Land Management at Crossroads in Africa: Impact of the Tanzania Village Land Act No. 5 of 1999 on the Fate of Customary Land Tenure)

Felician KOMU, Tanzania

Key words: Customary Tenure, Governance, Uniformity of Titling

SUMMARY

This paper argues for the need to adopt a uniform land titling system that does away with the customary land holding system in Tanzania and possibly other African countries. It departs from other existing literature that urges governments to recognize communal rights in land holdings. Urbanization and its way of life is arguably the driving force in national economies as well as in influencing socio-economic structures of the societies, where customary rules and norms that used to govern land use have been eroded. Coupled with incongruent information availability between policy makers and communities, the fate of customary land tenure has suffered a number of setbacks. A more transparent system in sharing information and land laws that take cognizance of the communities aspirations in a market economy situation is needed. Any attempt to extinguish customary land ownership will however, be hotly resisted by the people and policy makers oblivious of the benefits such action will offer. Deliberate efforts should therefore be in place that ensure basic quality standards are met in the titling process at affordable costs and people are informed of the forces at play as their areas continue to be urbanized.

Land Management at Crossroads in Africa: Impact of the Tanzania Village Land Act No. 5 of 1999 on the Fate of Customary Land Tenure

Felician KOMU, Tanzania

1. Background to the Study

Africa is a vast continent with diverse political and cultural heritages amongst its 53 countries. The most notable common features of the continent, however, are the subjucation of almost all its countires to colonialism in the last century, the differrent paths taken to redress effects of the colonial domination and the struggles towards controlling fast urbanizing population in the last 50 years. Throughout the history, the struggle for land by both indigenous peasants, pastoralists and large commercial farmers has created conflicts, some of which have epitomized in ugly fightings. Within the individual countries, land conflicts manifest themselves on two palates- the urban and rural divide.

In the urban sectors, land rights are secured against registered land titles while in the countryside, these rights are generally recognized through local communities under a general umbrella that is popularly referred to in almost all official United Nations doumentation as 'Customary land'. It is intriguing therefore on one hand to determine whether Africa has a common understanding of the land problem and on the other whether the African people especially those in the countryside where land is held on 'customarry titles' share same construction of land rights as the policy makers in Africa.

Towards the end of the colonial domination in Africa in late 1950s, some deliberate action was taken to contain the ensuing struggles for land. Policies were formulated by the outgoing colonial governments such as the British in Tanzania during 1953-55 that hatched an ´Individualization, Titling and Registration' (ITR) system of land tenure. The ITR system vied to transform customary land ownership that was communal to individual and exclusive rights that are secured under a law. The ITR did not win accollades in some countries. Tanganyika (as Tanzania was then) regarded this as a means of further alienation of the indigenous people from land that they had always owned which

"...*would have resulted into 'freehold' ownership of land whereby land tenure is individual, exclusive, secure, unlimited in time and negotiable in free land markets*..". (Isinika et al, 2010).

Indeed, Tanzania adopted a very harsh stand on ITRs to the effect that freehold interests in land were abolished and all land vested in the State through the President who became the Truste of land for the people in 1963. This stand has to be understood in the context of Tanzania politics towards independence in late 1950s by its founding President, Mwl J K Nyerere who campaigned vigourously against commoditizing land. Nyerere's stand on the subject as

contained in a publication dated 1958, ' Mali ya Taifa' continues to be inspirational to the land rights debate in Tanzania. In his words:
"...If we allow land to be sold like a robe, within a short period there would only be a few Africans possessing land in Tanganyika and all the others would be tenants..." (Julius K. Nyerere 1966: 55).

2. Evolution of land tenure in Independent Africa

A typical African country awakening from the yoke of colonial rule and nationalistic independence era exhibits three distinct epochs of times that shaped its land tenure system. The first epoch is the colonial times when large chunks of land were alienated many a times against the indigenous interests and occupied by colonial settlers. Many of the present pieces of legislation had their origins from these times. The Colonial system was followed by the nationalist independence era during which the new nationalistic governments grumbled against what they considered an unjust land holding system. Most of the new legislation promulgated by the new independence governments, are paradoxically a replicate of similar laws of the countries from which the colonial system was introduced into the African countries. This was to be expected mainly because the freed African had little training and poor grasp of economic affairs of the new nation. It is during this period that we witnessed alarming rate of rural-urban migration that ushered in new problems associated with urbanization. Interesting however is the fact that in all three eras, the State assumed the radical title to land (Tsikata, 2001).

The advent of the rural people to urban areas that were considered the den of the non-indigenous brought with it a variety of differing customs. These customs have had a strong bearing on land use and occupation in the African cities. The customs shrouded with nationalistic sentiments and the 'African Socialism' bred fertile grounds for abrogating existing laws on the use and occupation of land to the effect that hazard and wetlands were brought to use and squatting on planned areas became fashionable. It should however be noted that squatting and creation of slums in the African city was not solely for the nationalistic reasons as just said. Inability of the new independence governments to contain the fast urbanizing towns and local politics as well as bad land governance were other reasons for the disorderly developments in the African towns.

The two historical epochs were followed in the last two decades by a more complicated system embodied in globalization of the world economy. During this era, many of the legislation from the two preceding epochs have been reviewed, and a new international trade relation has re-instated features that smut the colonial era. It is during this era that the Eastern Africa countries carried out major land reforms that ended up with National Land Policy Frameworks in place at various times during 1989-1999 (UNECA,2010). Unlike the second epoch which was characterized in many of the African Countries with communal ownership, the last epoch embraced the 'western concept of individual property ownership'. What is of

greatest interest to us is however the recognition accorded to 'customary land ownership rights' throughout the three epochs amidst these varying political-economic systems and cultural structures. None of the existing publications has challenged this paradoxical co-existence of a dual land tenure system. Indeed, despite the continued commoditization of land and real estate, as observed by Andersen (2011), NGOs and other civil society organizations are mounting campaigns calling for governments to legally recognize customary communal tenure to safeguard community interests and the environment.

Customary land tenure system has been a pinnacle of both rural and urban economies in all the African countries and yet the most vulnerable. As urban population grows, intermingling of people of different traditions and customs results. Cultural mixes and enhanced commercialization inhibit the survival of customary land tenure system. Customary land tenure system has been treated with partisan as a darling of the entire land holding system and yet a bastard in practice as will be discussed below(Komu, 2003).

3. Do we have Customary Land Tenure?

Most of us believe as in faith that we still hold land on the so-called customary land tenure. We do not wish to accept the fact that our population is fast urbanizing and fast doing away with tribal customs and traditions. But it is increasingly becoming apparent that we cannot have customary land tenure system in urban areas. The case law on this is abound in Tanzania and the provision on restricting customary right of occupancy to village land (S14 of Act No. 5) further reinforces this argument.

Customary land tenure was communal, an aspect which has received admiration from a number of scholars. Tribal leader/chief administered the land for and on behalf of his subjects and would allocate it to those in need for cultivation of crops. With dismantle of Traditional rulers in Tanzania at the time of independence in 1961 and in subsequent legislation (e.g. Act No. 1 of 1965), the customary land tenure was left to die and individuals occupied and acquired land in what is akin to a modern market situation. In a study on a villagge just outside the Municipality of Moshi, Msaranga only 15% of new land occupiers obtained their land within the Chagga tradition of inheriting from parents(Lerise,1997). S.12 of Act No. 5 recognizes this fact and provides for three categories of village land: the Communal Village land, the individual/family/group land and the land that can be allocated to individuals and groups for use (derivative rights).[i]

The Village Land Act No. 5 of 1999 provides for the management and administration of village land. Village land management is entrusted to the Village Council, which is to be directed by the Village Council. The crux of the matter is that the management and administration must be in compliance with the customary law of the respective area. In a country where tribal inclinations are divorced from appointment to leadership and job posts, the possibility exists for some Village Councillors to have no hands-on experience with the

customary law of the land they are administering. The customary law is unwritten and largely depends on tell-tales from elders.

We may conclude this section by arguing that while the Law provides for existence of the customary right of occupancy in villages, its existence as its founding customary law is either non-existent or continuously being diluted and polarized by the infiltration of intermarriages, migrations and urbanization. It is to be reiterated that all laws do recognize customary tenure but not all accord it protection.

As a result, the so-called customary right of occupancy is the most vulnerable and insecure land tenure characterized by the following:

1. Title holder has no access to formal credits. In Tanzania an attempt has been made to register short term rights under a regularization scheme in informal settlements where individuals are assigned a residential land liences of a maximum of 5 years. Commercial banks have been reluctantly accepting these licenses in preference to the registered Certificate of Occupancy.
2. Title holder is discriminated if happens to be of the weaker sex.
3. It is prone to extinguishments upon expansion programmes of a city(Shivji, 1994).
4. Cultural mixes through intermarriage and co-exisence kill it.
5. Migration dilutes the tenure.
6. It is not uniformly applicable over a given geographical area. There is an exception on this from Lesotho, where a uniform land tenure has been saluted for its egalitarianism in land distribution and deterrent on land speculation (Mosaase,2000).
7. Customary land tenure facilitates land speculation.
8. Customary laws are against individualization of land tenure which is the key driver for land adminstration in today's world.
9. Customary land laws are unclear, how customary is customary land tenure
10. Urbanization alters the pattern of customary tenure, it will therefore die a natural death.

4. Is Customary Land Tenure recognized?

The Tanzania's National Land Policy of 1995 provides that existing rights in recognized long standing occupation or use of land must be clarified and secured by the law..' (see also S. 3(b) of the Land Act, 1999). The sentiments of the National Land Policy are well captured in both Act No. 4 and 5. Section 18 (i) of the Act No. 5 provides

'…. *A customary Right of Occupancy is in every respect of equal status and effect to a granted Right of Occupancy*..'

The proviso continues to clarify that the:

Customary Right of Occupancy is capable of being allocated by Village Council to person/persons and that it can be within Village land or reserved land; capable of being of indefinite duration and that it shall be governed by customary law in respect of any dealings,

between persons residing in or occupying or using the land. It is inheritable and transmissible by will and finally it is liable, subject to prompt and fair compensation, to acquisition by the State for public purpose...'

In practice, customary land holding systems are popular amongst the population particularly away from the towns. Within the land office practice, however, recognition of customary right of occupancy is doubtful. Within the same law, Act No. 5, an attempt to revive the old customary leases of a people such as in the Bahayas along Lake Victoria is not permissible. S19 of Act No5 categorically prohibits

'…or to permit or sanction the reintroduction of any form of customary leaseholds similar in nature to Nyarubanja tenure..'

Section 56 of Act No. 4 of 1999 provides for the demise of customary right of occupancy de facto. Under this provision, an interest in land may be regularized within urban and peri-urban areas. Criteria to be followed to declare an area ripe for scheme of regularization include:

a) *Where an area is dominated by dwellings either built and occupied by the present owners or abandoned dwellings by former occupiers*
b) *Where a large number of people have no lawful titles to the land*
c) *Where the land is occupied under customary law but which is the law of one group of people living in the area.*
d) *Where the area is well established having been occupied for a number years etc*

Implicit in the Regularization provisions in Act No. 4 is the fact that Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy(CCRO) is the title to:

"...un-built land, to a 'not-well established' settlement, to land occupied by a homogenous group of people with same customs and traditions, to rural land, to area where land occupiers have not appeared to be investing in their houses and businesses nor attempting to improve their areas through their own initiatives..."

It follows therefore from S 56 of Act No. 4 that Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy cannot be of equal Status to the Granted Certificate of Right of Occupancy. This is particularly so when one considers the urbanization trends where individuals from different ethnic groups converge in different locations within our urban areas. It is estimated for example by 2025, about 50% of Tanzania will be living in urban areas. What it will then mean is about 50% of the population will not be eligible to hold land under CCRO. Indeed it may be safely now argued that Customary Right of Occupancy is an uncertain mode of holding land, it is a temporal arrangement on hold until the locality within which the land is situate structurally changes to a settlement or has qualified to be declared a Planning Area.

5. Whither Customary Land Tenure

Whatever Customary land tenure submits itself to be, it is indeed a sensitive subject. Traditionalists and conservatives will hold to it obnoxiously of the implication that it has on their well-being. It is at the cradle of rural subsistence economy, not because it contributes more to the welfare of the land occupier than the other, but because it is the only alternative for him, the cheapest way of holding on the land, the easily understood system. The Land Authorities on the other hand lend it recognition lest the rural people revolt.

The dichotomy between rural and urban developments is unfortunately real although they are interdependent. Our towns cannot survive without the rural land uses, without farming areas that feed our towns. With increased urbanization[ii1], we expect a much shrunk peasant farmland. This will have an impact on the amount of support that the rural development would have lent to the urban development.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the type of land use and occupation and the registration. Information discerned from S 56 of the Land Act No. 4 of 1999 is that where an area has assumed urban character it then qualifies for a Regularization Scheme. Elsewhere, granted Right of Occupancy are a phenomena of urban areas and also identifiable with the large land users such as in large commercial farming. Customary Right of Occupancy is limited to the peasant. And where the peasant's income has grown to the extent of enabling him to acquire larger piece of land and do commercial farming, he will 'instantly' abandon the Customary Right of Occupancy and embrace Granted Right of Occupancy, notwithstanding the fact that his land is in the middle of a large village land and the laws allows this type of transfer.

It would therefore seem that the law and practice has condemned the poor man to a form of land title that is limited to rural land use, indeed peasant farming.

6. Impacts of customary land ownership on urban development:

Urban development comes about when the demand for space has been satisfied by a corresponding supply. In practice, no physical development will take place on land until there has been a real need for the type of development. Usually, a market situation provides stimulus for the development. Given the sentimental values that often go with customary land holding system, a large chunk of land is withdrawn from the market[iii]. This argument helps to explain why land acquisition programs are resented in the first instances. Those whose land has to be acquired by the State for any of the justifiable public interests are faced with the dilemma of overcoming their strong feelings about their strong relationship to land without which life is meaningless (Asuquo,2011). But they are also struggling with the fact that the

latent value of their land is now being spotted and they may not benefit from it more than the new land occupiers.

Land occupiers under customary law are not motivated to effect urban development of the caliber that the urban authorities would consider suitable for the area. The main reason for this phenomenon is economics; that they do not have adequate financial resources and quite often they cannot afford to even maintain the kind of development that may be wanted of them. But it is more complex than this, the customary land occupier is unable to seek credit anywhere not even with the help of the provision of the Village land Act. Neither financial institution nor indeed an NGO will be willing to part with large sum of money against a title whose certainty is determined by the rate at which the urban area grows and promptness of the Minister responsible for land in declaring a Scheme of Regularization or Planning Scheme.

Augustinus (2010) considers customary titles to land as motivating development of informal settlements. The context of her argument is on the need for a consistent land policy and legal framework. In our context, the legal framework is in place in the form of the Village Land Act of 1999, Land Policy of 1995 and several promulgations that exhort the right of holder of CCROs. While there is no strong reason for refusing the relationship between customary land tenure and growth and/or sustainance of informal settlement, there is a strong correlation between undefined Village Councils as land management units for village land and the ensuing informal settlements especialy around peripheries of major cities in Tanzania. The existing legal frameworks in Tanzania are idealistic and hardly take the view that communal land tenure is being eroded by a large number of factors as discussed earlier and therefore without strict governance mechanism, its continued use will only add to the worsening woes of informal settlement developemnts in the country. The existence of these frameworks are comforting to the policy makers who are hopeful that solutions to emerging problems would be found in them. Kironde(1997) affirms abuse of existing legal frameworks asserting that
"...*depending on the location, quite often, government (planned) land is allocated informally through private dealings which involve the exchange of money*…" p. 81

Enemark(2009) offers convincing views on how to prevent informal developments. He regards the lasting solution to be in the general improvement in national economic wealth in combination with increased levels of social and economic capital in society. It is with a sound national economy that one is assured of consistent implementation of land policies, and good land governance through well established institutions and systems.

7. Customary Tenure Holders Perspectives

Securing land titles to individuals in a typical African society raises a number of questions. The long established traditions limit individuals claims to land to only user rights. The concept of ownership rights is alien to the people in villages. Several studies carried out in

Tanzania indicate rights of individuals to land are defined by the unwritten customary rules and norms. These norms emphasize the user rights to land and that individuals allocated land by the Village Council or in the traditional setting by the Chief Tribal leader could only use the land and keep it for use of the next generation. Securing the land title through a registration process to any of the family members was not acceptable and is still not acceptable in traditional societies. The entitlement to land right did not matter whether it was for the male or female members, but rather spouses would hold the land for their children. Benjaminsen et al,(2003) confirm this view in a study that was carried out in the Southern highlands of Tanzania in Iringa. Individuals who do not make use of land allocated to them would have that land re-possessed by the village council. There are also several cases within the periphery of the commercial capital of Tanzania, Dar es Salaam where conflicts have arisen between individuals allocated land either through the respective village councils or through purchase but kept the land undeveloped for several years (usually two consecutive farming seasons).

Such un-occupied land becomes an easy target for young villagers especially the un-employed who with blessings of the Village Council occupy such lands for farming purposes. This kind of re-possession in areas has been likened to land invasion by villagers, a form of land grabbing that large commercial farmers have construed as being particularly disturbing. What is clear from studies made, is that the villagers contextualize the right to land in totally different ways to what the State, Policy Makers and large commercial farmers do.

The adoption of National Land Policy and eventually dedicated legislation that differentiates urban land and rural land has over the years encouraged villagers to confront land use planning authorities in land acquisition deals. During 2000-2004, there were protracted debates between the Ilala District (in Dar es Salaam) and Buyuni Village Council within the district over whether the Village was a registered village and thus with land ownership rights over the land that was subject of acquisition by the Municipality of Ilala in an urban expansion program and a resettlement plan for the expansion of Dar International Airport. The villagers contended that since the land was village land, it could not be acquired for urban land uses. The ensuing discussions ended with intervention of the District Commissioner in two separate occasions (2000 and 2002) who held public rally to try and convince the villagers of the right of the President to enter and take the land from the villagers. It was not until 2005 when out of the 890 farmers, 482 villagers had accepted to have their land taken, that a general decree was made by the Government to implement the envisaged project.

Land owners on the peripheries of urban areas hold the land on uncertain terms and are wary of the next actions by the Planning Authority. Once an adjacent area has been declared a planning area, they quickly rush to erect structures as a deterrent measure against possible land acquisition by the Planning Authorities. Such actions are rampant in most of Tanzania cities. As a result any subsequent application of a planning scheme in these areas tends to be

over-expensive on account of large sum of money required to compensate structures that will have been erected in anticipation of the Schemes. Indigenous population in areas that became planning areas have been pushed from their places of origin several times as the new planning areas expand. In an interesting case within Dar es Salaam, a social impact assessment on people that were to be relocated to pave way for the construction of 132kV Transmission Line by Electricity Utility Company(TANESCO) during 2005-06, it was revealed that four individuals had made fortune from compensation sums paid having been pushed three times within a decade. The individuals had realized they could relocate themselves in strategic locations that were to be subject of subsequent acquisition and had therefore become speculators for compensation payments.

8. What is the Alternative to Customary Right of Occupancy?

Customary Right of Occupancy as earlier argued is a convenience term coined to apparently recognize land occupation by people outside the urban areas. At the turn of the 19th Century, the Colonial Governments of the 'World' annexed large chunks of land out of the tribal lands in the colonized territories. The land that was left with natives was to be held under native law (customary law). Unfortunately, subsequent Governments have not created conducive environment upon which the holding system would transform itself to a 'modern' form of land ownership that takes cognizance of the cultural and socio-economic changes in the economy.

Those who own and occupy land under the Customary Right of Occupancy are themselves not aware of the laws that govern their occupation. In peri-urban areas such as those around Dar Es Salaam, land occupiers are not indigenous to the area. In a 2003 compensation services consultancy in Dar Es Salaam, out of the 1097 farms assessed for compensation, only 124 farms could be thought of being occupied by the indigenous in Bunju area. The rest were occupied by people from outside the areas mostly civil servants from around the periphery[iv] of the country where attachment to land is very strong. The latter group could not be said to be occupying lands under customary right of occupancy as they are not a distinct group nor are they occupying it under granted right of occupancy. They are at the same time not illegally occupying the land.

The immigrant population in urban fringes occupies the land on a quasi formal and informal system which is probably not recognized at law. They acquired the land through a purchase that was witnessed and is recognized by the Village Leadership. Some of them use the land on the same basis as they would have in their place of origins. If they are from Chagga tribe, they would plant a traditional plant, the 'sale' and where it is planted it is where all the rituals would be performed(a shrine). Some will set up family graveyards. The land will in quick turns be occupied under different customs and subsequently disposition may no longer be as

smooth as was between the former land occupiers and the immigrants. Subdivision of the land amongst heirs to the first settlers also becomes necessary in case of demise of the settler.

But generally the newcomers are much more loose when it comes to cultural values and may occupy the land without any course to traditional rights such burials and inheritance. They may however as a group establish indigenous structures such as assembly points where collectively they perform spiritual or ritual ceremonies. This latter group are occupying land under what has been identified as 'autochthonous' land tenure in the Americas.

Autochthonous land tenure is not recognized in Tanzanian laws and we can safely conclude here that the alternative to the seemingly customary right of occupancy in the country is not covered by our laws and at worst can be illegal.

The adoption of Social Tenure Domain Model (STDM) as a pro-poor land tool by the FIG in 2006 offers some light on what could happen with customary titles to land. In the preceeding discussions, it will have been noted that the parties to the whole arrangement, the customary landholders and the State, share very little information in common to each other. As a result, while the State organs maintain that the two land tenure systems are equal and none is in inferior to the other, the villagers perceieve their rights as limited and crave for transforming their interests to registered titles. The STDM takes a pragmatic view of the set up with the aim of putting in a land adminstration system that is found on sound land information and dissemination systems(Uitermark et al, 2010).

9. Conclusions

To resolve the problem of dual land tenure system, it is important that some intermediary was set up to bridge between the rural land uses and urban land uses. One of the fundamental problem is the non-recognition of rural land uses in urban Tanzania such as registering farm land. It is argued that Municipal governments should accept to grant Right of Occupancy to rural land uses within our urban areas with limits placed on quantum basis on one hand and find out ways of granting more permanent land holding systems over areas under customary land tenure systems. We should agree now to allow rural land uses as satellites in our towns rather than having the entire urban area dotted with lifeless buildings. Built areas can circumvent rural land uses or the vice versa. This may mean adopting a different concept of an African City altogether. A city that has as one of the land uses, agricultural land.

If we accept to enlist rural land uses within the urban land, and not just as 'green belts' or 'low-density plots' but rather 'agricultural land', some form of islands that bridge two urban settlements, we will need to re-consider our land laws. What would be required are laws that are fair to both parties and in particular the poor who are holding land under the customary tenure systems. It is pertinent that one uniform land tenure was in place. Uniformity in land

tenure makes it easy to administer the land, brings about fair competition in the market and greatly cuts down land speculation and checks infiltration of foreigners' access to land. This translates into having converting all rural land into title-based registration system. As it is at the moment, village councils are easy prey of the investible capital that is floating around. Foreign capital is also on hunt looking for land.

Is it possible to expect all land in Tanzania to be under uniform system of land tenure that is based on the cadastre mapping? Several attempts have been made to the extent of confirming the possibility of establishing a nation-wide cadastre. With use of aerial survey mapping, orthophotomaps can be developed and existing land boundaries mapped for titling purposes. This proposition may not sound tenable to land surveyors whose belief is that the land measurement must be accurate to a fraction of a milimetre. But can we afford to continue compromising a sustainable urban development to the whims of niceties of a cadastre survey plan?

Uniformity of land titles in Tanzania is a possibility that we all must endeavor to explore. We should not condemn part of the community to titles that we are certain that are of no use to them for a few years to come. It however remains to be seen in what ways one could diffuse the strong cultural sentiment to customary titles amongst the rural and indeed some of the urban population, amongst Civil Servants, Government Leaders and even Scholars. The STDM facilitates generation and disemination of land information which if well used would contribute positively towards understanding and common construction of solutions to problems and instill high level of good land governance. The biggest challenge is to change the attitude of mind towards existing customary land holding systems which indeed leaves the land management in Africa at crossroads.

References

Andersen, Kirsten Ewers (April 2011) Communal Tenure and the Governance Of Common Property Resources in Asia, Lessons From Experiences in Selected Countries, Land Tenure Working Paper 20

Asuquo Offiong Offiong (2011) A Rationalization of an African Concept of Life, Death and the Hereafter in American Journal of Social and Management Sciences, online publication, ScienceHuβ, http://www.scihub.org/AJSMS

Flavio M de Souza(1997) Perceived Security of Land Tenure in Pacific, Brazil Habitat Vol.25 No.2 pp 175

Harry Uitermark, H. and Lemmen, C.(2010)International Federation of Surveyors (FIG), The Social Tenure Domain Model A Pro-Poor Land Tool, Copenhagen

Isinika, A.C. & Mutabazi, K.(2010) Gender Dimensions of Land Conflicts : Examples from Njombe and Maswa Districts in Tanzania in Havnevicky, K. & Isinika, A.C(Eds) Tanzania in Transition from Nyerere to Mkapa, Mkuki na Nyota Publishers, Dar es Salaam

Kironde, J.M. Lusugga (1995) Access to land by the urban poor in Tanzania: Some findings from Dar es Salaam, *Environment and Urbanization, Vol* 7: 77

Kombe, J (1994) The Demise of Public Urban land Management and the Emergence of the Informal Land Market in Tanzania- A case of Dar Es Salaam, Habitat, Vol. 18 No. 1 pp 23-43

Komu, F (2003) Customary and Informal Land Tenure System in African Cities: Polemics of Sustainable Urban Development, paper presented at the 4th AFRES Conference held at The University of Nairobi during 12-13th March, 2003

Lerise, F. S.(1997) Planning at the end of the river: land and water use management in Chekereni, Moshi district, Tanzania, Arkitektskolen, Copenhagen

Marco Bura(1997) ;Land Use and Development Dynamics in the Peri-Urban Zones of Dar Es Salaam- a quest for Planning and Management Responses, Journal of Building and Land Development Vol 4 No.2

Mosaase A,(2000) Lesotho's land policy Under the Land Act 1979 and its implications for the agricultural sector.

Nyerere, J.K.(1966) Freedom and Unity, Oxford University Press, London

Stern & Rodney R White (1989) African cities in crisis- managing rapid urban growth, Colarado West View Press

Stig Enemark, Robin McLaren, Paul van der Molen(2009) Land Governance in Support of The Millennium Development Goals A New Agenda for Land Professionals, Conference Proceedings, FIG / World Bank Conference, Washington DC, USA 9–10 March 2009, FIG Publication 45

Tsikata, D.(2001)Land Tenure Reforms and Women.s Land Rights: Recent Debates in Tanzania, Paper Prepared for the UNRISD Project on Agrarian Change, Gender and Land Rights, ISSER, University of Ghana
UN-Habitat (2010) Informal Urban Development in Europe - Experiences from Albania and Greece (Chryssy A Potsiou, ed)
United Nations Economic Commission for Africa(2010) Land Policy in Africa: Eastern Africa Regional Assessment, AUC-ECA-AfDB Consortium, Addis Ababa
Volkan C, Hulya D & Mehmet G (2002) concept of Ownership in Land Arrangement Studies in Turkey, FIG XXII International Congress, Washington.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

Felician Komu's career in real estate includes teaching and consultancy services mainly in the fields of land management, real estate valuation and housing. He has held a number of positions as academic and professional over his lifetime. He has been faculty member of Ardhi University, Member of the Land Administration Unit at Ardhi University, President of the Africa Real Estate Society and Board Member of the International Valuation Standards Committee. He has carried out consultancy services extensively in areas of land acquisition and compensation, resettlement planning and valuation. He has several publications in land acquisition, housing and property maintenance.

CONTACTS

Dr Felician Komu
Ardhi Univeristy
P O Box 32309
Dar Es Salaam
Tanzania
Tel. +255 222 775214
Fax + 255 222 775214
Email: komu@aru.ac.tz
Web site: www.aru.ac.tz

Endnotes

[i] Communal land has been a subject of privatization strategies in some areas. In Moshi area, the Village Councils in Uru and Kibosho have leased such lands to investors sometimes at a very low rent. In one instances, the Village Council subdivided the land and distributed amongst its members. The sub-divided land hardly 10m x 70m were selling at between Tshs 300,000-400,000 in 1994-5(i.e US$350-470) but currently at upwards of Tshs. 15,000,000/=(~US $ 9,400)

[ii] The urban population of Dar Es Salaam was for example only 2000 in 1887, todate the official census figures put it at 2,600,000; a figure disputed by several scholars who believe the figures to be well over 3,500,000. By 1961, the urban population in Tanzania was hardly 10%, todate the urban population accounts for 30% as compared to over 60% for its southern neighbor Zambia

[iii] In some tribal societies, it is taboo to sell land and especially so where it comprises a shrine as observed by Asuquo(2011)

[iv] In Tanzania, the most fertile lands are found around the periphery such as Kilimanjaro, Lake Regions and Southern highlands