o n m e n t a l P r o g r a m . U R L : http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

Note on Edition Dates:

The edition dates for textual resources are noted above because they were used to formulate the original content. We also have used online resources (cited above) to update coverage as needed.

Information Resources

For more information about environmental concepts, CountryWatch recommends the following resources:

The United Nations Environmental Program Network (with country profiles)

[<http://www.unep.net/>](http://www.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environment Program on Climate Change

[<http://climatechange.unep.net/>](http://climatechange.unep.net/)

The United Nations Environmental Program on Waters and Oceans

[<http://www.unep.ch/earthw/Pdepwat.htm>](http://www.unep.ch/earthw/Pdepwat.htm)

The United Nations Environmental Program on Forestry: "Forests in Flux"

[<http://www.unep-wcmc.org/forest/flux/homepage.htm>](http://www.unep-wcmc.org/forest/flux/homepage.htm)

FAO "State of the World's Forests"

[<http://www.fao.org/forestry/FO/SOFO/SOFO99/sofo99-e.stm>](http://www.fao.org/forestry/FO/SOFO/SOFO99/sofo99-e.stm)

World Resources Institute.

[<http://www.wri.org/>](http://www.wri.org/)

Harvard University Center for Health and the Global Environment

[<http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/the-review.html>](http://www.med.harvard.edu/chge/the-review.html)

The University of Wisconsin Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment

<http://sage.aos.wisc.edu/>

International Environmental Agreements and Associations

International Policy Development in Regard to Global Warming:

Introduction

Regardless of what the precise nature of the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and global warming may be, it seems that there is some degree of a connection between the phenomena. Any substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and global warming trends will likely involve systematic changes in industrial operations, the use of advanced energy sources and technologies, as well as global cooperation in implementing and regulating these transformations.

In this regard, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) stipulated the following objectives:

1. To stabilize "greenhouse gas" concentrations within the atmosphere, in such a manner that would preclude hazardous anthropogenic intervention into the existing biosphere and ecosystems of the world. This stabilization process would facilitate the natural adaptation of ecosystems to changes in climate.
2. To ensure and enable sustainable development and food production on a global scale.

Following are two discussions regarding international policies on the environment, followed by listings of international accords.

Special Entry: The Kyoto Protocol

The UNFCCC was adopted at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, and entered into force in 1994. Over 175 parties were official participants.

Meanwhile, however, many of the larger, more industrialized nations failed to reach the emissions' reduction targets, and many UNFCCC members agreed that the voluntary approach to reducing emissions had not been successful. As such, UNFCCC members reached a consensus that legally binding limits were necessitated, and agreed to discuss such a legal paradigm at a meeting in Kyoto, [Japan](#) in 1997. At that meeting, the UNFCCC forged the Kyoto Protocol. This concord is the first legally binding international agreement that places limits on emissions from industrialized countries. The major greenhouse gas emissions addressed in the Kyoto Protocol include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, sulfur hexafluoride, and methane.

The provisions of the Kyoto Protocol stipulate that economically advanced nations must reduce their combined emissions of greenhouse gases, by approximately five percent from their 1990

levels, before the 2008-2010 deadline. Countries with the highest carbon dioxide emissions, such as the [United States](#) (U.S.), many of the European Union (EU) countries, and [Japan](#), are to reduce emissions by a scale of 6 to 8 percent. All economically advanced nations must show "demonstrable progress" by 2005. In contrast, no binding limits or timetable have been set on developing countries. Presumably, this distinction is due to the fact that most developing countries - - with the obvious exceptions of [India](#) and [China](#) -- simply do not emit as many greenhouse gases as do more industrially advanced countries. Meanwhile, these countries are entrenched in the process of economic development.

Regardless of the aforementioned reasoning, there has been strong opposition against the asymmetrical treatment assigned to emissions limits among developed and developing countries. Although this distinction might be regarded as unfair in principle, associations such as the Alliance of Small Island States have been vocal in expressing how global warming -- a result of greenhouse gas emissions - has contributed to the rise in sea level, and thus deleteriously affected their very existence as island nation states. For this reason, some parties have suggested that economically advanced nations, upon returning to their 1990 levels, should be required to further reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by a deadline of 2005. In response, interested parties have observed that even if such reductions were undertaken by economically advanced nations, they would not be enough to completely control global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming. Indeed, a reduction in the rate of fossil fuel usage by developing nations would also be necessary to have substantial ameliorative effect on global warming.

As such, the Protocol established a "Clean Development Mechanism" which permits developed countries to invest in projects aimed at reducing emissions within developing countries in return for credit for the reductions. Ostensibly, the objective of this mechanism is to curtail emissions in developing countries without unduly penalizing them for their economic development. Under this model, the countries with more potential emissions credits could sell them to other signatories of the Kyoto Protocol, whose emissions are forecast to significantly rise in the next few years. Should this trading of emissions credits take place, it is estimated that the Kyoto Protocol's emissions targets could still be met.

In 1999, the International Energy Outlook projected that Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and Newly Independent States, as well as parts of Asia, are all expected to show a marked decrease in their level of energy-related carbon emissions in 2010. Nations with the highest emissions, specifically, the U.S., the EU and [Japan](#), are anticipated to reduce their emissions by up to 8 percent by 2012. By 2000, however, the emissions targets were not on schedule for achievement. Indeed, the U.S. Department of Energy estimates forecast that by 2010, there will be a 34 percent increase in carbon emissions from the 1990 levels, in the absence of major shifts in policy, economic growth, energy prices, and consumer trends. Despite this assessment in the U.S., international support for the Kyoto Protocol remained strong, especially among European countries

and island states, who view the pact as one step in the direction away from reliance on fossil fuels and other sources of greenhouse gases.

In 2001, U.S. President, George W. Bush, rejected his country's participation in the Kyoto Protocol, saying that the costs imposed on the global economic system, and especially, on the US, overshadowed the benefits of the Protocol. He also cited the unfair burden on developed nations to reduce emissions, as another primary reasons for withdrawal from the international pact, as well as insufficient evidence regarding the science of global warming. Faced with impassioned international disapproval for his position, the U.S. president stated that his administration remained interested in dealing with the matter of global warming, but would endorse alternative measures to combat the problem, such as voluntary initiatives limiting emissions. Critics of Bush's position, however, have noted that it was the failure of voluntary initiatives to reduce emissions following the Rio Summit that led to the establishment of the Kyoto Protocol in the first place.

In the wake of the Bush administration's decision, many participant countries resigned themselves to the reality that the goals of the Kyoto Protocol might not be achieved without U.S. involvement. Nevertheless, in Bonn, [Germany](#), in July 2001, the remaining participant countries struck a political compromise on some of the key issues and sticking points, and planned to move forward with the Protocol, irrespective of the absence of the U.S. The key compromise points included the provision for countries to offset their targets with carbon sinks (these are areas of forest and farmland which can absorb carbon through the process of photosynthesis). Another compromise point within the broader Bonn Agreement was the reduction of emissions cuts of six gases from over 5 percent to a more achievable 2 percent. A third key change was the provision of funding for less wealthy countries to adopt more progressive technologies.

In late October and early November 2001, the UNFCCC's 7th Conference of the Parties met in Marrakesh, [Morocco](#), to finalize the measures needed to make the Kyoto Protocol operational. Although the UNFCCC projected that ratification of the Protocol would make it legally binding within a year, many critics noted that the process had fallen short of implementing significant changes in policy that would be necessary to actually stop or even slow climate change. They also maintained that the absence of U.S. participation effectively rendered the Protocol into being a political exercise without any substance, either in terms of transnational policy or in terms of environmental concerns.

The adoption of the compromises ensconced within the Bonn Agreement had been intended to make the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol more palatable to the U.S. In this regard, it failed to achieve its objective as the Bush administration continued to eschew participation in the international accord. Still, however, the Bonn Agreement did manage to render a number of other positive outcomes. Specifically, in 2002, key countries, such as [Russia](#), [Japan](#) and [Canada](#) agreed to ratify the protocol, bringing the number of signatories to 178. The decision by key countries to

ratify the protocol was regarded as "the kiss of life" by observers.

By 2005, on the eve of a climate change conference in London, British Prime Minister Tony Blair was hoping to deal with the problems of climate change beyond the provisions set forth in the Kyoto Protocol. Acknowledging that the Kyoto Protocol could not work in its current form, Blair wanted to open the discussion for a new climate change plan.

Blair said that although most of the world had signed on to Kyoto, the protocol could not meet any of its practical goals of cutting greenhouse gas emissions without the participation of the United States, the world's largest polluter. He also noted that any new agreement would have to include India and China -- significant producers of greenhouse gas emissions, but exempt from Kyoto because they have been classified as developing countries. Still, he said that progress on dealing with climate change had been stymied by "a reluctance to face up to reality and the practical action needed to tackle problem."

Blair also touted the "huge opportunities" in technology and pointed toward the possibilities offered by wind, solar and nuclear power, along with fuel cell technology, eco-friendly biofuels, and carbon capture and storage which could generate low carbon power. Blair also asserted that his government was committed to achieving its domestic goal of reducing carbon dioxide emissions by 20 percent by 2010.

In the United States, President George W. Bush has said that global warming remained a debatable issue and despite conclusions reached by his own Environmental Protection Agency, he has not agreed with the conclusion that global warming and climate change are linked with human activities. Bush has also refused to ratify Kyoto on the basis of its economic costs.

Australia, an ally of the United States, has taken a similarly dim view of the Kyoto Protocol. Ahead of the November 2005 climate change meeting in Canada in which new goals for the protocol were to be discussed, Australia's Environment Minister, Ian Campbell, said that negotiating new greenhouse gas emission levels for the Kyoto Protocol would be a waste of time. Campbell said, "There is a consensus that the caps, targets and timetables approach is flawed. If we spend the next five years arguing about that, we'll be fiddling and negotiating while Rome burns." Campbell, like the Bush administration, has also advocated a system of voluntary action in which industry takes up new technologies rather than as a result of compelling the reduction of emissions. But the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF) has called on its government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol, to establish a system of emissions trading, and to set binding limits on emissions. Interestingly, although it did not sign on to Kyoto, Australia was expected to meet its emissions target by 2012 (an 8 percent increase in 1990 levels in keeping with the country's reliance on coal). But this success has nothing to do with new technologies and is due to state-based regulations on land clearing.

Note: The Kyoto Protocol calls for developed nations to cut greenhouse emissions by 5.2 percent of 1990 levels by 2012.

Special Entry: Climate Change Summit in Copenhagen (2009) --

In December 2009, the United Nations Climate Change Summit opened in the Danish capital of Copenhagen. The summit was scheduled to last from Dec. 7-18, 2009. Delegates from more than 190 countries were in attendance, and approximately 100 world leaders, including British Prime Minister Gordon Brown and [United States](#) President Barack Obama, were expected to participate. At issue was the matter of new reductions targets on greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

Despite earlier fears that little concurrence would come from the conference, effectively pushing significant actions forward to a 2010 conference in [Mexico](#) City, negotiators were now reporting that the talks were productive and several key countries, such as [South Africa](#), had pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The two main issues that could still lead to cleavages were questions of agreement between the industrialized countries and the developing countries of the world, as well as the overall effectiveness of proposals in seriously addressing the perils of climate change.

On Dec. 9, 2009, four countries -- the [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) -- presented a document outlining ideas for raising and managing billions of dollars, which would be intended to help vulnerable countries dealing with the perils of climate change. Described as a "green fund," the concept could potentially help small island states at risk because of the rise in sea level. [Bangladesh](#) identified itself as a potential recipient of an assistance fund, noting that as a country plagued by devastating floods, it was particularly hard-hit by climate change. The "green fund" would fall under the rubric of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, for which developed countries have been committed to quantifying their emission reduction targets, and also to providing financial and technical support to developing countries.

The [United Kingdom](#), [Australia](#), [Mexico](#) and [Norway](#) also called for the creation of a new legal treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol. This new treaty, which could go into force in 2012, would focus largely on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by 2020. But [Australia](#) went even further in saying that the successor treaty to the Kyoto Protocol, should be one with provisions covering all countries. Such a move would be a departure from the structure of the Kyoto Protocol, which contained emissions targets for industrialized countries due to the prevailing view that developed countries had a particular historic responsibility to be accountable for climate change. More recently, it has become apparent that substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions demanded by scientists would only come to pass with the participation also of significant developing nation states, such as [China](#) and [India](#). Indeed, one of the most pressing critiques of the Kyoto Protocol was that it was a "paper tiger" that failed to address the impact of the actions of

emerging economies like [China](#) and [India](#), with its focus on the developed economies.

Now, in 2009, [China](#) -- as the world's biggest greenhouse gas emitter -- was responding this dubious distinction by vocalizing its criticism of the current scenario and foregrounding its new commitments. Ahead of the Copenhagen summit, [China](#) had announced it would reduce the intensity of its carbon emissions per unit of its GDP in 2020 by 40 to 45 percent against 2005 levels. With that new commitment at hand, [China](#) was now accusing the [United States](#) and the European Union of shirking their own responsibilities by setting weak targets for greenhouse gas emissions cuts. Senior Chinese negotiator, Su Wei, characterized the goals of the world's second largest greenhouse gas emitter -- the [United States](#) -- as "not notable," and the European Union's target as "not enough." Su Wei also took issue with [Japan](#) for setting implausible preconditions.

On Dec. 11, 2009, [China](#) demanded that developed and wealthy countries in Copenhagen should help deliver a real agreement on climate change by delivering on their promises to reduce carbon emissions and provide financial support for developing countries to adapt to global warming. In so doing, China's Vice Foreign Minister He Yafei said his country was hoping that a "balanced outcome" would emerge from the discussions at the summit. Echoing the position of the Australian government, He Yafei spoke of a draft agreement as follows: "The final document we're going to adopt needs to be taking into account the needs and aspirations of all countries, particularly the most vulnerable ones."

China's Vice Foreign Minister emphasized the fact that climate change was "a matter of survival" for developing countries, and accordingly, such countries need wealthier and more developed countries to accentuate not only their pledges of emissions reduction targets, but also their financial commitments under the aforementioned United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. To that end, scientists and leaders of small island states in the Indian Ocean, the Pacific Ocean and the Caribbean Sea, have highlighted the existential threat posed by global warming and the concomitant rise in sea level.

China aside, attention was also on [India](#) -- another major player in the developing world and a country with an industrializing economy that was impacting the environment. At issue was the Indian government's decision to set a carbon intensity target, which would slow emissions growth by up to 25 percent by the 2020 deadline. This strong position was resisted by some elements in [India](#), who argued that their country should not be taking such a strong position when developed wealthy countries were yet to show accountability for their previous commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The matter grew so heated that the members of the opposition stormed out of the parliament in protest as Indian Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh defended the policy. But the political pressure at home in [India](#) was leaving the Indian delegation in Copenhagen in a state of chaos as well. In fact, India's top environmental negotiator refused to travel to Copenhagen in protest of the government's newly-announced stance.

China and [India](#) were joined by [Brazil](#) and [South Africa](#) in the crafting of a draft document calling

for a new global climate treaty to be completed by June 2010. Of concern has been the realization that there was insufficient time to find concurrence on a full legal treaty, which would leave countries only with a politically-binding text by the time the summit at Copenhagen closed. But Guyana's leader, President Bharrat Jagdeo, warned that the summit in [Denmark](#) would be classified as a failure unless a binding document was agreed upon instead of just political consensus. He urged his cohorts to act with purpose saying, "Never before have science, economics, geo-strategic self-interest and politics intersected in such a way on an issue that impacts everyone on the planet."

Likewise, [Tuvalu](#) demanded that legally binding agreements emerge from Copenhagen. Its proposal was supported by many of the vulnerable countries, from small island states and sub-Saharan Africa, all of whom warned of the catastrophic impact of climate change on their citizens. [Tuvalu](#) also called for more aggressive action, such as an amendment to the 1992 agreement, which would focus on sharp greenhouse gas emissions and the accepted rise in temperatures, due to the impact the rise in seas. The delegation from [Kiribati](#) joined the call by drawing attention to the fact that one village had to be abandoned due to waist-high water, and more such effects were likely to follow. Kiribati's Foreign Secretary, Tessie Lambourne, warned that the people of [Kiribati](#) could well be faced with no homeland in the future saying, "Nobody in this room would want to leave their homeland." But despite such impassioned pleas and irrespective of warnings from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that the rise in sea level from melting polar ice caps would deleteriously affect low-lying atolls such as [Tuvalu](#) and [Kiribati](#) in the Pacific, and the [Maldives](#) in the Indian Ocean, the oil-giant [Saudi Arabia](#) was able to block this move.

Meanwhile, within the developed countries, yet another power struggle was brewing. The European Union warned it would only agree to raise its target of 20 percent greenhouse gas emissions reductions to 30 percent if the [United States](#) demonstrated that it would do more to reduce its own emissions. It was unknown if such pressure would yield results. [United States](#) President Barack Obama offered a "provisional" 2020 target of 17 percent reductions, noting that he could not offer greater concessions at Copenhagen due to resistance within the [United States](#) Congress, which was already trying to pass a highly controversial "cap and trade" emissions legislation. However, should that emissions trading bill fail in the Senate, the [United States](#) Environment Protection Agency's declaration that greenhouse gases pose a danger to human health and the environment was expected to facilitate further regulations and limits on power plants and factories at the national level. These moves could potentially strengthen the Obama administration's offering at Copenhagen. As well, President Obama also signaled that he would be willing to consider the inclusion of international forestry credits.

Such moves indicated willingness by the Obama administration to play a more constructive role on the international environmental scene than its predecessor, the Bush administration. Indeed, ahead of his arrival at the Copenhagen summit, President Barack Obama's top environmental advisors

promised to work on a substantial climate change agreement. To that end, [United States](#) Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Lisa Jackson said at a press conference, "We are seeking robust engagement with all of our partners around the world." But would this pro-engagement assertion yield actual results?

By Dec. 12, 2009, details related to a draft document prepared by Michael Zammit Cutajar, the head of the Ad-hoc Working Group on Long-Term Cooperative Action, were released at the Copenhagen climate conference. Included in the document were calls for countries to make major reductions in carbon emissions over the course of the next decade. According to the Washington Post, industrialized countries were called on to make cuts of between 25 percent and 40 percent below 1990 levels -- reductions that were far more draconian than the [United States](#) was likely to accept. As discussed above, President Obama had offered a provisional reduction target of 17 percent. The wide gap between the released draft and the United States' actual stated position suggested there was much more negotiating in the offing if a binding agreement could be forged, despite the Obama administration's claims that it was seeking greater engagement on this issue.

In other developments, the aforementioned call for financial support of developing countries to deal with the perils of climate change was partly answered by the European Union on Dec. 11, 2009. The European bloc pledged an amount of 2.4 billion euros (US\$3.5 billion) annually from 2010 to 2012. Environment Minister Andreas Carlgren of [Sweden](#) -- the country that holds the rotating presidency of the European Union at the time of the summit -- put his weight behind the notion of a "legally binding deal." Meanwhile, Yvo de Boer, a top United Nations climate change official, focused less on the essence of the agreement and more on tangible action and effects saying, "Copenhagen will only be a success if it delivers significant and immediate action that begins the day the conference ends."

The division between developed and developing countries in Copenhagen reached new heights on Dec. 14, 2009, when some of the poor and less developed countries launched a boycott at the summit. The move, which was spurred by African countries but backed by [China](#) and [India](#), appeared to be geared toward redirecting attention and primary responsibility to the wealthier and more industrialized countries. The impasse was resolved after the wealthier and more industrialized countries offered assurances that they did not intend on shirking from their commitments to reducing greenhouse gases. As a result, the participating countries ceased the boycott.

Outside the actual summit, thousands of protestors had gathered to demand crucial global warming, leading to clashes between police and demonstrators elsewhere in the Danish capital city. There were reports of scattered violence across Copenhagen and more than 1,000 people were arrested.

Nevertheless, by the second week of the climate change summit, hopes of forging a strong deal were eroding as developed and developing nations remained deadlocked on sharing cuts in

greenhouse gases, and particularly on the matters of financing and temperature goals. In a bid to shore up support for a new climate change, [United States](#) President Barack Obama joined other world leaders in Copenhagen. On Dec. 14, 2009, there was a standoff brewing between the [United States](#) and [China](#). At issue was China's refusal to accept international monitoring of its expressed targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The [United States](#) argued that China's opposition to verification could be a deal-breaker.

By the close of the summit, the difficult process eventually resulted in some consensus being cultivated. A draft text called for \$100 billion a year by 2020 to assist poor nations cope with climate change, while aiming to limit global warming to two degrees Celsius compared with pre-industrial levels. The deal also included specific targets for developed countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and called for reductions by developing countries as a share of their economies. Also included in the agreement was a mechanism to verify compliance. The details of the agreement were supported by President Barack Obama, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva.

This draft would stand as an interim agreement, with a legally-binding international pact unlikely to materialize until 2010. In this way, the summit in Copenhagen failed to achieve its central objective, which was to negotiate a successor to the Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions.

Editor's Note

In the background of these developments was the growing global consciousness related to global warming and climate change. Indeed, as the Copenhagen summit was ongoing, it was clear there was enormous concurrence on the significance of the stakes with an editorial on the matter of climate change being published in 56 newspapers in 45 countries. That editorial warned that without global action, climate change would "ravage our planet." Meanwhile, a global survey taken by Globescan showed that concern over global warming had exponentially increased from 1998 -- when only 20 percent of respondents believed it to be a serious problem -- to 64 percent in 2009. Such survey data, however, was generated ahead of the accusations by climate change skeptics that some climate scientists may have overstated the case for global warming, based on emails derived in an illicit manner from a British University.

Special Entry: Climate change talks in Doha in [Qatar](#) extend life of Kyoto Protocol (2012)

December 2012 saw climate talks ensue in the Qatari city of Doha as representatives from countries across the world gathered to discuss the fate of the Kyoto Protocol, which seeks to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. The summit yielded results with decisions made (1) to extend the Kyoto Protocol until 2020, and (2) for wealthier countries to compensate poorer countries for the losses and damage incurred as a result of climate change.

In regards to the second matter, Malia Talakai of [Nauru](#), a leading negotiator for the Alliance of Small Island States, explained the necessity of the compensation package as follows: “We are trying to say that if you pollute you must help us.”

This measure was being dubbed the "Loss and Damage" mechanism, and was being linked with [United States](#) President Barack Obama's request for \$60 billion from Congress to deal with the devastation caused by Hurricane Sandy months before. The sight of a hurricane bearing down on the northern Atlantic seaboard, along with the reality of the scope of reconstruction, appeared to have illustrated the economic costs of climate change -- not so much as a distant environmental issue -- but as a danger to the quotidian lives of people. Still, there was blame to be placed on the [United States](#) and European countries -- some of world's largest emitters -- for failing to do more to reduce emissions.

To that latter end, there was in fact little progress made on the central issue of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Had those emissions been reduced, there would have been less of a need to financially deal with the devastation caused by climate change. One interpretation was that the global community was accepting the fact that industrialization was contributing to global warming, which had deleterious effects on the polar ice caps and concomitantly on the rise of sea level, with devastating effects for small island nations. Thus, wealthier countries were willing to pay around \$10 billion a year through 2020, effectively in "damages," to the poor countries that could be viewed as the "collateral damage" of industrial progress. But damages today could potentially be destruction tomorrow, leaving in place the existential challenges and burdens to be born by some of the world's smallest and least wealthy island countries.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the representative for the small island nation states at the Doha summit responded with ire, characterizing the lack of progress on reducing emissions as follows: "We see the package before us as deeply deficient in mitigation (carbon cuts) and finance. It's likely to lock us on the trajectory to a 3,4,5C rise in global temperatures, even though we agreed to keep the global average temperature rise of 1.5C to ensure survival of all islands. There is no new finance (for adapting to climate change and getting clean energy) -- only promises that something might materialize in the future. Those who are obstructive need to talk not about how their people will live, but whether our people will live."

Indeed, in most small island countries not just in the Pacific, but also the Caribbean and Indian Ocean, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have been dominant themes with dire life and death consequences looming in the background for their people. Small island nations in these region are already at risk from the rise of sea-level, tropical cyclones, floods. But their very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming were also at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Increasingly high storm surges can wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Accordingly, the very existence of island nations, such as [Kiribati](#) and [Tuvalu](#), are

at severe risk of being obliterated from the map. Yet even with the existential threat of being wiped off the map in the offing, the international community has been either slow or restrictive in its efforts to deal with global warming, climate change, economic and ecological damage, as well as the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees.

A 2012 report from the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the Pacific Regional Environment Program underlined the concerns of small island nations and their people as it concluded that the livelihoods of approximately 10 million people in Pacific island communities were increasingly vulnerable to climate change. In fact, low-lying islands in that region would likely confront losses of up to 18 percent of gross domestic product due to climate change, according to the report. The report covers 21 countries and territories, including [Fiji](#), [Kiribati](#), [Samoa](#) and [Tonga](#), and recommended environmental legislation intended to deal with the climate crisis facing the small island countries particularly. As noted by David Sheppard, the director general of the Pacific Regional Environment Program that co-sponsored this study: "The findings... emphasize the need more than ever to raise the bar through collective actions that address the region's environmental needs at all levels."

Regardless of the failures of the summit in [Qatar](#) (discussed above), the meeting did facilitate a process starting in 2015, which would bind both wealthy and poor countries together in the mission of forging a new binding treaty that would replace the Kyoto Protocol and tackle the central causes of climate change.

For more information on the threats faced in small island nations by climate change and the measures being undertaken to lobby for international action, please see the Alliance for Small Island States available online at the URL: <http://aosis.org/>

Special Report

COP 21 summit in Paris ends with historic agreement to tackle climate change; rare international consensus formed on environmental crisis facing the planet (2015) --

In mid-December 2015, the highly-anticipated United Nations climate conference of parties (COP) in Paris, [France](#), ended with a historic agreement. In fact, it would very likely be understood as the most significant international agreement signed by all the recognized countries of the world since the Cold War. Accordingly, the Paris Agreement was being distinguished as the first multilateral pact that would compel all countries across the world to cut its carbon emissions -- one of the major causes of increasing greenhouse gas emissions, which contribute to global warming, and its deleterious effects ranging from the dangerous rise in sea level to catastrophic climate change.

The accord, which was dubbed to be the "Paris Agreement," was the work of rigorous diplomacy and fervent environmental advocacy, and it aimed to address the climate change crisis facing the planet. As many as 195 countries were represented in the negotiations that led to the landmark climate deal. Indeed, it was only after weeks of passionate debate that international concurrence was reached in addressing the environmental challenges confronting the world, with particular attention to moving beyond fossil fuels and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The success of the COP 21 summit in Paris and the emergence of the landmark Paris Agreement was, to some extent, attributed to the efforts of France's Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius who presided over the negotiations. The French foreign minister's experience and credentials as a seasoned diplomat and respected statesman paid dividends. He skillfully guided the delegates from almost 200 countries and interest groups along the negotiations process, with ostensibly productive results and a reasonably robust deal to show for it.

On Dec. 12, 2015, French Foreign Minister Fabius officially adopted the agreement, declaring: "I now invite the COP to adopt the decision entitled Paris Agreement outlined in the document. Looking out to the room I see that the reaction is positive, I see no objections. The Paris agreement is adopted." Once Foreign Minister Fabius' gavel was struck, symbolically inaugurating the Paris Agreement into force, the COP delegate rushed to their feet with loud and bouyant cheers as well as thunderous applause.

In general, the Paris Agreement was being hailed as a victory for enviromental activists and a triumph for international diplomats, while at the same time being understood as simply an initial -- and imperfect -- move in the direction of a sustainable future. China's chief negotiator, Xie Zhenhua, issued this message, saying that while the accord was not ideal, it should "not prevent us from marching historical steps forward."

United States President Barack Obama lauded the deal as both "ambitious" and "historic," and the work of strenuous multilateral negotiations as he declared, "Together, we've shown what's possible when the world stands as one." The [United States](#) leader acknowledged that the accord was not "perfect," but he reminded the critics that it was "the best chance to save the one planet we have."

Former [United States](#) Vice President Al Gore, one of the world's most well known environmental advocates, issued a lengthy statement on the accomplishments ensconced in the Paris Agreement. He highlighted the fact that the Paris Agreement was a first step towards a future with a reduced carbon footprint on Planet Earth as he said, "The components of this agreement -- including a strong review mechanism to enhance existing commitments and a long-term goal to eliminate global-warming pollution this century -- are essential to unlocking the necessary investments in our future. No agreement is perfect, and this one must be strengthened over time, but groups across every sector of society will now begin to reduce dangerous carbon pollution through the framework of this agreement."

The central provisions of the Paris Agreement included the following items:

- Greenhouse gas emissions should peak as quickly as possible, with a move towards balancing energy sources, and ultimately the decrease of greenhouse gases in the second half of this century
- Global temperature increase would be limited to 1.5 degrees Centigrade above pre-industrial levels and would be held "well below" the two degrees Centigrade threshold
- Progress on these goals would be reviewed every five years beginning in 2020 with new greenhouse gas reduction targets issued every five years
- \$100 billion would be expended each year in climate finance for developing countries to move forward with green technologies, with further climate financing to be advanced in the years beyond

It should be noted that there both legally binding and voluntary elements contained within the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the submission of an emissions reduction target and the regular review of that goal would be legally mandatory for all countries. Stated differently, there would be a system in place by which experts would be able to track the carbon-cutting progress of each country. At the same time, the specific targets to be set by countries would be determined at the discretion of the countries, and would not be binding. While there was some criticism over this non-binding element, the fact of the matter was that the imposition of emissions targets was believed to be a major factor in the failure of climate change talks in Copenhagen, [Denmark](#), in 2009.

In 2015, the talks faced challenges as several countries, such as [China](#) and [India](#), objected to conditions that would stymie economic and development. In order to avoid that kind of landmine, a system Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs) was developed and formed the basis of the accord. As such, the Paris Agreement would, in fact, facilitate economic growth and development, as well as technological progress, but with the goal of long-term ecological sustainability based on low carbon sources. In fact, the agreement heralded as "the beginning of the end of the fossil fuel era." As noted by Nick Mabey, the head of the climate diplomacy organization E3G, said, "Paris means governments will go further and faster to tackle climate change than ever before. The transition to a low carbon economy is now unstoppable, ensuring the end of the fossil fuel age."

A particular sticking point in the agreement was the \$100 billion earmarked for climate financing for developing countries to transition from traditional fossil fuels to green energy technologies and a low carbon future. In 2014, a report by the International Energy Agency indicated that the cost of that transition would actually be around \$44 trillion by the mid-century -- an amount that would render the \$100 billion being promised to be a drop in the proverbial bucket. However, the general expectation was that the Republican-controlled Senate in the [United States](#), which would have to ratify the deal in that country, was not interested in contributing significant funds for the cause of climate change.

A key strength of the Paris Agreement was the ubiquitous application of measures to all countries. Of note was the frequently utilized concept of "flexibility" with regard to the Paris Agreement. Specifically, the varying capacities of the various countries in meeting their obligations would be anticipated and accorded flexibility. This aspect presented something of a departure from the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which drew a sharp distinction between developed and developing countries, and mandated a different set of obligations for those categories of countries. Thus, under Kyoto, [China](#) and [India](#) were not held to the same standards as the [United States](#) and European countries. In the Paris Agreement, there would be commitments from all countries across the globe.

Another notable strength of the Paris Agreement was the fact that the countries of the world were finally able to reach consensus on the vital necessity to limit global temperature increases to 1.5 degrees Centigrade. Ahead of the global consensus on the deal, and as controversy continued to surface over the targeted global temperature limits, the leaders of island countries were sounding the alarm about the melting of the Polar ice caps and the associated rise in sea level. Prime Minister Enele Sopoaga of [Tuvalu](#) issued this dismal reminder: "Tuvalu's future ... is already bleak and any further temperature increase will spell the total demise of [Tuvalu](#). No leader in this room carries such a level of worry and responsibility. Just imagine you are in my shoes, what would you do?" It was thus something of a victory for environmental advocates that the countries of the world could find consensus on the lower number -- 1.5 degrees rather than 2 degrees.

A significant weak point with regard to the Paris deal was a "loss and damage" provision, which anticipates that even with all the new undertakings intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and move to a low carbon future, there would nonetheless be unavoidable climate change consequences. Those consequences ranged from the loss of arable land for farmers as well as soil erosion and contamination of potable water by sea water, to the decimation of territory in coastal zones and on small islands, due to the rise in sea level, with entire small island countries being rendered entirely uninhabitable. The reality was that peoples' homes across the world would be destroyed along with their way of life.

With that latter catastrophic effect being a clear and present danger for small island countries, the Association of Small Island States (AOSIS) demanded that the developed world acknowledge its responsibility for this irreversible damage.. Despite the fact that greenhouse gas emissions and the ensuing plague of global warming was, indeed, the consequence of development in the West (the [United States](#) and Europe) and the large power house countries, such as [Russia](#), [China](#) and [India](#), there was no appetite by those countries to sign on to unlimited liability. Under the Paris Agreement, there was a call for research on insurance mechanisms that would address loss and damage issues, with recommendations to come in the future.

The call for research was being regarded as an evasion of sorts and constituted the weakest aspect

of the Paris Agreement. Not surprisingly, a coalition of small island nations demanded a "Marshall Plan" for the Pacific. Borrowing the term "Marshall Plan" from the post-World War II reconstruction effort, the coalition of Pacific island nation, which included [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), [Fiji](#), and the [Marshall Islands](#), called for an initiative that would include investment in renewable energy and shoreline protection, cultural preservation, economic assistance for economies in transition, and a plan for migration and resettlement for these countries as they confront the catastrophic effects of the melting of the Polar ice caps and the concomitant rise in sea level. The precise contours of the initiative remained unknown, unspecified, and a mere exercise in theory at the time of writing. Yet such an initiative would, at some point, have to be addressed, given the realities of climate change and the slow motion calamity unfolding each day for low-lying island nations across the world.

As noted by Vice President Greg Stone of Conservation International, who also functions as an adviser to the government of [Kiribati](#), "Imagine living in a place where you know it's going to go away someday, but you don't know what day that wave's going to come over and wash your home away." He added, "It's a disaster we know is going to happen." Meanwhile, the intervening years promised to be filled with hardship for small island nations, such as [Kiribati](#). Stone explained, "For every inch of sea-level rise, these islands lose 10 feet of their freshwater table to saltwater intrusion," Stone explained. "So it's not just about the day the water finally goes over the island; it's also about the day that there's just not enough water left and everyone has to move off the island." Presaging the future for island nations that could face submersion, Stone said, "If you look ahead 50 years, a country like [Kiribati](#) could become the first aqueous nation. possibility of migration. That is, they own this big patch of ocean, and they administer it from elsewhere."

Foreign Minister Minister Tony Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) emerged as the champion advocating on behalf of small island nation states and a loose coalition of concerned countries from the Pacific to the Caribbean, but with support from the [United States](#). He addressed the comprehensive concerns of small island nations regarding the weaknesses of the deal, while simultaneously making clear that the Paris Agreement signified hope for the countries most at risk. In a formal statement, Debrum declared: "We have made history today. Emissions targets are still way off track, but this agreement has the tools to ramp up ambition, and brings a spirit of hope that we can rise to this challenge. I can go back home to my people and say we now have a pathway to survival." Debrum highlighted the imperatives of Pacific island nations, saying, "Our High Ambition Coalition was the lightning rod we needed to lift our sights and expectations for a strong agreement here in Paris. We were joined by countries representing more than half the world. We said loud and clear that a bare-bones, minimalist agreement would not fly. We instead demanded an agreement to mark a turning point in history, and the beginning of our journey to the post-carbon era."

Debrum of the [Marshall Islands](#) espoused the quintessential synopsis of the accord and its effects

for those most likely to be affected by climate change as he noted, “Climate change won’t stop overnight, and my country is not out of the firing line just yet, but today we all feel a little safer.”

Editor's Entry on [Environmental Policy](#):

The low-lying Pacific island nations of the world, including [Kiribati](#), [Tuvalu](#), the [Marshall Islands](#), [Fiji](#), among others, are vulnerable to the threats posed by global warming and climate change, derived from carbon emissions, and resulting in the rise in sea level. Other island nations in the Caribbean, as well as poor countries with coastal zones, were also at particular risk of suffering the deleterious effects of climate change.

Political policy in these countries are often connected to ecological issues, which have over time morphed into an existential crisis of sorts. Indeed, ecological concerns and the climate crisis have also been dominant themes with life and death consequences for the people of island nations in the Pacific. Indeed, the very livelihoods of fishing and subsistence farming remain at risk as a result of ecological and environmental changes. Yet even so, these countries are threatened by increasingly high storm surges, which could wipe out entire villages and contaminate water supplies. Moreover, because these are low lying island nations, the sustained rise in sea level can potentially lead to the terrain of these countries being uninhabitable at best, and submerged at worst. Stated in plain terms, these countries are at severe risk of being obliterated from the map and their plight illuminates the emerging global challenge of environmental refugees. In these manifold senses, climate change is the existential crisis of the contemporary era.

Since the time of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, there have been efforts aimed at extending the life of that agreement, with an eye on minimizing greenhouse gas emissions, and thus minimizing the effects of climate change. Those endeavors have largely ended in failure, as exemplified by the unsuccessful Copenhagen talks in 2009 and the fruitless Doha talks in 2012 respectively. The success of the COP 21 talks in [France](#), with the adoption of the landmark Paris Agreement in 2015, was regarded as the first glimmer of hope. Not only did the Paris Agreement signify the triumph of international diplomacy and global consensus, but it also marked the start of the end of the fossil fuel era, with the path forward toward a low carbon future reliant on greener technologies. Most crucially, the Paris Agreement stood as the first significant response in recent times to the central challenge of climate change and its quotidian effects on the lives of real human beings across the world.

1. Major International Environmental Accords:

General Environmental Concerns

Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, Espoo, 1991.

Accords Regarding Atmosphere

Annex 16, vol. II (Environmental Protection: Aircraft Engine Emissions) to the 1044 Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, Montreal, 1981

Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), Geneva, 1979

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), New York, 1992

Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, Vienna, 1985 including the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Depleted the Ozone Layer, Montreal, 1987

Accords Regarding Hazardous Substances

Convention on the Ban of the Import into Africa and the Control of Transboundary Movements and Management of Hazardous Wastes within Africa, Bamako, 1991

Convention on Civil Liability for Damage Caused during Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road, Rail and Inland Navigation Vessels (CRTD), Geneva, 1989

Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention), Basel, 1989

Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, Helsinki, 1992

Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region (Waigani Convention), Waigani, 1995

European Agreement Concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), Geneva 1957

FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, Rome, 1985

2. Major International Marine Accords:

Global Conventions

Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter (London Convention 1972), London, 1972

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by Protocol of 1978 relation thereto (MARPOL 73/78), London, 1973 and 1978

International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage 1969 (1969 CLC), Brussels, 1969, 1976, and 1984

International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage 1971 (1971 Fund Convention), Brussels, 1971

Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea (HNS), London 1996

International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response, and Co-operation (OPRC), London, 1990

International Convention Relation to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties (Intervention Convention), Brussels, 1969

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), Montego Bay, 1982

Regional Conventions

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping from Ships and Aircraft (Oslo Convention), Oslo, 1972

Convention for the Prevention of Marine Pollution from Land-based Sources (Paris Convention), Paris, 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention), Paris, 1992

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1974 Helsinki Convention), Helsinki 1974

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Baltic Sea Area (1992 Helsinki

Convention), Helsinki 1992

Conventions within the UNEP Regional Seas Programme

Convention on the Protection of the Black Sea against Pollution, Bucharest, 1992

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, Cartagena de Indias, 1983

Convention for the Protection, Management, and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the Eastern African Region, Nairobi, 1985

Kuwait Regional Convention for Co-operation on the Protection of the Marine Environment from Pollution, [Kuwait](#), 1978

Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment and Coastal Region of the Mediterranean Sea (Barcelona Convention), Barcelona, 1976

Regional Convention for the Conservation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Environment, Jeddah, 1982

Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region, Noumea, 1986

Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and Coastal Area of the South-East Pacific, Lima, 1981

Convention for Co-operation in the Protection and Development of the Marine and Coastal Environment of the West and Central African Region, Abidjan, 1981

3. Major Conventions Regarding Living Resources:

Marine Living Resources

Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), Canberra, 1980

International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), Rio de Janeiro, 1966

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW), Washington, 1946

Nature Conservation and Terrestrial Living Resources

Antarctic Treaty, Washington, D.C., 1959

Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention), Paris, 1972

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Nairobi, 1992

Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), Bonn, 1979

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), Washington, D.C., 1973

Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), Ramsar, 1971

Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), Paris 1994

FAO International Undertaking on Plant Genetic Resources, Rome, 1983

International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994 (ITTA, 1994), Geneva, 1994

Freshwater Resources

Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, Helsinki, 1992

4. Major Conventions Regarding Nuclear Safety:

Convention on Assistance in the Case of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency (Assistance Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident (Notification Convention), Vienna, 1986

Convention on Nuclear Safety, Vienna, 1994

Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, Vienna, 1963

5. Major Intergovernmental Organizations

Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD)

European Union (EU): Environment

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)

International Labour Organization (ILO)

International Maritime Organization (IMO)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds (IOPC Funds)

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Environment Policy Committee (EPOC)

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

World Bank

World Food Programme (WFP)

World Health Organization (WHO)

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

World Trade Organization (WTO)

6. Major Non-Governmental Organizations

Atmosphere Action Network East Asia (AANE)

Climate Action Network (CAN)

Consumers International (CI)

Earth Council

Earthwatch Institute

Environmental Liaison Centre International (ELCI)

European Environmental Bureau (EEB)

Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)

Friends of the Earth International (FoEI)

Greenpeace International

International Chamber of Commerce (ICC)

International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)

International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)

International Solar Energy Society (ISES)

IUCN-The World Conservation Union

Pesticide Action Network (PAN)

Sierra Club

Society for International Development (SID)

Third World Network (TWN)

Water Environment Federation (WEF)

Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO)

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD)

World Federalist Movement (WFM)

World Resources Institute (WRI)

World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF)

7. Other Networking Instruments

Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED)

Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment (GLOBE)

Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC)

United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (UN-NGLS)

Appendices

Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources: Key Data

Altapedia. URL: http://www.atlapedia.com/online/country_index.htm

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com>

Geobase Global Statistics. URL: <http://www.geoba.se>

Infoplease. URL: <http://www.infoplease.com>

The Statesman's Year Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

[United States](http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.htm) Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.htm

[United States](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

World Bank. URL: <http://www.worldbank.org/>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

Methodology Note for Demographic Data:

The demographic numbers for cities and national populations listed in CountryWatch content are derived from the Geoba.se website, which analyzes data from the World Bank. The current demographic numbers displayed on the Countrywatch website are reflective of the latest available estimates.

The demographic information for language, ethnicity and religion listed in CountryWatch content is

derived from a mix of sources including the Altapedia, Central Intelligence Agency Factbook, Infoplease, and State Department Background Notes.

Sources: Political Overview

Agence [France](http://www.afp.com/en/) Presse. URL: <http://www.afp.com/en/>

BBC International News. URL: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Britannica Book of the Year. 1998-present. David Calhoun, ed. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

Britannica Online URL :<http://www.eb.com>

Britannica Year in Review. URL: <http://www.britannica.com/browse/year>

Chiefs of State and Cabinet Members of Foreign Governments. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Christian Science Monitor. URL: <http://www.csmonitor.com/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

CNN International News. URL:<http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Current Leaders of Nations. 1997. Jennifer Mossman, ed. Detroit: Gale Research

The Economist Magazine. (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Economist Country Briefings. URL: <http://www.economist.com/countries/>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Elections Around the World. URL: <http://www.electionworld.org/>

Election Resources. URL: <http://electionresources.org/>

Europa World Yearbook 1999. Vols. I & II. 1999. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Europe World Online. URL: <http://www.europaworld.com/pub/>

Financial Times. URL: <http://www.financialtimes.com>

Foreign Government Resources. URL: <http://www.lib.umich.edu/govdocs/foreign.html>

[Human Rights](http://www.hrw.org) Watch. URL: <http://www.hrw.org>

IFES Election Guide. URL: <http://www.electionguide.org>

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. URL: <http://www.idea.int/>

International Who's Who 1997-1998, 61st Edition. 1997. London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Leadership Views, Chiefs of State Online. URL : <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/chiefs/index.html>

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

New Encyclopedia Britannica. 1998. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

New York Times. URL: <http://www.nytimes.com> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

Patterns of Global Terrorism. n.d. [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State. Washington D.C.: [United States](http://www.state.gov) Department of State Publications.

Political Handbook of the World. n.d. Arthur S. Banks, Thomas C. Muller, ed. Binghamton, New York: CSA Publications.

Political Reference Almanac Online. URL: <http://www.polisci.com/almanac/nations.htm>

Reuters News. URL: <http://www.reuters.com/>

Rulers. URL: <http://rulers.org/>

The Guardian Online. URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/> (Various editions and dates as cited in particular reviews)

The Statesman's Year-Book 2006. Barry Turner, ed. London: St. Martin's Press.

United Nations Development Programme. URL: <http://hdr.undp.org>

United Nations Refugee Agency. URL: <http://www.unhcr.org>

[United States](#) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

[United States](#) Department of State, World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers (WMEAT) URL : http://www.state.gov/www/global/arms/bureau_ac/reports_ac.html

United States Department of State, Country Reports on [Human Rights](#) Practices. URL: <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2002/18245.htm>

[United States](#) Department of State, Background Notes. URL : http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

Virtual Library: International Relations Resources. URL: <http://www.etown.edu/vl/countgen.html>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

-- See also list of News Wires services below, which are also used for research purposes. --

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original Country Reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Sources: [Economic Overview](#)

BP Statistical Review of World Energy. URL: <http://www.bp.com/genericsection.do?categoryId=92&contentId=7005893>

BP Statistical Review of World Energy, June 1998. 1998 to present. Page 1.C. London: The British Petroleum Company.

International Monetary Fund, Direction of Trade Statistics Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics. 1998 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics Yearbook. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook, May 1999. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund Publication Services.

International Labour Office, World Employment Report, 1998-99. 1998 to present. Geneva: International Labour Office.

United Nations Statistical Division Online. URL: <http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm>

United Nations Statistics Division, Monthly Bulletin of Statistics (MBS On Line), November 1999 Edition. 1999 to present. New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Statistical Yearbook, 43rd Issue. 1999. 1999 to present New York: United Nations.

United Nations, Food & Agricultural Organization, FAOSTAT Database. URL : <http://apps.fao.org/>
United Nations, Comtrade Data Base, <http://comtrade.un.org/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs.
URL:<http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Database

United States Geological Service, Mineral Information

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. Washington, D.C. [United States](#) of America. URL:http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html

The World Bank, Global Development Finance, Country Tables. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

The World Bank Group, World Development Indicators. 1999 to present. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Yearbook of Tourism Statistics, World Tourism Organization. 1998 to present. Madrid: The World Tourism Organization.

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Methodology Notes for Economic Data:

Estimates by CountryWatch.com of GDP in dollars in most countries are made by converting local currency GDP data from the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook to US dollars by market exchange rates estimated from the International Monetary Fund International Financial Statistics and projected out by the CountryWatch Macroeconomic Forecast. Real GDP was estimated by deflating current dollar values by the US GDP Implicit Price Deflator.

Exceptions to this method were used for:

- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Nauru
- Cuba
- Palau
- Holy See
- San Marino
- Korea, North
- [Serbia](#) & Montenegro
- Liberia
- Somalia
- Liechtenstein
- Tonga
- Monaco
- Tuvalu

In these cases, other data and/or estimates by CountryWatch.com were utilized.

Investment Overview

C o r r u p t i o n a n d T r a n s p a r e n c y I n d e x . U R L :
<http://www.transparency.org/documents/cpi/2001/cpi2001.html#cpi>
<<http://www.transparency.org/documents/>

Deloitte Tax Guides. URL: <http://www.deloittetaxguides.com>

Trade Policy Reviews by the World Trade Organization . URL: http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tpr_e/tp_rep_e.htm#bycountry

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

United States Department of State, Country Commercial Guides. 1996-2006. Washington, D.C. U n i t e d S t a t e s o f A m e r i c a . U R L : http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/com_guides/index.html

World Bank: Doing Business. URL: <http://www.doingbusiness.org>

World Bank: Governance Indicators. URL: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance>

Social Overview

Borden, G.A., Conaway, W.A., Morrison, T. 1994. *Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands: How to do Business in Sixty Countries*. Holbrook, Massachusetts, 1994.

Center for Disease Control. URL: <http://www.cdc.gov>

Eldis Country Profiles. URL: <http://www.eldis.org/country/index.htm>

Ethnologue. URL: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>

Government of Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. URL: <http://www.dfat.gov.au/geo>

Government of Canada Foreign Affairs and International Trade. URL: http://www.voyage.gc.ca/consular_home-e.htm

Library of Congress Country Studies. URL: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/cshome.html>

Lonely Planet. URL: <http://www.lonelyplanet.com/worldguide/>

Steve Kropla's Online Help For World Travelers. URL: <http://www.kropla.com/>

[United Kingdom](http://www.fco.gov.uk/) Ministry of Foreign and Commonwealth Office. URL: <http://www.fco.gov.uk/>

United Nations Human Development Report. URL: <http://www.undp.org/hdro>

UNICEF Statistical Database Online. URL: <http://www.unicef.org/statis/atoz.html>

[United States](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html) Central Intelligence Agency, World Factbook. 2001. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group. URL: <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html>

United States Department of State, Background Notes. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/background_notes/index.html

United States Department of State, Commercial and Business Affairs: Travel Tips. URL: http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/business/cba_travel.html

United States Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs. URL: <http://travel.state.gov/>

World Health Organization. URL: <http://www.who.int/home-page/>

World News Connection, National Technical Information Service. Springfield, Virginia, USA.

Internet News Service, Xinhua News Agency (U.S.) Inc. Woodside, New York. URL: <http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/>

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Methodology Notes for the HDI:

Since 1990, the United Nations Development Programme, in concert with organizations across the globe, has produced the [Human Development Index](#) (or HDI). According to the UNDP, the index measures average achievement in basic human development in one simple composite index, and produces from this index a ranking of countries. The HDI is a composite of three basic components of human development: longevity, knowledge and standard of living. Longevity is measured by life expectancy. Knowledge is measured by combination of adult literacy and mean

years of schooling. Standard of living is measured by purchasing power, based on real GDP per capita (in constant US\$) adjusted for differences in international living costs (or, purchasing power parity, PPP). While the index uses these social indicators to measure national performance with regard to human welfare and development, not all countries provide the same level of information for each component needed to compute the index; therefore, as in any composite indicator, the final index is predicated on projections, predictions and weighting schemes. The index is a static measure, and thus, an incomplete measure of human welfare. In fact, the UNDP says itself the concept of human development focuses on the ends rather than the means of development and progress, examining in this manner, the average condition of all people in a given country.

Specifically, the index is calculated by determining the maximum and minimum for each of the three components (as listed above) and then measuring where each country stands in relation to these scales-expressed as a value between 0 and 1. For example, the minimum adult literary rate is zero percent, the maximum is 100 percent, and the reading skills component of knowledge in the HDI for a country where the literacy rate is 75 percent would be 0.75. The scores of all indicators are then averaged into the overall index.

For a more extensive examination of human development, as well as the ranking tables for each participating country, please visit: <http://www.undp.org>

Note on [History](#) sections

In some CountryWatch Country Reviews, open source content from the State Department Background Notes and Country Guides have been used.

Environmental Overview

Environmental Profiles: A Global Guide to Projects and People. 1993. Linda Sobel Katz, Sarah Orrick, and Robert Honig. New York: Garland Publishing.

The Environment Encyclopedia and Directory, 2nd Edition. 1998. London: Europa.

Environmental Protection Agency Global Warming Site. URL: <http://www.epa.gov/globalwarming>

Food and Agriculture Organization of United Nations: Forestry. URL: <http://www.fao.org/forestry/site/sofo/en/>

Global Warming Information Page. URL: <http://globalwarming.org>

Introduction to Global [Environmental Issues](#), 2nd Edition. 1997. Kevin Pickering and Lewis Owen.

London: Routledge.

Trends: Compendium of Data on Global Change. URL: http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/emis/em_cont.htm

United Nations Environmental Program. URL: http://www.unep.org/GEO/GEO_Products/Assessment_Reports/

United Nations Global Environmental Outlook. URL: <http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/>

United States Department of Energy, Country Analysis Briefs. URL: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/contents.html>

World Climate Data Online. URL: <http://www.worldclimate.com>

World Directory of Country Environmental Studies. 1996. The World Resource Institute.

World Factbook. US Central Intelligence Agency. Washington, D.C.: Printing and Photography Group.

1998-1999 World Resources Guide to the Global Environment by the World Resources Institute. May, 1998.

1998/1999 Yearbook of International Cooperation on Environment and Development. 1998. London: Earthscan Publications.

Note on Edition Dates:

The earlier edition dates are noted above because they were used to formulate the original country reviews and serve as the baseline for some of the information covered. Later editions have been used in some cases, and are cited as such, while other more recent online resources (cited above) contain recent and ever-updated data sets used for research.

Other Sources:

General information has also been used in the compilation of this review, with the courtesy of governmental agencies from this country.

News Services:

CANA Daily Bulletin. Caribbean Media Agency Ltd., St. Michael, [Barbados](#).

Central and Eastern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Central and Eastern Africa.

Daily News, Panafrican News Agency. Dakar, [Senegal](#).

PACNEWS, Pacific Islands Broadcasting Association. Suva, [Fiji](#).

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. Washington D.C. USA.

Reuters News. Thomson Reuters. New York, New York. USA.

Southern Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for Southern Africa.

Voice of America, English Service. Washington D.C.

West Africa Report, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs - Integrated Regional Information Network for West Africa. 1998-1999

Note: Some or all these news services have been used to research various sections of this Country Review.

USING COUNTRYWATCH.COM AS AN ELECTRONIC SOURCE:

MLA STYLE OF CITATION

Commentary

For items in a "Works Cited" list, CountryWatch.com suggests that users follow recommended patterns for indentation given in the *MLA Handbook*, 4th edition.

Individual Works

Basic form, using an Internet protocol:

Author/editor. *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. Available Protocol (if applicable):Site/Path/File. Access date.

Examples:

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. *Country Review: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *Country Review:France*. Online. Available URL : http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=61 October, 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

Parts of Works

Basic form, using an Internet protocol:

Author/editor. "Part title." *Title of Print Version of Work*. Edition statement (if given). Publication information (Place of publication: publisher, date), if given. *Title of Electronic Work*. Medium. AvailableProtocol (if applicable): Site/Path/File. Access date.

Examples:

Youngblood-Coleman, Denise. "People." *CountryWatch.com: France*. 2003. Houston, Texas: CountryWatch Publications, 2003. *CountryWatch.com: France*. Online. Available URL : http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_topic.asp?vCOUNTRY=61&SECTION=SOCIAL&TOPIC=CLPEO&TYPE=TEXT. October 12, 2003.

Note:

This is the citation format used when the print version is not used in the reference.

For further source citation information, please email: editor@countrywatch.com or education@countrywatch.com.

CountryWatch

CountryWatch is an information provider for public and private sector organizations that operate globally. The management of CountryWatch has extensive international experience and has utilized this experience to provide a concise and useful set of political, economic, and business information for its clients in the form of Country Reviews, the Country Wire, CountryWatch Data, Elections Central, CountryWatch Videos and CountryWatch Forecast.

This Country Review is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information on the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publication is not intended to provide legal, accounting, investment, or other professional advice.

CountryWatch believes that the information and opinions contained here in are reliable, but does not make any warranties, express or implied, and assumes no liability for reliance on or use of the information or opinions contained herein.

The offices of CountryWatch are located at:

CountryWatch, Inc.
5005 Riverway Suite 220
Houston, Texas 77056 U.S.A.
Tel: 800-879-3885
Fax: 713-355-3770
Web address: <http://www.countrywatch.com>
Email: support@countrywatch.com

ISBN: 1- 60523- 642-X

Burundi Country Review

2016

ISSN: 1- 60523- 893-5

Printed in the United States of America