

**AFRICAN EVANGELISTIC ENTERPRISE (AEE)**  
**PHASE II PROJECT ON: RECONCILIATION, PEACE AND GOOD**  
**GOVERNANCE IN BURUNDI**  
**2005-2009**

*“The world is far too strong for a divided Church”*

**MID - TERM EVALUATION REPORT**

**BY:**

**Bishop Dr. Jean-Luc Kuye – Ndondo WA Mulemera**

**Mrs. Marjorie Niyungeko**

**Agnes Abuom (Team Leader)**

**TAABCO RESEARCH AND CONSULTANCY**

**P.O BOX 10488**

**NAIROBI, KENYA**

**MAY, 2008**

## Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Abbreviations	3
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
<b>1.0 BACKGROUND</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1 A Brief History of Burundi	10
1.2 The AEE and ELFCN	11
1.3 The Terms of reference and Evaluation Purpose	12
<b>2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.0 PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES DURING THE PERIOD AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 Project Design	15
4.2 Relevance of the Project	16
4.3 Effectiveness of the Project	17
4.4 Methodology	21
4.5 Effectiveness	22
4.6 Project Management	23
4.7 Gender Dimension of the Programme	24
4.8 Model of Faith Based Approach	24
4.9 Partnership	25
4.10 Impact and Sustainability	26
4.11 Future Direction of the Project	27
<b>5.0 HIGHLIGHTS, CHALLENGES AND LESSONS LEARNT</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 Main highlights of the Programme	29
5.2 Key Challenges	29
5.3 Lessons Learnt	30
<b>6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>ANNEXES</b>	
Annex 1: Guiding Questions For Interviews	34
Annex 3. List of Interviewees	35

## ABBREVIATIONS

AEE	African Evangelistic Enterprise
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CNEB	Consei National des Eglise au Burundi
D.R.C	Democratic Republic of Congo
ELFCN	Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway
FGDs	Focus Group Discussions
G.G	Good Governance
GLEF	Great Lakes Ecumenical Forum
HIV	Human Immune Virus
IGA	Income Generating Activities
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development
SAN	Strategic Action Network
THR	Trauma Healing and Reconciliation
THARS	Trauma Healing & Reconciliation Services
TOR	Terms of Reference
TOTs	Training of Trainers
TRC	Truth and reconciliation Commission
TZ	Tanzania
WOI	World Outreach Initiatives

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The aim of this mid-term evaluation is to explore by assessing the project plan phase II, the levels of achievements, challenges, and the way forward to be incorporated in the strategic plan. An evaluation process is about the commitment of management to learn and infuse the feed back into the re- design of programme, implementation structure and organizational purpose with a view to ensuring effective and efficient implementation of the planned activities. In this regard we thank the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway (ELCFN) and the AEE leadership for their commitment.

The entire evaluation team wish therefore, to thank the Coordinator of the project Mr. Emmanuel Kopwe and the entire team of staff of AEE and ELFCN for the great opportunity to journey and learn together during the month of April 2008 which witnessed the successful Mid -Term Evaluation process. The process and space provided for the evaluation was an interactive, participative and a learning one for all parties involved.

We extend our sincere gratitude to the staff of World Outreach Initiatives, all beneficiaries of the project and church leaders as well those who participated in responding to our questions at times until very late in the evening. Their commitment and good will for the programme was evidenced by their availability to share their experiences, ideas and suggestions with the Evaluation Team.

Furthermore, as the Team leader I am grateful to my colleagues Mrs. Marjorie Niyengeko the General Secretary of the Bible Society in Burundi and Bishop Jean – Luc Kuye – Ndongwa Mulemera, the Chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (D.R.C); for their deep knowledge, insights and support during the evaluation exercise.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Burundi is a small landlocked country of only 27,834 square kilometers bordering Rwanda, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo (D.R.C) with a population of less than seven million inhabitants, made up of the Tutsi about 14% (.840million), Hutu 85% (5.2million) and about 1% Batwa (.060million) ethnic groups. Population density is approximately 215 per square km (World Bank 2002). Modes of production have historically been pastoralist practiced mainly by the Tutsi and farming by the Hutu and Batwa. Therefore people have over the years depended on subsistence agriculture and herding of cows although some cash crops were introduced during the colonial era such as coffee. In general the conditions of life depict poverty with high rates of illiteracy for example it is believed that about 60% of the women are illiterate.

Burundi has since its independence experienced cycles of violence with limited spaces when there was relative peace. Like the other countries in the great lakes region, Burundi has suffered from the deficit of good governance, poverty, corruption and inequitable distribution of resources. Before independence Burundi was ruled by two different colonial powers with different regimes. To begin with Germany made Burundi, Rwanda and Tanganyika as one country with an administration capital in Dar Es Salaam and during this colonial era, the Kingship and chiefdoms were retained a governance system that was obviously undemocratic and non participatory. When the Germans lost in the World War I their colonies were taken over by other colonial powers and in the case of Burundi it is the Belgians who ruled for 46 years. New economic and social activities introduced by the Belgians benefited once again a minority leave a legacy of inequality.

In as much as the conflict analysis of Burundi is at times reduced to Hutu and Tutsi, such an approach risks overlooking serious underlying systemic and historical economic, social, cultural and political factors. Therefore like in any conflict ethnic violence and vengeance needs to be understood as triggers of deeper root causes. The marginalization of the poor who have limited land for livelihood, mobilization and use of ethnic identity by the elite and the scarce economic resources in the country as a whole is used by different elite groups to divide the people.

After over ten years of civil war in Burundi, peace was finally brokered with the help of the African Union (AU) under the leadership of the late President Nyerere and later the South African government. The peace accord signed in Arusha ushered in multi party elections which resulted in the current government led by President Pierre Nkurunziza. Unfortunately having started on a hopeful note peace seems to elude the country as the FNL rebel group is stepped up its war activities.

The Burundians yearn for peace, reconciliation and good governance. Their plea is for insecurity to end and for healing to take place. It is in the context of engaging the Church

in peace and reconciliation that the AEE was invited to walk along side with churches in the ministry of reconciliation. At the start of this project, AEE conducted shadow diplomacy and mediation between the rebels and the government as well as working with churches to develop a joint voice on the call for peace. Already in 1996, the AEE organized for church leaders meetings at which a statement and an action plan were developed. At this time the AEE was working on a tight rope both financially and contact in Burundi. However, since the ELFCN (Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway) was interested in peace and reconciliation and because of prior relationships between the two organizations, they agreed to develop a proposal for funding and in 2000 an agreement and funding was secured.

With financial support from NORAD and ELFCN it became possible for the AEE to go full blast in to Burundi but initially the security was a challenge and most of the activities were conducted in Bujumbura. This ten year project planned in two phases was evaluated in 2003 and found to be relevant and useful and the evaluation proposed a continuation with a few adjustments. One of them was an increase in staffing as the project was almost a one man affair. Another proposal was to seek to create an ecumenical and a religious platform for the project in order to ascertain ownership and participation of a broad based group of churches but more important to develop a joint peace agenda. An international ecumenical solidarity and advocacy forum to be developed in support of the Burundi church leaders. A second phase was developed and is under implementation. Before the end of the phase an evaluation was anticipated and hence the current evaluation. Both the ELFCN and AEE developed the terms of reference and also identified and contracted the consultants.

The evaluation team was facilitated by the project team and all necessary and relevant documents and appropriate logistics. Unfortunately due to insecurity the team could not visit the activities and meet with beneficiaries in the provinces and we are aware that this has limited somewhat the findings of the evaluation to Bujumbura although a number of civic leaders came from the provinces and discussed their experiences with us for example the governors. Regarding the main findings of the project, the team noted that most of the planned activities have been implemented and positive results registered. Trauma healing received the highest commendation by respondents because it changed their lives. Many testimonies were given on how women, youth, civic leaders, army officers and church leaders had been touched. Another major activity that was applauded is good governance and in this case the governors and civic leaders from Buyenzi found the trainings useful and are applying them.

Findings of the evaluations indicate that the number of people trained as ToTs are not adequate to cope with the demand for workshops especially in trauma healing and reconciliation. Indeed the project has trained a number but many more are needed. Furthermore, follow up of trainings is rather weak and the monitoring tool is almost non existent. A number of respondents argued for follow up workshops so as to strengthen their capacity but it is mainly the TOTs who had extra training for their specific task.

Church leaders' capacity building for advocacy still needs to be worked on however, many seminars in the provinces and national level are on peace building and trauma healing. On the other hand, good governance started rather late due to insecurity and negotiations with government to facilitate the process. An area that the project has registered great success is in organizing workshops for the youth/students and women empowerment. Many young people have reestablished relationships with their parents and many women have found new meaning in life especially widows. Male and female relations – gender is a challenge in Burundi but through trauma healing and reconciliation a number of couples and individuals end up reviewing their perceptions, attitudes and treatment of one another. The emphasis on HIV and AIDS continued in this phase and through PACWA and SAN a number of workshops were organized and medical support provided. The Radio Hope also airs messages on prevention and medical support. In addition radio hope runs programmes on popular education on family, peace and reconciliation. Activities in civic education were not conducted neither has an ecumenical platform for church leaders for a joint agenda for peace been established.

Organizationally, AEE has hired adequate staff and it is no longer a one man show – Mr. Kopwe. In fact the offices in Burundi and Dar Es Salaam have enough personnel as well as equipment to implement the project. Also important is the management of the project whereby the Dar Es Salaam level has a functional and competent committee while in Bujumbura the Director of World Outreach Initiative (WOI) provides oversight and guidance to staff. The team in Dar Es Salaam works in faith as it has never been to the field.

Relevance of the project in Burundi cannot be overstated. The three pillars of the project namely peace building, reconciliation and good governance are more than relevant especially where trauma healing is part of reconciliation. At the level of effectiveness, it can be argued that the project has attained above 80% of the planned activities which is a big step, given the uncertain situation. Concerning the methods of work, AEE uses workshop and TOT and biblical references including manuals that exist in Kinya-rwanda. Other manuals are developed by the resource people for example, THARS. Additional methods especially energizers, Walk and Talk could facilitate the learning as well as extra time for workshops. As regards efficiency, the project has remained within the budget votes and reports prepared in good time. Fundraising for purposes of diversification became a challenge and this may be due to the staff capacity as they are overstretched in the field.

Although the number of women participating in the project has increased over the years and they appreciate the change training has brought, the project lacks knowledge on gender and therefore gender dynamics in programming. Some basic information on gender would enhance the analysis of needs and differentiation between men and women. As deeply rooted in faith, the project can fit in most Christian contexts and in Moslem context with some adjustment on language. Otherwise, the faith based approach touches the inner values, attitude and heart of the person which are usually difficult in situations of conflict and post conflict. This in fact is what distinguishes the project from other similar projects. The partnership between AEE and ELFCN has been one of mutual

respect, shared vision and concern for peace and reconciliation, accountability and transparency. Communication between the partners is smooth and supportive. On networking, the project has entered in to a number of contacts with many organizations at national, regional and local with a view of broadening the scope of dissemination of information and also securing sustainability of the project.

It is evident according to the evaluation team that the project has had impact on the lives of people as many have changed attitudes, taken steps to work with those they considered enemies and a case of a young women returning the land to refugees who came back against the advise of relatives was very moving. The nature and scope of impact is at relational level and needs more analysis and documentation. But for sure something positive has happened to many lives. Questions about the future of the programme are alive on the minds of AEE and Burundians especially since the needs are many regarding healing and good governance.

**Sustainability** of the project is not full fledged but some TOTs and individuals could continue if it came to an end in 2009. This in our view would be premature. Since diversification of funding has become nearly impossible some possible adjustments for the remaining period are the following: the project should focus on trauma healing and good governance and church leaders both at the national and provincial levels; there is need to train more TOTs and carry out a monitoring of impact. Activities related to the radio hope and HIV and AIDS could be scaled down and other ways found of keeping the citizens informed for example, invite government journalists to workshops and they could air programmes.

In terms of **future**, ELFCN should make an effort to link AEE with other possible donors working in DRC so that the project could work regionally as initially planned. The project would have needed another phase to be able to develop a corps of serious and thoroughly trained TOTs to continue with the programme. One way to do it is to target individuals in churches and organizations including government for TOT training which is happening now but in an intentional manner.

The evaluation team recommends that:

1. Training and capacity enhancement requires well articulated mechanism of follow up of participants and institutions and in this respect AEE should put in place a mechanism. AEE should consider the need to hire a consultant to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tool to find out the impact of their work and also to develop a data base of those trained *“If you cannot measure it, you cannot manage it”*.
2. Duration of workshops was considered by nearly all respondents as inadequate especially given that these are no ordinary workshops, long historical prejudices and animosity between people needs time to break ice prior to making input. Some of the workshops were like conferences and not workshops because of their size. In as much as the demand is high, trainers need to consider learning facilities



and individual learning styles. That training days be increased to at least four for the remaining period.

3. **Future Adjustments** - In view of potential phase out or reduced activity AEE provide enough and thorough training of TOTs to cope with demand for workshops in the provinces.
4. Since the plan had a regional dimension and AEE initially planned to work regionally but did not realize the idea, there is need to consider including at least D.R.C in the new programme plan especially given the expressed interest in parts of D.R.C by some of the leadership. In other words, the project should seek to include D.R.C so that the GLEF spirit is and networking sustained with a view to creating broader accountability of church leaders.
5. **Project Design:** Given the complexity and fluidity of Burundi, AEE should ensure provision of services to priority constituencies. In addition the plan is logical however the main document should contain indicators as clearly stated in annual plans.
6. **Gender** – empowerment of women is appreciated and to enhance the role and place of women, the project should undertake gender analysis of the situation and infuse findings in to the activities.
7. **Sustainability** – the project should continue with the measures of ensuring sustainability namely to train pastors, volunteers and TOTs including opinion leaders among youth and women. Where possible the project needs to develop other sustainability strategies for example, diversifying funding through locally tested fund raising strategies within AEE and Burundi.
8. **Peace and Advocacy** - the AEE become a voice to Government of Burundi on the dire need for healing so that they understand demobilizing people without subjecting them to healing process is useless if not dangerous.
9. **Radio Hope** - the project actively seek to systematically engage church leaders once again in contributing and find ways of building ownership around the radio station. The project should consider the use of the national radio.

## 1.0 BACKGROUND

### 1.1 A BRIEF HISTORY OF BURUNDI

Burundi is a small landlocked country of only 27,834 square kilometers bordering Rwanda, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo (D.R.C) with a population of less than seven million inhabitants, made up of the Tutsi about 14% (.840million), Hutu 85% (5.2million) and about 1% Batwa (.060million) ethnic groups. Population density is approximately 215 per square km (World Bank 2002). Modes of production have historically been pastoralist practiced mainly by the Tutsi and farming by the Hutu and Twa. Therefore people have over the years depended on subsistence agriculture and herding of cows although some cash crops were introduced during the colonial era such as coffee. In general the conditions of life depict poverty with high rates of illiteracy for example it is believed that about 60% of the women are illiterate.

Since the time Burundi got its independence in 1962, it has experienced cycles of conflict. The heights of violence were recorded in the years 1965-1966, 1972, 1987-1988, 1991, 1993 and 1996. Like Rwanda, many interpret the conflict to be between the Hutu and Tutsi main ethnic communities in the struggle for political power and control of the state and therefore resources. Except for few years of relative peace Burundi has not been a stable country. Even as this evaluation is planned and conducted parts of the country are threatened by FNL rebel group that is believed to control Bujumbura rural. The conflict is in many respects caused by unequal distribution of economic resources and political power. Land is a crucial economic resource and with a high population density the pressure for land is real since it is one of the key means of production and access to life by many peasants.

A comparison between the ethnic groups, shows that the Tutsi have generally been more educated than the other groups; have monopoly of the control of the army until recently, businesses and civil service including the judiciary. On the other hand, the majority Hutu and Twa are less educated and had fewer choices in terms of economic and political institutions. In the absence of any other lucrative economic activity, the control of state organs by elite gives them greater power on who can access top award jobs and economic resources a situation that automatically turns the state and it's a contested and an enviable institution because of the opportunities and power it provides. Unfortunately this is not unique to Burundi but a common phenomenon in Africa where the role of the state as an instrument of power and resources implies that whoever controls it wields excessive power that is used to distribute meager resources to their community and cronies.

In as much as the conflict analysis of Burundi is at times reduced to Hutu and Tutsi, such an approach risks overlooking serious underlying systemic and historical economic, social, cultural and political factors. Therefore like in any conflict ethnic violence and vengeance needs to be understood as triggers of deeper root causes. The marginalization of the poor who have limited land for livelihood, mobilization and use of ethnic identity

by the elite and the scarce economic resources in the country as a whole is used by different elite groups to divide the people.

Conflicts in Burundi have been managed differently in the various epochs. The 1996 military coup by Major Pierre Buyoya was internationally condemned followed by economic sanctions. It can be argued that such pressure witnessed Major Buyoya's acceptance to share power with the National Assembly. The late President Nyerere initiated talks about talks but he died before any peaceful settlement was reached. Tanzania (TZ) plays an important role as a neighbour of Burundi given the many refugees who have always found refuge across the border and to-date refugees of 1972 are still in Tanzania although Burundi government has been advocating for the return of its citizens.

After several initiatives by neighbouring countries under the umbrella of the African Union which also established troops in 2001, a peace accord was successfully brokered by the South Africans ushering in a Transitional Government of Burundi and the rebel - Forces for the Defense of Democracy (CNDD-FDD). It is evident like in many post conflict situations that without solid political and judiciary institutions the peace accord may not last. Hence the dire need for the government of Burundi to strengthen capacity of its institutions such as the judiciary, the legislature, the police, etc. Communities who have suffered violence need healing and counseling as well as concrete peace dividends. Given the many years of conflict, limited movement, freedom of speech and association, safe space and forums for dialogue and reconciliation at all levels of the society are a must. More critical in the truth and reconciliation process is the role of civil society and faith based organizations which implies that recent efforts by the government to establish a Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) is applauded and ought to seek participation and engagement of civil society actors.

## **1.2 The African Evangelistic Enterprise (AEE) and the Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway (ELFCN)**

The African Evangelistic Enterprise is an international organization based in Africa with ten offices spread around the continent. A few years ago, the organization restructured with a view to establishing a functional approach whereby management function is undertaken by Pan African Executive Directors for different ministries. One of these ministries is Reconciliation. Each and every executive officer reports to the International Team Leader who in turn reports to the International Partnership Board (IPB).

The ministry of reconciliation at the Pan African level was established in 1998 and Mr. E. Kopwe has pioneered the establishment of the desk after relinquishing his role as a Regional Coordinator after a call made in Kigali, Rwanda during a reconciliation mission in 1995 that AEE set up a reconciliation ministry. At that meeting in Kigali in 1995, church leaders present from Burundi requested support from AEE. Starting in 1996, the reconciliation ministry had only half a staff but the journey with Burundi churches was under way with a document describing what the ministry is about, who they are and what the problems the country was experiencing as well as envisioning where the

country should be in future. Prior to a partnership being entered with ELFCN, AEE went through challenges in its work in Burundi. For example, it was forced to suspend its work when some of the church leaders alleged that it was biased towards one ethnic group.

The Evangelical Lutheran Free Church of Norway (ELFCN) and African Evangelistic Enterprise AEE) have since the year 2000 been partners working for peace, reconciliation and good governance in Burundi. There is a specific MOU governing this partnership. The project holder is the AEE an organization based in Dar Es Salaam while the beneficiaries are the Burundi people. Before this specific partnership, ELFCN was already working with the communication department of AEE and were also interested in doing reconciliation work. Because of this mutual coincidence and history of relationships, a ten year proposal was developed and submitted in 1999 with funding starting in the year 2000. The project was in two phases of five years and it was funded both by ELFCN and NORAD. Resources and monitoring of the progress of the project is undertaken by the ELFCN. Initial evaluation of the project was undertaken in 2003. The current 2008 evaluation found it essential to check on how far the recommendations of the evaluation report of 2003 were addressed in the second phase of the project. It is important to observe that the evaluation process is initiated by ELFCN in consultation with the AEE and in line with the project plan thus ensuring ownership of the process and results.

### **1.3 Terms of Reference and the Evaluation Purpose**

The evaluation exercise was initiated by both the AEE and ELFCN responsible staff persons in line with the proposal whose lifetime comes to an end in the year 2009. Once a lead consultant was identified, the Terms of Reference (ToR) were interpreted and shared with both parties. It was also the AEE which sourced for two other consultants thus making a team of three persons which was gender sensitive with one man and two women. In addition, the team included a Burundian to facilitate local knowledge as well as a church leader who was better placed to interpret the position of the church and leadership in the programme and country. The inclusion of Bishop Dr. Jean – Luc Kuye – Ndondo wa Mulemera was essential due to the initial and the potential regional perspective and dimension of the programme.

#### **Key objectives of the evaluation were as follows:**

- 1.3.1 Document the progress of the project and assess the impact of its activities in relation to its goals;
- 1.3.2 Evaluate the potential of this project to, with various components, become a model of faith based approach to peace and reconciliation work;
- 1.3.3 Look into the needs for continuation and sustainability of the project after the current 5 year period of NORAD funding and in doing so consider a transition into other possible financing and owner structures of the project after 2009.

#### **Expected Results of the Evaluation**

- Hold a debriefing with the staff team in Burundi
- Present a draft report to management and staff in Tanzania
- Submit a final report

## 2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Approach

The approach used by the evaluation team was participatory and interactive dialogue. A variety of methods especially participatory ones such as interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were applied in order to access relevant information from a variety of stakeholders that address stated objectives of the assignment.

Evaluation exercise was perceived as a process creating space for key actors to share, reflect and learn from each other and from activities of the project. It was also a moment of documenting experiences for organizational learning and improving best practices. As an evaluation team, a deliberate intention was made to ensure that AEE and project beneficiaries stopped to look back to the time they started engaging with the various activities, reflect on the current context and mirror changes that have since occurred as well as project into the future based on the past and present realities.

### 2.2 Specific Methods/Tools used

A number of tools and methods were utilized as follows:

**2.2.1 Desk Study** – the evaluation team undertook a desk review of relevant project documents and other related material: original project description and second project description, evaluation reports, annual plans, reports, budgets and financial statements for the years 2005 – 2007/08.

**2.2.2 Scheduled Individual Interviews:** Interviews were conducted with key stakeholders for example Project Manager, staff in Tanzania and Burundi, project committee, staff and leaders of significant cooperating local partners in Burundi, significant church leaders, representatives of beneficiaries of target groups, journalists, politicians, etc.

**2.2.3 Focus Group Discussions:** a number of FGDs were conducted with groups such as Pastors/church leaders, women leaders, civic leaders, youth leaders, staff etc.

**2.2.4 Observations:** The evaluation team had an opportunity to observe a workshop in session in Bujumbura organized by the implementing partners and facilitated by TOT trained by the project with a view to getting a first hand impression of the knowledge, skills and methods used. In this workshop the team applied observation and listening skills to gather soft data.

### 2.3 Limitations of the Evaluation

To begin with the evaluation started much later than initially planned due to unavoidable tight schedules of the Team Leader which changed the composition of the team as one of

the original members was unavailable. At the very start and throughout the evaluation exercise, the rebels resumed the attack on Bujumbura shelling of bombs and firing of guns could be heard. This made it difficult for the team to carry out field visits in the provinces. Field visits by the evaluation team were to encompass randomly selected project sites where activities were undertaken during phase two of the project. It was also expected that the team would hold discussions with different categories of participants of the project and assess their experiences and benefits; as well as assess the level of awareness of the activities and possible outcome to those sections of the population that have so far not directly participated in the activities of the project including indirect positive and negative impact of the project. The team ended up being confined to Bujumbura and highly regrets this omission of field visits as it left lacunae in the evaluation process.

### **3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES**

The agreement of this project and its planning was in two phases of five years (2000-2004 and 2005 – 2009). Overall development goal was described as follows:

The project aims at:

- (i) Contributing to the creation of a culture of tolerance, inclusiveness and unity among Burundians.
- (ii) Supporting the process towards a peaceful and democratically governed society in Burundi.

A number of specific goals for the entire programme period were stipulated as:

- (i) Contribute towards common approach among the foreign agencies involved in peace and reconciliation efforts in Burundi;
- (ii) Create an atmosphere of tolerance and unity among religious leaders;
- (iii) Build a capacity for peace and reconciliation work among the religious leaders, in order to make them resource persons in this area;
- (iv) Arrange training of trainers who will be able to assist in the work at regional level, and train people at grass root level;
- (v) Assist the religious leaders in establishing dialogue forums at local level and later in phase II at the national level.

Specific objectives for phase II (2005- 2009) were mentioned as:

- (i) Consolidation of the work done in the previous phase.
- (ii) Peace building and creating a trauma healing process (the depth which will largely be dependent on the democratic process).

Strategies Applied during phase II include:

- (i) Networking and cooperation with various organizations as a means to broaden the base for engagement in the peace building process
- (ii) Use of opinion leaders especially youth and women who are expected to continue the work.
- (iii) Workshop is both a strategy and method in project description.

## **4.0 PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED ACTIVITIES DURING THE PERIOD AND CONCLUSIONS**

This chapter discusses the main findings in terms of planned and implemented activities including deviations and conclusions observed by the evaluation team. The team sought to understand the coherence of the programme, impact, sustainability and future direction. Key planned activities include:

- (i) Networking efforts with both local and international organizations;
- (ii) Advocacy/church leaders capacity building workshops;
- (iii) TOT in the regions,
- (iv) Trauma Healing and Reconciliation in the regions, communes and villages;
- (v) Radio Hope – empower population through civic education/HIV and AIDS;
- (vi) Weekly Breakfast prayer meetings;
- (vii) HIV and AIDS;
- (viii) Awareness creation and peace and reconciliation for youth and women; and
- (ix) Trauma Healing and Reconciliation for security forces and other civic leaders.

Below is a description of activities implemented and challenges that the project experienced.

### **4.1: Project Design**

The main purpose of this phase two was to establish/restore peace in the country and eventually good governance and reconciliation. As this is phase two of the project, many of the activities were already identified in the project proposal and many of the activities are either a consolidation or continuation of the phase one. Concerning the design of the project the context was well understood since AEE had been following developments in Burundi since 1995. Hence the contextual analysis reflected in project proposal remains the reference point whereby issues of peace and reconciliation are highlighted as needing attention as well as establishing forums for dialogue between various factions.

Programme design was informed by consultations with various leaders both church, military and civil society as well as participants in previous workshops including views from WOI, THARS who had a working relationship with AEE. Already in 2005 when Great Lakes Ecumenical Forum (GLEF) was established they affirmed the need for healing of wounds in Burundi and this influenced the programme focus. Another group that influenced the focus of the programme was the military whom AEE had facilitated mediation with the rebels. The Anglican Archbishop Rt. Rev. Bernard Ntahoturi who is also the chair of CNEB has played a key role as an adviser. Since the contextual analysis was conducted in the first phase, AEE did not view it necessary to undertake another in-

depth situational analysis as the project was evolving responding to the situation and political changes among others and therefore they concentrated on formulating project applications which were done annually. Assumptions especially the key one that there would be peace was critical for this phase because due to insecurity some activities were not feasible or started rather late for example, trainings in the provinces. It was only in 2006 that activities intensified in the field and movement improved. Therefore, project formulation is in line with the request of the partner whereby the objectives are stated, strategies, assumptions and activities. Programme activities are interlinked with a clear understanding that peace without healing is incomplete and peace and healing without good governance is an empty shell.

To conclude, phase two project meets the criteria of the donor. For purposes of monitoring however, an articulation of both process and quantitative indicators would have been useful for purposes of monitoring and assessing impact. Therefore a logical framework could be considered in future. Present indicators are not quantitative and difficult to monitor (see page 18 of summary document) but it is essential to note that in annual plans the indicators are specific. Further, a continuous process of scanning the fast changing environment would also assisted in re-focusing activities and target groups. Finally, there was need to undertake a more serious stakeholder /target analysis – this would have provided a better understanding of church leader’s landscape, and civil society organizations especially the Moslem community. Since the country was initially not safe the programme was almost confined to Bujumbura with target/participants being sourced by pastors for workshops and it is only after 2006 that AEE went to provinces by invitation. Given the complexity and fluidity of Burundi, AEE should ensure a continuous scanning of the context with a view to remaining relevant and providing appropriate services to priority constituencies.

#### **4.2: Relevance of the Project**

The main focus of the second phase was “to establish a process towards a peaceful and a democratically governed society”. There is no doubt that the objective of the programme was and remains relevant. First and foremost Burundi has gone through centuries of governance system that was exclusive and non participatory beginning with the Kings to the colonial era through the post independence period. Second, the Arusha Peace Accord provides mechanisms for sharing power that is new and thus the democratization process was anchored on weak governance institutions and culture. Third most of the present leaders were in the bush fighting as well as the army for 14 to 15 years and many have limited skills in governance and administration. Besides governance institutions being weak allegations of corruption are rampant and the government has instituted an anticorruption brigade, anti-corruption court and a Ministry of Good Governance. Finally, the culture of intolerance has permeated the society for many decades and the second objective was to nurture a culture of tolerance. All these are indicators of the deficits in governance that require undivided attention. The AEE has through WOI and SAN signed a protocol with the Ministry of G.G attesting to the relevance and need in the country.



At the level of peace and trauma healing, the evaluation team was informed that about 54% of Burundi population are traumatized hence the deviant and bizarre behaviour and the need for trauma healing. In other words, one person out of four is traumatized. Therefore as one of the respondents stated, “*peace without healing would be superficial*”. In spite of the Arusha Peace Accord, one rebel group namely FNL has not joined the government as it is still waging war in Bujumbura and its outskirts. The message of healing is more than relevant to the context of and people of Burundi and so is peace building as was attested by those interviewed. Both phases one and two are relevant to Burundi as a post conflict nation. AEE has been on target by focusing on reconciliation, peace and good governance. While many respondents argued that AEE should also link peace building to development and in as much as it is necessary, this would probably loose the original direction and it is possible that AEE would need extra resources and different competencies.

### **4.3: Effectiveness of the Project**

The programme planned a number of activities that are to be implemented during this phase.

**4.3.1 Networking** with organizations working on trauma healing with a view to engaging the ecumenical forum is one of the key activities. The AEE has networked widely with a number of organizations and the ecumenical forum. Some of the organizations that are now functioning like a resource include THARS, SAN, WOI, PACWA and CNEB. This is proving to be one of the strengths of AEE as it not based in Burundi. On Good Governance AEE is working with SAN, on HIV and AIDS is with PACWA, on Trauma Healing and Reconciliation it is with THARS and on Church leaders CNEB provides the ecumenical forum. A number of workshops were conducted on the above mentioned themes. Networking is used both programmatically and as a measure to liaise with local NGOs and Churches and in this vein, AEE has attended GLEF meetings, been in touch with FECCLAHA and NCA. From the activities, AEE is networking at national and regional levels.

### **4.3.2 Church Leaders Initiatives**

Capacity building has in phase two moved out of Bujumbura to the provinces where a number of pastors are keen that AEE facilitate workshops. The challenge mentioned in the first evaluation namely that AEE continue to seek to bring church leaders together with a view to develop a strategy for national reconciliation remains an issue. Although meetings were held for church leaders in Bujumbura, the team has not jelled and there are plans to continue in 2008 and hold the meetings like leadership mission. In 2005, two church leaders meetings were held and 3 for Christian leaders; while in 2006 five workshops were held for church leaders and 4 for Christian leaders. In 2007, Christian leaders had 5 while church leaders attended 4 workshops and in 2008 Christian leaders workshops conducted are 3 and 1 for church leaders. To-date the project has not

convened church leaders in a systematic manner with other religious leaders and although national level workshops for church leaders were conducted they have proved a challenge as they continue to seek unity in peace and reconciliation work. The project plan anticipated capacity in advocacy of church leaders at grass root level but this has not materialized yet.

#### **4.3.3 Weekly Prayer Breakfast Meetings**

These are meetings for senior national leaders and from 2005 to April 2008 three (3) workshops were conducted. Given the objective of these meetings which is to create a spiritual space for national leaders across various divides, the number is limited for the time frame and the importance of this level of leaders and their role in peace and reconciliation, workshops so far are few. There is need for more such meetings that gather leadership from a wide spectrum of society.

#### **4.3.4 Women Leaders Reconciliation workshops**

Perhaps a key activity planned during this phase was empowerment of women and youth leaders. Unlike phase one of the project, women have received a lot of attention during this period under review. The following are the number of workshops conducted in 2005 (2) in 2006 (5 including 1 for widows) in 2007 (67 including 1 for widows) and in 2008 (3 including 1 for widows). Workshops provided space for women to discuss issues that culturally are impossible a fact that most female respondents acknowledged and appreciated. The example of widows who thought their lives had come to an end when their husbands died, found a lease of life and now look at life positively.

#### **4.3.5. Youth Reconciliation workshops**

This is perhaps the most vulnerable group as it is usually engaged in war and conflict. Like most African countries the youth form the largest social group of the society in Burundi. It was noted that a number of young people had problems with their parents and the workshops enabled them understand themselves better. In 2005 (2) workshops were held and in 2006 (1), in 2007 (2) and (1) in 2008.

#### **4.3.6 HIV and AIDS**

Awareness creation activities on HIV and AIDS are at two levels. One is through the radio Hope programmes like prevention messages, medical information and advocacy for people living with AIDS that are aired. Two is workshops for women living with AIDS jointly organized with PACWA and for youth jointly organized with SAN. In both cases resource people are professional medical and social workers knowledgeable in the subject.

#### **4.3.7 Trauma Healing**

The project has remained faithful to this objective of healing and many grass root workshops for military, church leaders, youth, women and students including civic leaders were mounted. Nearly all respondent testified to the importance of trauma healing and how they were helped to overcome their pain and took a step of forgiving those who caused the suffering. A case of a military officer who now works as a TOT with a fellow

colleague who almost killed him is telling. While another narration by an officer who lost his members of his family is able to forgive and work with the perpetrators of violence. Teachers are another category that learnt how to deal with child abuse and enforce child rights. The evaluation team heard from this group how teachers were able to discern the challenges that children face and assist them to overcome due to the information gathered from workshops. Patience and the art of listening were noted as an important skill in assisting children who have come through conflict in the school.

#### **4.3.8. Good Governance**

Due to delays in connecting with government leadership and security workshops in Good Governance only started in 2007. Governors, civic leaders and military are appreciative of the capacity they have gained from these workshops. One governor noted that they now know how to work with people of different persuasions. In view of leadership that is aloof from people GG workshops emphasized integrity, transparency, participation and leaders being close to people. With the protocol signed in 2008 with the Ministry of G.G, the project should reach higher echelons of government leaders.

#### **4.3.9. Radio Hope**

The evaluation team met with one of the staff of Radio Hope. This is a radio owned by WOI and independent started on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2002 and it serves an important function in disseminating peace and reconciliation messages, HIV and AIDS awareness information etc. In as much as the programmes continue with support from AEE, the previous evaluation recommended that a survey be carried out to find out how many people listen to programmes and to find strategies of how to reach more people. In addition that in the second phase, there was no need for Radio Hope to be a distinct component of the project. Further, proposed regular consultations with church leaders, so as to secure “ownership” of the radio by the same has not happened. It is not clear as to why these recommendations were not addressed in the project. The evaluation team proposes that the project actively seek to systematically engage church leaders once again in contributing and find ways of building ownership around the radio station. The project should consider the use of the national radio.

The main topics of training are: Trauma Healing, which was the dominant focus in the year 2005. In 2006 trainings included Training of Trainers, HIV and AIDS but again the main emphasis was on THARS. A focus for 2007 was a mixture of themes namely G.G, THARS, Leadership, HIV and AIDS, Mission and TOT; while in 2008 again the emphasis has gone to THARS and one workshop for G.G and HIV and AIDS.

#### **4.3.10 Unrealized activities/Deviations**

Nearly all planned activities were implemented except that GG workshops were not mounted in 2005 and 2006. Leadership, G.G and Gender was only started in 2007 and the civic leadership in terms of governors and commune leaders found it relevant as needy groups of people in decision making –counselors, administrators and groups who have high risk of conflict. Many governors we interviewed requested for more such workshops. Neither were the peace rallies and civic education are hitherto unattended to. Another activity not realized was the survey of radio listeners in order to determine the

relevance and numbers of listeners. The evaluation team learnt that the radio run by WOI is the second in the country in terms of geographical coverage. It may be useful for AEE to rethink the use of government radio and TV as the coverage is also wide and reconsider the recommendation by the 2003 evaluation to phase out radio.

**Table 1: Summary of workshops**

Year	No. Of Seminars	Female	Male	Total
2005		473	366	839
2006		837	2,326	3,163
2007				
2008		178	333	604

*Note: The figures may not be accurate and need validation*

To conclude the programme has achieved most of the activities planned except that a number started late for example, the G.G and leadership. Many narrations were given in terms of impact. After the training the evaluation team heard that those who were enemies become brethren and when compared with American ambassador’s training those who attended the AEE workshops were of the opinion that AEE touches the heart and people’s needs than the one organized by the USA ambassador.

A concern was raised that to secure a peaceful future in Burundi the AEE should train more students in secondary schools and universities. In addition, widows and youth have benefited from training –testimonies of healed people were vividly told to the evaluation team. An Association of former national army officers, ex combatants, ex military from all churches has been set up following the workshops with a view to multiply the training to others. So that according to one officer “Those who were seen destroying the country should also be seen building it”.

Workshops have created safe space for all to share their wounds openly and issues thought to be personal are shared especially by (women) whom according to tradition/culture are not allowed to share problems and wounds from the home but AEE workshops enabled a process of sharing sorrows resulting in group therapy; time for women to talk; to pray; to cry together; time to be oneself and share experiences since women do not have enough space.

Workshops for teachers made it possible for some to have a better understanding for the need of patience with children as they now can situate the behaviour of traumatized children better. There is also improved recognition of the need to respect the rights of

children even by parents. A woman stated that “I now spend more time with children and this has improved our relationship and the behaviour of my children”.

#### **4.3.11 Coherency and Synergy**

At the project level the themes of G.G, peace and reconciliation and trauma healing are interrelated and the flow is evident. It was noted that workshops on GG also touch on trauma healing as a mechanism of ensuring peace. Thematic coherence and logic exists but there is need to sharpen the GG theme and related components for example, the place of HIV and AIDS in the project whilst important requires a rethinking in order to link to GG and peace and reconciliation. Components such as counseling were highly demanded and trauma healing which may call for more efforts and therefore adjustment of the programme.

Organizationally the churches are not all in tune with the activities especially at the national level. Since the evaluation team did not visit the regions it is not possible to discern about coherence although information from staff showed that there is more collaboration at that level. Organizational coherence and synergy is currently limited and the project may consider a national committee with representation from Evangelical Alliance and CNEB to give support to WOI.

#### **4.4: Methodology**

As a capacity building programme, the evaluation team inquired into the methods and tools that the project has employed. To begin with prayer plays a central role in all workshops whereby each day starts and ends with a prayer. The overall approach is workshops based on a theme with Biblical reference where biblical examples are given and bible verses quoted to substantiate issues. A case in point is the use of the cross as a reference point/solution to the problem in trauma healing. Conventional methods are used such as group work, experience sharing, plenary discussions, and teaching through inputs by resource people. The workshop is a major tool that the project uses.

Facilitators make use of a manual developed in Rwanda by AEE for trauma healing and reconciliation premised on biblical material and which is in the process of being translated in Kirundi. As regards Good Governance, an outline exists which uses same approach as that of THR namely biblical and therefore different from conventional method because healing of trauma is included. The main content includes basically national mind set – developing a historical perspective with a view to reinforce unity instead of the fragmented picture; principles and characteristics of GG; accountability, integrity, values of leadership; leadership styles; and types of governance. The evaluation team noted that workshop themes are well prepared and that in THAR there are two manuals used by the resource organization one biblical and the other general in order to allow for access by all including non Christians.

Resources persons are different for different topics for example; THAR is facilitated by Trauma Healing and Reconciliation Service (THARS) who have trained TOTs as well; on governance SAN provides facilitation in addition to AEE team. The HIV and AIDS training and counseling have also professional facilitators. Apart from the manuals listening techniques are emphasized.

In conclusion methods are fairly participatory and they engage participants. A number of observations were made that AEE needs to consider for purposes of effective dissemination of information and these are: One is the need to provide hand out to participants in order to ensure proper reference and correct application. Two suggestions were made to consider the numbers of participants and the acoustics thus probably use loud speakers for better hearing. This is applicable in situations where participants are more than 50 as in the case of the armed forces. Third, given that learning takes place in a variety of ways, the use of videos, case studies, testimonies, drama and Walk and Talk may be worth considering. Fourth and final the use of TOT should be carefully assessed for example, some participants were of the view that a widow TO would be more effective when addressing other widows and since TOT is the main tool then AEE needs to train many and they should be representative of the various social groupings.

#### **4.5: Effectiveness**

*Finance:* The management and accountability of funds is in line with the agreement. First, Burundi office produces reports immediately after a workshop is concluded and also quarterly ones. At the Tanzanian level, audits are conducted, office is managed by an accountant who ensures that book keeping is maintained according to agreed standards but this is in French and at times reports especially vouchers may pose a challenge for staff in Dar who have to constantly ask clarifications.

The auditors are at the level of Dar Es Salaam AEE office and have never visited Burundi to establish the system that is operational. In Dar Es Salaam, the accountant is conversant with fund accounting as he has experience from another programme/organization. Auditors have conducted audits and submitted management letters since 2004 to 2007 which the evaluation team assessed and found no concern or issue raised to management except in audit management letter issued in 2008. The auditors have recommended that the project establish an assets registry in Burundi

A comparison between the resources and the need have no parity. However, the AEE has kept the administrative costs low at least less than 35%. Therefore the expenditure is within the limits of the proportion between administration and programme. This is taking in to account the fact that both the Coordinator and Assistant are involved in programme work.

In terms of fund assurance, the project has received all the money requested. In 2004 the budget was at US\$ 129,900 and in 2005 the total budget was US\$ 249,800 including a local contribution of US\$10,000, in 2006 it was US\$ 289,000 with a local contribution of

US\$ 10,000; in 2007 it was US\$ 394,000 and local contribution of US\$ 7,700 and for this year 2008 the budget is 332,000 while the other contribution is 7,700. It is noteworthy that the project has not attracted other funding. The evaluation team recommends that one the auditor may need to visit Burundi office to provide guidance on vouchers and issues of exchange rate in US \$ which should be reflected on the vouchers. Two AEE coordinator/staff need to walk the Burundi based staff on imprest policy so that it is clear to all for purposes of supporting the accounting function.

*Human Resources:* The approach of using resource persons means that AEE has adequate staff levels especially after Mr. Kopwe hired in 2005 an Assistant which was a concern raised in the last evaluation. Other two staff based in Burundi hired during this period was the National Coordinator and Assistant National Coordinator as well as accounts assistant making the staff compliment more and better. The AEE has tried to upgrade capacities of staff through training in Reconciliation and Governance. Otherwise, there is need to enhance capacities in peace building and conflict resolution. Staff when interviewed about remuneration, felt comfortable with their salaries as they are line with baselines in Tanzania and Burundi in particular WOI salary scales.

*Support Facilities:* Both in Dar and Bujumbura, the facilities are currently adequate namely office space, computer, internet and vehicles. There is need for the Bujumbura office to keep a register of assets however few.

It can be argued in conclusion that the programme has achieved much more in relation to finances – with an average of US\$6,000 per workshop many participants have been touched and lives transformed.

The challenge for the AEE is that it has only one source of funding.

#### **4.6: Project Management**

There are two centres of programme management. The first one is in Dar/TZ where there is a committee that is responsible for oversight, guidance and monitoring. It is through this committee that the coordinator submits progress reports to the AEE Board meetings. The committee meets prior to the Board meeting and at times ad hoc meetings are convened if need be. Most of the members that the evaluation team interviewed are committed church leaders and professionals. They meet regularly and tend to have a quorum. Capacities of the committee include banking skills, leadership, capacity building. There is no special skill on peace or reconciliation but a commitment to the vision and concern for Burundians.

At the Bujumbura level, the staff implements activities under the supervision of the Director of WOI. There is no committee to support their work. In the event of a dispute at Bujumbura level, there is no established independent mechanism to intervene other than the Coordinator or his Assistant. Apparently there was no provision in the project plan for the AEE committee to visit the programme in Burundi. The visit by the Team Leader who is also a member is by virtue of her capacity as a facilitator for the workshops. Thus the committee has worked with trust and confidence in the staff team.

In Bujumbura and Dar/TZ staff attended a retreat that has imbibed the culture of peace and reconciliation. From observation the virtues of peace and reconciliation were evident in the committee.

It may be prudent for at least two of the committee members to visit the programme so as to undertake their roles from a point of knowledge in addition to commitment and concern. There is also need to review the management structure in Burundi with a view to establish a national committee to support the WOI Director. This committee could be made of religious leaders, some civic leaders etc., and their role would be monitoring and guidance/advice to the project.

#### **4.7: Gender Dimension of the programme**

In the project plan activities are envisaged for women and gender. As illustrated by the number of workshops and attendants, many women have benefited from the programme as well as men. Without thinking through the concept of gender, AEE has included young men and women, men and women but without utilizing the concept of gender. Women are very present in all aspects of programme – HIV and AIDS, Trauma healing, Reconciliation and Good Governance.

Although AEE is aware of gender disparities in Burundi, in future, the programme would benefit from undertaking a gender analysis with a view to better understand the strategic and basic needs of men and women in peace, reconciliation and good governance. Such an analysis should ascertain development of appropriate strategies and thematic components to address gender needs of men and women, boys and girls. One such component could be more seminars for couples (husbands and wives) to share the pain and trauma and in this way begin to touch the surface of gender challenges in Burundi society. The project plans have put women together with youth there are valid reasons to separate the two categories as youth require special strategies different from women.

#### **4.8: Model for faith-based Approach**

The faith based approach was appreciated by all categories of participants. A governor noted that it was the first time she came into contact with scripture texts. Moslem participants were overwhelmed by the examples in the Bible that point to good governance and leadership. Indeed, the programme highlights the need for reconciliation, peace and good governance to get to the heart of the values and morals of people and not mere technical and logical knowledge. It recognizes that it is the heart that must change to enable the head function correctly in other words, both the head/mind and heart must change. In social and economic development, the place of religion is being recalled and affirmed showing that a human being needs to be approached in all aspects.

Having acknowledged the faith based approach as essential and replicable in all situations especially in Africa, the team is concerned that Trainers should be fully grounded in their religious knowledge so that they do not risk misguiding participants. Further sensitivity



to non Christian constituencies that may not be ready for such an approach is imperative by providing adequate explanations and material. This is a matter that AEE should watch out for because in a haste to train some of the TOTs may be ill prepared and cause harm rather than good.

Finally, whilst the faith based approach is relevant and replicable, it should be accompanied by well thought out technical knowledge on the specific subject matter as is now the case with trauma healing conducted by THARS. There is absolute need to ensure that there is no effort at evangelization of one religion by another in such training workshops because the purpose would otherwise be lost. Fortunately this has not been the case in Burundi although the evaluation team heard that one Moslem participant left the workshop even before he heard the teachings. His Moslem colleagues, junior to him continue to blame him for this action .

The evaluation team wondered whether Burundi was a realistic example for inter-faith context since most people were exposed to Christian faith as most Moslems were initially Christian. The team recommends that while a faith based approach is relevant, the project should adopt a THARS approach of using two types of material especially in an inter-faith context.

#### **4.9: Partnership**

AEE is in partnership in principle with ELFCN but is also hosted by World Outreach Initiatives an NGO in Burundi. It was not until recently that a Memorandum of Understanding was developed and signed between AEE and WOI. This is important step in the partnership since the relationship has been rather informal and to some extent personal.

At the level of AEE-WOI the two plan every year together and share expressed needs and recommendations from workshops, discussions with church leaders and facilitators from different backgrounds. Besides the EFCN which is the principle partner, AEE has signed a protocol through WOI and the Ministry of G.G which recognizes the role of the AEE. In addition, AEE also partners with SAN in conducting G.G and HIV and AIDS workshops and with THARS in conducting THAR workshops. Another partner in project implementation is PACWA in HIV and AIDS.

In the past AEE proposed to WOI the activities to be implemented, these days, AEE asks them to propose activities. Although relationship has been fluid the MOU will now provide a legal understanding that regulates the partnership. There is however, need to include exit measures in MOU and to clearly enter in to an institutional agreement and not an individual.

Evidently, the principles of partnership are accountability, transparency, integrity and biblical principles. Both ELFCN and AEE share the same vision for peace and

reconciliation in Burundi and that is how come the partnership started. There is a mutual agreement on areas of cooperation, time frames and criteria for the relationship and reporting.

In conclusion, the partnership has been mutually enriching, a shared vision and purpose. However, the MOU with world Outreach should be with the institution and not the individual which seems to be the case now as per the formulation. The AEE and ELFCN have both met their obligations as stipulated in the contract.

#### **4.10: Impact and Sustainability**

A number of major changes have occurred but this evaluation could not assess impact as this should come at the end of the programme hence the evaluation team assessed changes as shared and testified by respondents. In a traumatized nation, everyone is an enemy and everyone is a friend however, what the programme is doing is creating more possibilities for friends. Governors and other leaders testified to the fact that they have learnt new way of leading at civic /governor/ judges levels. One judge who attended a workshop on GG and THR did apparently state that after the workshop, “I have signed so many divorce papers but I will now try to discuss with couples what I now understand following the training”. Another person observed that “these are teachings we have never got and we want our young children to be taught prior to marriage”. Obviously this judge will before giving a ruling in divorce cases listen carefully and provide counsel because he/she now has new insights in family life. Concerning G.G governors noted that there is mutual understanding between them and people and now hold more meetings to dialogue than give instructions.

Awareness on Trauma Healing Training - Workshops for security forces ; the army and police were appreciated as crucial because they provided healing. Officers who were enemies now work together as trainers; an officer whose village was heavily affected by war and a church was attacked, lost a mother and brother was able to overcome fear and face former rebels face to face after training. In Gitega, the workshop was according to chaplains a success due to stories told by all various groups represented.

The written a tripartite agreement with Ministry of G.G to conduct G.G workshops is recognition of the importance of work and its relevance. A group of women have established a prayer team because they have been healed and they pray for the peace and healing of the nation. Many testimonies were told for example, by Youth who in past did not communicate with parents and now do; politicians who were arch enemies who now talk and tease each other; a separated church pastor who after the workshop was re-united with his wife. Before many Hutus and Tutsi could not eat together nor encourage inter marriage but this is changing as the evaluation team witnessed a young Hutu –Tutsi couple; Hutus and Tutsi can eat together. The team met a young couple the man a Hutu and the woman a Tutsi who got married after meeting in one of the workshops.

Regarding sustainability the AEE anticipated that it would diversify the funding base but this did not materialize. Therefore in order to ascertain sustainability of the project a

number of strategies are stated in the plan namely; reaching out to opinion leaders so that they can continue to work for peace and reconciliation (2007); training more people who become change agents; training of TOT to work on a voluntary basis; capacity build radio programme staff, training of pastors and develop the NGO capacity. To-date the TOT are very few to cover the demands of communities from village, commune, region and national level but AEE has adopted an appropriate strategy because a number of TOTs were sharing information within the vicinity. Another functional approach is voluntary people in communities some of who shared what they are doing after they got trained. For these people to be more effective they require attending more than one workshop otherwise the risk of misinterpretation is high.

In view of the above mentioned strategies, AEE should conduct a survey of strategies in order to establish whether they indeed can result in meaningful sustainability of activities. In spite of AEE hoping to raise money from other donors this did not materialize and there are no concrete strategies for the same. Possible adjustment in the project is to seek for additional resources over another phase to ensure that enough TOTS and pastors including volunteers are trained in trauma healing at least.

#### **4.11: Future direction of the project**

There is no doubt that AEE programme has just scratched the surface and the need for peace, reconciliation and good governance in Burundi is immense. In fact the relative peace that the country has been enjoying is threatened by the FNL rebels. Therefore if possible AEE should identify possible funding partners in order to accomplish the following:

- Training of more TOTs in various institutions such as armed forces, army and police; Secondary Schools; universities; in provinces with pastors; governors and parliament (MPs).
- Undertake intensive follow up of TOTs and other key participants and record testimonies of people healed and trained who could be used as living testimonies in workshops (Living Letters).
- Conduct more trainings on trauma healing and reconciliation and Good Governance;

As far as adjustments are concerned, the programme should consider the following:

- Include conflict prevention/mitigation in peace and reconciliation training;
- Additional days to be added to the current three to five or at least four per training. This is to allow for climate setting, bonding of participants and opening up to each other;
- Review the place of HIV and AIDS and consider dropping it as one of the components and concentrate on Trauma Healing, Peace building and Good Governance;

- For conflict prevention and resolution, AEE may use the services of a consultant to train both staff and TOTs;
- As the project trains more TOTs there is need for appropriate Trainers for respective groups e.g. widows would need a widow who understands their situation and the same case for the military;
- Many of those interviewed were concerned that without Income Generation Activities (IGA) to support those healed they could due to poverty revert to old behaviour, especially those who were deeply wounded or who may find joining the rebel group lucrative. Therefore AEE should seek linkages with development organizations involved in service delivery and refer participants.

It is important to note that the programme in question is a good initiative entrusted in an organization that has a heart and cares for Burundi. Equally critical is the fact that fighting has resumed again. In view of the end of financial arrangement in 2009, ELFCN should consider linking AEE with other funding partners. The on-going rebel activities could jeopardize the efforts made so far by AEE. Since the plan had a regional dimension and AEE initially planned to work regionally but did not realize the idea, there is need to consider including at least D.R.C in the new programme plan especially given the expressed interest in parts of D.R.C by some of the leadership.

## **5.0 HIGHLIGHTS, CHALLENGES AND LESSONS EARNED**

The project has over the last three years registered a number of highlights, challenges and lessons. Journeying through Burundi has been both learning and doing moment for the AEE. Through many hurdles like insecurity, the project has steered the cause it set out to do.

### **5.1 The main highlights of the programme are:**

- the ability to reach the military and police who are key in maintaining security and the rule of law;
- Training of Governors in G.G as a basis of ensuring accountable leadership and good governance;
- The planned collaboration between the ministry of G.G and AEE to train members of the cabinet;
- Attitudinal and behavioural changes that have taken place at individual level as testified by those the team met;
- AEE project is now well known in the country and when the team travels around they are not suspected as before but they are welcomed etc.;
- A broad and strong network with civil society organizations;
- Moslem participants from Buyenzi appreciated the training on leadership/governance and have requested similar workshops for members of their community as this was new knowledge; and
- The project has within the last few years since 2006 when security improved managed to move rapidly in the villages, communes/regions;
- The corps of TOTs is impressive and an important cornerstone for the future of the work;
- Empowerment of women who are healed as illustrated by Anglican women is a milestone in the journey; and
- So much work has been achieved by very few people/staff.

### **5.2 Key Challenges**

The evaluation team identified the following as the main challenges:

- Participation and unity of church leaders at the national level especially the CPBU remains a hard road to travel;
- Some church leaders who have not understood the purpose of the project tend to close the door to members who in turn hide to attend workshops anyway;
- Time for workshops is short, need adequate time for climate setting – ice breakers to overcome fear, adequate time for sharing/discussion;
- Limited time meant that participants were overloaded;
- Workshops should include animation /energizers especially for the armed forces;

- Poverty and lack of basic needs could mitigate the work of trauma healing, peace and reconciliation;
- Weak follow up of workshops and participants and few facilitators;
- There is high demand for workshops TOTs are few and cannot cope;
- Lack of clear future funding for the project despite its relevance and effectiveness;
- Follow up workshops for Moslem community requires a structured approach;
- Limited follow up in general of workshops; and
- Continued insecurity that threatens implementation of activities

### 5.3 **Lessons Learnt**

During these past three years lessons can be noted although the project has not documented them. When the project started for example, a number of obstacles stood in the way but as time progressed the project leadership has taken note of many ideas and issues. Some of the lessons learnt are:

- Patience is cardinal to trauma healing and peace and reconciliation work;
- Healing is a prerequisite to lasting and just peace;
- Truth may not always be shared nor the same, it depends from where one stands and the perspective of history and circumstances;
- In some contexts it may be easier for an outsider to function than a local but they must develop and have confidence and trust of the people;
- It is important to take time to understand the community and their culture and respect their experiences in order to share the knowledge one brings;
- A faith based approach is more richer than a pure technical one as it addresses both the spiritual and the physical;
- Peace and reconciliation needs partnership that has mutual trust, share common vision and values as in the case of ELFCN and AEE;
- Good Governance is a building stone for meaningful peace and reconciliation to obtain;
- External people are only facilitators any intervention must be anchored and owned by the people in a particular country;
- Demobilization of armed forces and other people is futile unless they are first given an opportunity to heal in order to reconstruct their lives; and
- Regional dimension of a conflict must be taken in to account for lasting solution in this case the Great Lakes region should be constantly considered when seeking to restore peace in Burundi.

## 6.0: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The programme has achieved most of the planned activities. The AEE is one of the few organizations that is committed and knows the Burundi context quite well. Future areas of focus should seriously consider need TOTs, conflict prevention and the ongoing work on trauma healing and reconciliation including good governance. It is the opinion of the evaluation team that HIV and AIDS is not the core competence of AEE and there are other organizations better placed to carry on the task of awareness creation on HIV and AIDS.

The evaluation team recommends that:

- 6.1 Training and capacity enhancement requires well articulated mechanism of follow up of participants and institutions and in this respect AEE should put in place a mechanism. AEE should consider the need to hire a consultant to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tool to find out the impact of their work and also to develop a data base of those trained “*If you cannot measure it, you cannot manage it*”.
- 6.2 Duration of workshops was considered by nearly all respondents as inadequate especially given that these are no ordinary workshops, long historical prejudices and animosity between people needs time to break ice prior to making input. Some of the workshops were like conferences and not workshops because of their size. In as much as the demand is high, trainers need to consider learning facilities and individual learning styles. That training days be increased to at least four for the remaining period.
- 6.3 **Future Adjustments** - In view of potential phase out or reduced activity AEE provide enough and thorough training of TOTs to cope with demand for workshops in the provinces.
  - Since the plan had a regional dimension and AEE initially planned to work regionally but did not realize the idea, there is need to consider including at least D.R.C in the new programme plan especially given the expressed interest in parts of D.R.C by some of the leadership. In other words, the project should seek to include D.R.C so that the GLEF spirit is and networking sustained with a view to creating broader accountability of church leaders.
- 6.4 **Project Design:** Given the complexity and fluidity of Burundi, AEE should ensure a continuous scanning of the context with a view to remaining relevant and providing appropriate services to priority constituencies. In addition the plan is logical however the main document should contain indicators as clearly stated in annual plans.

- 6.5 Gender** – empowerment of women is appreciated and to enhance the role and place of women, the project should undertake gender analysis of the situation and infuse findings in to the activities.
- 6.6 Sustainability** – the project should continue with the measures of ensuring sustainability namely to train pastors, volunteers and TOTs including opinion leaders among youth and women. Where possible the project needs to develop other sustainability strategies for example, diversifying funding through locally tested fund raising strategies within AEE and Burundi.
- 6.7 Peace and Advocacy** - the AEE become a voice to Government of Burundi on the dire need for healing so that they understand demobilizing people without subjecting them to healing process is useless if not dangerous.
- 6.8 Radio Hope** - the project actively seek to systematically engage church leaders once again in contributing and find ways of building ownership around the radio station. The project should consider the use of the national radio.
- 6.9 Effectiveness** – the project enhance its capacities through staff training in project management skills and peace and conflict resolution.
- 6.10 Project Management** - AEE establish a committee in Burundi to work closely with the Director of WOI and to engage church leaders. The aim is to increase organizational coherence and synergy. This may mean reviewing the MOU with WOI to include such changes and to broaden scope of supervision.
- 6.11 Ecumenical Forum of church leaders**—the project intensify its activities at the national level with evangelical alliance and CNEB to strengthen the ecumenical platform and movement for peace and reconciliation.



## ANNEXES

### Annex 1: GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

#### 1.0 Project Preparation and Design

1. What process was used to design the project?
2. Who participated in the design?
3. Was a situation analysis undertaken?
4. Is there coherency, harmony between objectives, strategy, activities and indicators?
5. What key assumptions were made at the time of design?

#### 2.0 Relevance of the Project

1. To what extent does the project address the context and its needs?
2. What were the peace and governance needs?
3. Why was it that the project was relevant in the Burundi context?

#### 3.0 Effectiveness of the Project

1. Performance by objective
2. What was planned?
3. What has been achieved /implemented?
4. Which of the activities were not realized and why?

#### Methodology

1. What methods and tools were used?
2. Which methods were useful and not so appropriate and why?
3. Does the project need other methods does the project need?

#### 4.0 Project Efficiency

Organizational Structure -----

Structure of the Strategic Plan-----

1. What is the annual budget?
2. What is the proportion between administration and programme?
3. *Human Resources* --- What is the carrying capacity? Number of staff, qualifications and experience in Reconciliation and Governance.
4. *Support Facilities* -- -- How are the facilities of the programme – office, computer, internet, vehicles etc?

#### 5.0 Project Management

1. What is the management structure?
2. What are the capacities of governance?
3. What are the roles of the AEE – Executive Committee?
4. In what ways does the management reflect the vision and values of the project?
5. Describe the Reconciliation work culture.

## **6.0 Gender Dimension of the programme**

1. How does the project address the gender issues?
2. What are gender issues in the project?
3. What strategies are in place to address gender needs – men and women, boys and girls?

## **7.0 Model for Inter-faith**

1. What are the elements in project for inter-faith?
2. What are the challenges for interfaith approach?
3. What are the potentials?
4. What are the threats?

## **8.0 Partnership**

1. What are the principles of partnership and are they shared?
2. What is the vision of the partnership?
3. What are the mutual accountability mechanisms?
4. Are there areas of improvement? If so which ones?

## **9.0 Impact and Sustainability**

1. Describe the major changes that have occurred as a result of the project both positive and negative?
2. Have desired results been realized?
3. What was the situation before and now?
4. What sustainability strategies and activities were planned for?
5. Which of these activities have yielded results?

## **10.0 Future direction of the project**

1. If this project were to continue, what would the focus be?
2. What adjustments would be needed on the current programme?
3. What resources human, finance and facilities would be required?
4. In view of end of financial arrangement in 2009 how will the work continue?
5. What plans are in place for continuity?

## **11.0 Highlights, Challenges and Lessons learnt**

1. What in your view are the key highlights of the project?
2. Outline five major challenges.
3. What do you consider as the main lessons learnt from this project?

## **12.0 Recommendations**

## **Annex 2.0: List of Interviewees**

### **2.1 Staff**

- |                          |                                 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Delphine Ndayikeza    | Director, World Outreach        |
| 2. Mr. Charles Ndikumana | Coordinator, Burundi            |
| 3. Mr. Evaristo Musuzuna | Accountant – Burundi            |
| 4. Emerimana Emery       | Assistant Coordinator – Burundi |
| 5. Silon Nsabinpa        | Driver                          |
| 6. Mr. Emmanuel Kopwe    | Coordinator – Tanzania          |
| 7. Pastor David Nkone    | Assistant Coordinator –TZ       |
| 8. Tony Lucas            | Accountant –TZ                  |
| 9. Secretary – TZ        |                                 |
| 10. Driver - TZ          |                                 |

### **2.2 Board/Committee Members**

- |                                 |                        |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Bishop Charles <b>Salala</b> | Vice Chair             |
| 2. Mrs. Grace Masalakulangwa    | AEE Team Leader/member |
| 3. Mrs. Leah Mwakioma           | Member                 |
| 4. Mr. Muze Lawrence            | Treasurer              |
| 5. Mr. Simon E. Jengo           | Member                 |
| 6. Mr. Emmanuel Kopwe           | Ex Officio Member      |

### **2.3 Beneficiaries**

- |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Suleiman Mosi                 | Governor of Gitega                  |
| 2. Mr. Sylvester Ndayzai             | Governor of Karuzi                  |
| 3. Colonel Adelen Gacukuzi           | General Chaplain- Army              |
| 4. Abbe' Ndayitwayeko Jean Berchmans | General Chaplain-Police             |
| 5. Christian Niyonkuru               | Director, Strategic Actions Network |
| 6. Pastor Sophonie Ngendakuriyo      | Manager World Relief                |
| 7. Hon. Martin Nivyabandi            | Minister, Ministry of GG            |
| 8. Mr. Adolph Baranyizigye           | Advisor to Minister of Education    |

### **2.4 Anglican Women Focus Group**

1. Bigirimana Clavera
2. Bukwiye Jeanne
3. Munuma Juliette
4. Ndezwenayo Rose
5. Bitariho Jacqueline
6. Muhorakeye Mireille

7. Sabukumi Jeanne
8. Nankundwa Yolamu

- 
9. Colonel Deo Ntiyankundiye
  10. Colonel Antoine Harushimana
  11. Dr. Rwajekera
  12. Ms. Bararufise Marcelline Governor of Rutana
  13. Ms. Sarah Niyonzima Has 15 orphans

## 2.5 Teachers Focus Group

- 
- |                                   |          |
|-----------------------------------|----------|
| 1. Ms. Niragira Scholastique      | Kibenga  |
| 2. Mr. Bashirahishize Jean Claude | Kinaywa  |
| 3. Ms. Nsabimana Sabine           | Kanyosha |
- 
- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| 4. Marie Claire Nduwimana | PACWA   |
| 5. Esperance Nizigiyimana | PACWA   |
| 6. Peace Nihorimbere      | Director PACWA  |
| 7. Mr. David Niyonzima    | Trauma Healing and Reconciliation Services<br>(Facilitator) |
- 
- |                                 |                                       |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 8. Ms. Lydia Ndiambaje          | Radio Producer                        |
| 9. Mr. Haruna Sibomana          | Chief-Buyenzi (3)                     |
| 10. Mr. Hussein Assumani        | Chief- Buyenzi (2)                    |
| 11. Ms. Hawa Nzirubusa          | Chief – Buyenzi (5)                   |
| 12. Pastor Andre Nzaniye        | Eglise Evangelique du Afrique Central |
| 13. Pastor Etienne Nahimana     | Evangelical Alliance                  |
| 14. Pastor Leopold Banzubaze    | Evangelical Alliance                  |
| 15. Bishop Noe Nzeyimana        | CNEB                                  |
| 16. Pastor Justine Nzoyisaba    | United Methodist Church               |
| 17. Ms Venessa Nivigira         | Student at University                 |
| 18. Mr. Tony J-Claude Tunezerwe | Completed Law degree                  |
| 19. Mr. Charles Gachahu         | Young couple                          |
| 20. Ms. Gilbertine Harerimana   | Young Couple                          |
| 21. Bishop Pie                  | Anglican Bishop of Bujumbura          |
- 
- |                     |              |
|---------------------|--------------|
| 22. Ms. Jacqueline  |              |
| 23. Opportune Simba |              |
| 24. Cecile          | Anglican TOT |

## 2.6 Interpreters

Esperance NISHIMWE  
Lambert Ntakuratimana