

Land registration and strategic gender segregated data capturing for land ownership: Experience from land regularization projects in Tanzania

*¹Naomi Norah Makota, ²Dr. Cosmas B.M. Haule

¹ PhD Student; Open University of Tanzania, Dar ES salaam, Tanzania.

² Supervisor, Lecturer - Department of Geography, Faculty of Arts and Social sciences; Open University of Tanzania, Tanzania.

Abstract

Land registration is an important aspect of the Land Administration System (LAS) which enables to capture land ownership information and status for supporting planning and decision making processes. This study was conducted at Magomeni in Mtwara-Mikindani Municipality and Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu at Kinondoni Municipality in Tanzania. The purpose of the study was to assess the status of the existing LAS and suggest ways to improve it through capturing and segregating data related to gender. Data were collected using household surveys, influential people and key informant interviews. Interviews were conducted at the lowest level of local government authority administrative structure (*Mtaa*) and Municipal Council. Questionnaires regarding potential sources of land registration information were administered to house owners and checklists were designed to capture information from key informants and influential people involved in land regularization projects. The results from the study showed that land register existed in some study areas but was not specifically for LAS, no gender segregated data and had limited or restricted accessibility. Since there were different approaches used to make land/property transactions among individual owners, the *Mtaa* reported not obliged for keeping such information. Following these findings, the study concludes that there were no reliable information on land/property in both study areas. The study therefore recommends an introduction of a simple gender inclusive land register that would capture and align gender segregated data from *Mtaa* to Municipal levels in order to have comprehensive and reliable land records for supporting planning and strategic decision making.

Keywords: Land registration, gender segregated data, land ownership, land administration system (LAS), land regularization, data capturing, sale and transfer of land

1. Introduction

Land and property registration are among critical elements of Land Administration System (LAS) used in different countries. According to Enemark (2009) ^[7], LAS focuses on land tenure, land value, land use and land development. Land tenure enlightens the whole process of land registration where people can be granted with title deeds, residential license which guarantee the rights of ownership of parcels of land. Likewise, according to Kanji *et al.* (2005) ^[13], land registration is necessary when land title is insecure or there is development of land market due to expanding population and if there is high incidences of disputes concerning such particular land. In this regard, Kanji *et al.* (2005) ^[13], assert that the formal registration of land which is in unplanned areas might be useful to poor people as it helps to claim their right to land. Moreover, it is also crucial for different players to have clear records for LAS to help understanding the status and trends of land ownership for supporting development plans and decision making as far as gender consideration is concerned.

2. Literature Review

Various studies in East and West African countries (Kanji *et al.*, 2005) ^[13] have shown that the process of land registration is characterized by bureaucratic processes and are not gender sensitive. In most cases, many land registration programs finished up grinding down women's land rights due to the second position that women are placed in terms of ownership

(Sinha *et al.*, 2007; Mwagae, 2013) ^[19, 15]. This is due to traditions, norms and culture that limit women's chances to own land. (Enemark, 2009) ^[7] and (Bezu *et al.* 2013) ^[11] contended on various factors contributing to challenges facing documentation in LAS, including social and political issues where women land tenure could be touched upon. In Tanzania, the Land Act No. 4 stipulates about the need for all unplanned settlement to be registered (URT, 1999) ^[23] under land regularization programs. This condition is accommodated by formal legalization of unplanned settlements and registration of ownership.

In Lima, the story of land regularization has been best documented (Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, 2006; Payne, 2008) ^[6, 17] which helped others to monitor the progress attained and understand the impact of the program. This is supported by (Derby, 2002) ^[4] study in Tanzania which found that for effective land management operations and policy decisions, there is a need for database to store all necessary records. The process of establishing database and tracking records of land regularization is very important to assess the trends in relation to women land ownership (World Bank, 2012) ^[22]. Proper recording will help the government to understand the pros and cons of land regularization programs. However, in most cases, the existing mechanism for tracking and recording impact of land regularization programs is poor.

In such cases, there is inadequacy information on the existing land registration records, sources of information on land owner's movement and change in place of residence resulting

from land regularization. Such situation will continue to ignore gender segregated data. The study is therefore aiming to assess the status of the existing LAS and propose simplified approach of capturing gender segregated data in both newly surveyed and regularized plots to facilitate and help sharing information among different stakeholders like buyers and planners. Kanji *et al.*, (2013) ^[13] asserts that keeping records of land registration issues help to know what is happening and therefore assist planners, policy makers to understand the trends which in turn helps in supporting future decision making.

Besides that, Angel and Mayo (1993) as cited by Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, (2006) ^[5] asserted that, land registration enables tracking of land and house transactions and assures the buyer on legal protection. Likewise, Bezu *et al.* (2013) ^[1] underlined that land regularization and registration of property rights as part of LAS, lead to increased value of land and properties in informal settlements.

3. Theoretical Framework

Theoretically it has been noted by various scholars that most of land related laws give women right to own but is not practical (Kironde, 2009; Sinha *et al.*, 2007; Mwagae, 2013) ^[14, 19, 15]. Such situation is complemented by some of categories of Feminist Legal Theory, such as Dominance Theory which states "law and treatment of women in relation to men has not been equal or fair". Moreover, Angels' in his theory stated that "...subordination of women was associated with rise of male owned private property and patriarchal family alongside that of class - divided society which led in turn to the development of modern state".

De Soto in his approach was emphasizing on changing dead capital to collateral. This could have been a good idea only if the majority of women were becoming part of the process and ownership of that particular property. De Soto believed that land regularization/formalization approach would give poor (majority are women) opportunity to use their property for economic empowerment (Gilbert, 2009) ^[8]. This is not easy. In his thinking of property ownership, De Soto did not consider traditional set ups and norms which stated by Angels' in his theory. These are important issues to consider especially when dealing with poor people and underprivileged groups like women as they are the majority victims of lack of control over land. Having reliable gender segregated data could help different players like decision makers to know the extent and changes brought about by land regularization.

Theory of change can act as a driving seat which can be used to drive changes in the direction suitable for achieving desired results. Connolly *et al.* (2015) ^[2] pointed out that, critical part of designing successful reform project is making theory of change very clear. So if our government wants to make sure that our land registration has gender segregated data, needs to design a simple approach for data capturing in order have reliable source of data as far as women ownership is concerned.

4. Materials and Methods

This study was conducted at Magomeni in Mtwara-Mikindani Municipality and Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu at Kinondoni Municipality in Tanzania. The study applied mixed methods research design as described by (Creswell *et al.*, 2011) ^[3]. The study responded on the main research

questions on "How suitable and reliable are the existing land administration systems in relation to land regularization records? How gender sensitive are they?" To address these key issues, 10 key informants were interviewed from the Local Government Authorities (LGAs) which covered officials from the Land Departments and Wards, MKURABITA and WAT. Key informant interviews were guided by the checklists developed and were administered by the researcher. Apart from key informant interviews, a questionnaire was developed and administered to 197 respondents by a researcher and research assistants. The purpose was to capture data related to availability and reliability of gender segregated data in LAS. In addition, different documents related to gender issues and LAS were collected from the Internet and other research findings. Data from key informants were analyzed using the Content and Structural Functional Approach while data from household survey were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Tracking land regularization records in existing LAS

In the course of an in-depth interview with one of the key informants in Kinondoni Municipal, it was noted that there were register books which showed applications received or a normal file movement register which was used to register all incoming applications for title deeds/residential licenses. There was another register books which documented all processed and approved title deeds/residential licenses. These register books were also used by owners to sign off whenever they collected their title deeds/residential licenses.

In LAS, as far as land tenure was concerned, the study revealed that there were no register books for either specific land regularization or normal (from new surveyed areas) land registration in Kinondoni Municipal Council. Traditionally, land registration process had more focus on newly surveyed plots rather than regularized plots. The land registry department in all study areas had all files necessary for land registration that were kept using normal/traditional ways. Findings from the key informant from Kinondoni Municipal Council informed about challenges faced in land registration processes, that in some cases the registration process differed based on the specific requirements of the project. A similar observation was also noted by Haussener (2014) ^[9] as he found a complex and variation of land registration systems in Tanzania as cited from an example of the 20,000 Plots Program funded by the World Bank between the years 2004-2008. Likewise, there were no evidences of gender segregated data in this project.

Furthermore, in Mtwara Mikindani Municipal Council, the study noted that the files for Magomeni Mtwara were arranged according to location and kept in the same area for easy access. However, in Dar es Salaam it was not easy to access the files due to restricted conditions. This situation made it difficult for the researcher to understand the filing system. Furthermore, it was also difficult for the researcher to come out with the correct figure of segregated data on gender/sex distribution, a situation that was also observed by Thambikeni *et al.* (2015) ^[21] and Haussener (2014) ^[9] in their studies.

Although the results from in-depth interviews with key informant in Mtwara Mikindani Municipal Council showed

the existence of a special land regularization register book, the study failed to get access to it and surprisingly enough, the Municipal failed to give the list from the register. As a result, the researcher was forced to look for someone to prepare a list of all land/property owners in Magomeni Mtwara involved in the land regularization project initiated by the Government.

Likewise, during the study there were no evidences of land ownership transfer made in Magomeni Mtwara that resulted from the land regularization process in the area. The results from the study showed similar challenges posed by land regularization as raised by Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, (2006 and 2007) ^[5, 6] and Enemark (2009) ^[7] that there were no tracking systems or proper records of what had happened or continued to happen with respect to transfer of ownership. Besides, during in-depth interviews with key informants in Kinondoni Municipal, they clarified that in the case of official transfer of land/property, responsible people should go to lawyers or magistrates to undergo the legal procedures for transferring land/property. The Kinondoni key informant reported that transfer of land/property could not be authorized by Ward Executive Office (WEO) because they had no legal recognition in ownership transfer process. That is why Kinondoni Municipal commented about irrelevance of having alignment in information with WEO or *Mtaa* Executive Office (MEO) in terms of land transfer. The results from the study in Mtwara Mikindani Municipal revealed that there was no evidence of information on LAS which was shared or aligned with WEO or MEO. Such situation was also noted in Hannanasif as well. Qian (2014) ^[18] in his study on *Evaluating land administration system from the perspective of good governance in Kathmandu valley* commended the importance of having integrated system in LAS in order to be able to capture all land administration issues.

The results from household surveys and key informants from both Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu showed that the different approaches used by house owners when selling/buying properties might have contributed to the difficulty in having reliable source of information. Similarly, in one of MEOs in Hannanasif, it was noted that there was no proper documentation especially when house owners sold their properties. House owners were free to use any form of agreement – either from MEO/WEO or advocates. The available information was noted to be different even within *Mtaa* level. Although owners were free to use any means to prepare their sale agreements, however, two key informants from Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu stated about challenges faced when people visited the offices to look for information or records on sellers and buyers of land/property in their areas. Using different approaches in selling/transferring was pointed out as a big challenge in the documentation of land/properties. However, even though other people could have sold their land/properties through LGAs, the study done in Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu revealed that there was still no evidence of documentation in this regard. Such situation was also noted by Durand-Lasserve *et al.* (2007) ^[6] and (Kironde 2009) ^[14] and therefore insisted on the importance of having local records in low level which could be integrated in the main LAS. This will help the system to acquire more information because a lot of things are happening on land/property without the attention of LGAs. Qian (2014) ^[18] pointed that, land registration is one of the

important elements of LAS as it helps in the availability of land information hence provides land tenure security.

The findings from Mtwara Municipal key informant interviews showed difficulties in getting similar information on sale/transfer of land/property or any sale agreement made through advocates unless it was directly reported to them. However, in both municipalities, the study observed that any sale/transfer of property remained officially in the name of the first person that appeared in the municipal register book, despite the fact that the property had already been legally sold/transferred by lawyer or advocate to a new owner. This situation resulted to lack of gender segregated data in all study areas.

5.2 Tracking gender information in LAS

The results from discussions with the key informants from both Kinondoni and Mtwara Municipal Councils showed that despite the fact that there were no specific arrangements done for land regularization information, the existed record system still did not take gender issues into consideration. This was not a surprising issue because Kaarhus *et al.*, (2005) ^[12] provided similar criticism regarding lack of consideration for gender issues in the implementation of land regularization process adopted from De Sotto. The study confirmed that the weaknesses of LAS in relation to the implementation of land regularization projects and lack of gender consideration could make it difficult to have clear mechanisms of tracking the impacts of the project in gender perspectives. The study revealed weak LAS in both Municipal Councils as they used similar file format/structure as it was also asserted by Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, (2007) ^[6]. Similar situation was noted following the improvement of LAS by MKURABITA.

Despite the fact that MKURABITA improved LAS in Handeni and Mbeya in the issuance of Customary Certificate of Right of Occupancy (CCROs), more emphasis was put in the process of land regularization rather than improving LAS in terms of gender inclusiveness. An interview with one of the key informants from MKURABITA also revealed that, improved LAS did not have significant impact on gender issues. Following the discussion with the key informant from Kinondoni Municipal Council, the study also revealed that the weak LAS was contributed by the fact that, land regularization was a new approach in the system, therefore, the existed LAS used to accommodate registration of new surveyed plots rather than those from land regularization projects. Similar situation was also pointed out by Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, (2007) ^[6] which showed weakness of LAS due to various issues including registration process and insufficient human and financial resources. However, one could argue that inclusion of just a column to capture sex status in the file/register does not necessarily have cost implications.

Further inquiries were made to both key informants from Kinondoni and Mtwara Mikindani Municipal Councils on the approaches used in case one needed information on gender issues. They insisted that all data in relation to gender could be extracted from the register book as there was no specific kind of information arrangement which could easily make it accessible. The impression from the response showed that the issue of gender was not considered despite the gender sensitive Land Act of 1999 - No 4 and 5 (URT, 1999) ^[23, 24]. Such situation complemented with what was stated in

Feminism Legal Theory, especially in Dominance Theory. However, the response from other interviewed key informant from Kinondoni Municipal showed that, they did not see the rationale of keeping/recording such kind of data because it was well known that there were equal opportunities for ownership between men and women. Similarly, this perception complemented with what was stated in theory of Angels and Dominance. In this regard, such kind of thinking needs to be transformed by the government itself in terms of the system used to acquire such data and/or improve curriculum used to train personnel dealing with LAS to reflect and emphasize on gender aspects as asserted by Obeng (2011)^[16]. Gender information is very crucial in any development process because planners need to be supported by reliable information as pointed out by (Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, 2006; Payne, 2008)^[5, 17] in their studies in Lima. It is difficult to know the trends of ownership if there are no detailed reliable sources of information (Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, 2006)^[5]. Under such circumstances, it was not easy to identify the sex of owners of property/land unless it was requested; a process that needed extra work to segregate data from the register book.

Contrary to Magomeni Mtwara where information could be accessed, in Kinondoni Municipal Council it was difficult to have access to the normal register book as they said that the information needed to be treated as confidential. Assumptions were either the information could be misused, abused or exposed to people who may not be needed to have such access. Land Officers are the in-charge and have authority to give information regarding the register book. But for Kinondoni Municipal it was restricted due to what they claimed to be confidential information. The key informants pointed out that the information contained in the register book like, name of owner, date, file reference number and so forth could not be provided. Thus, the researcher was only allowed to take a couple of photographs of some blank sample files and other forms used by people from both formal and informal settlements when registering their land/properties.

According to Sittie (2006)^[20], Ghana had also experienced difficulties to access land information due to the different systems used by the country such as traditional and legal framework.

During in-depth interviews with key informants in Mtwara Mikindani Municipal Council, the information was accessible, but it was not well arranged and therefore causes lots of inconveniences for those who needed the service. ILC and IFAD in the Gender in Agriculture Sourcebook Module 4(2008)^[10] and Kahuri (2010)^[11], criticized projects which undermined important aspect of capturing information on land reform projects to monitor impact of land regularization as far as gender issues were concerned.

Contrary to the study areas in Dar es Salaam, in Magomeni Mtwara, the researcher was allowed to have access to land registry information. However, due to the nature of the required and existed data, the researcher had to request the authorized Office Clerk to extract information from the land registry and prepare a gender segregated list from the register book, since it was missing. By doing so, it enabled the researcher to include another column where the sex of plot owners was identified. This gave a clear picture and position of women in land/property ownership rather than estimating figures as it was being used by different projects. For example, in a report regarding plot ownership in the 20,000 Plots Project in Dar es Salaam, it was estimated that 30% of women owned plots.

Thus, all Municipal Councils can use the simplified version of improved land registration book and files which will need less amount of resource to design and implement. This can be used to acquire very useful information which will be easier to confine all information for computerization as it was also proposed by Thambileni *et al.* (2014)^[21] and Mwangi (2013)^[15]. This will enable the inclusion of missing gender segregated data. Capturing and inclusion of such kind of information will only need short training, normal technology and the cost will also be very minimal and will enhance participation, as emphasized by (Bezu *et al.*, 2013)^[11].

Table 1: Sample of Register that includes Gender, Settlements and Location

SN	Name	Sex	Plot	Block	Planned or Unplanned	Location	CRO /Title Deed or Residential Liscense No.	Signature
e.g 1	Evan Niizie, Eric Hangi, Ngaimanya Jolly	CF or JF	158	K	Planned	Hannanasif	200166	
2	Anonyele Elvis	M	84	D	Unplanned	Mburahati Barafu	17832	
3	Naomi &Vedast Makota	C	46	E	Unplanned	Magomeni	901604	
4	Norah Mfuko	F	70	R	Unplanned	Mburahati	70465	

Sex can be defined in five ways; 1- Male or Female (M or F); 2- Co ownership male & female (C); 3 - Co ownership either both male/female (CF/CM); 4 - Joint ownerships (J); 5 - Joint ownership either both male/female (JF/JM).

Source: *Research Data, 2015*

5.3 Information and movement of house owners after land regularization

The study noted that, some house owners believed land regularization contributed to the movement of property/land

owners due to the increase of land value in the land market. Results (Table 1) shows change in location of land owners resulted from land regularization.

Table 2: Land/Property owners’ movement resulted by Land Regularization

Variables	Owners Movements Resulted by Land Regularization Process			Chi-Square $\chi^2= 17.482$ $p= 0.000$
	Sold and moved to new settlements	Did not sell	Total	
Hannanasif	58 (87.9)	8 (12.1)	66 (100)	
MburahatiBarafu	41 (56.9)	31 (43.1)	72 (100)	
MagomeniMtwara	36 (61)	23 (39)	59 (100)	
Total	135 (68.5)	62 (31.5)	197 (100)	

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05^{**}$, significant at $p \leq 0.01$, ns Not significant
Source: *Research Data, 2015*

The results (Table 1) show that more than fifty percent of the respondents suggested that a number of house owners sold their land/property in regularized informal settlements and moved to other new informal settlements. In addition, more than 50% of house owners in all study areas sold their land/properties and moved to other settlements. Hannanasif was the leading in this case. The results (Table 1) regarding selling and not selling of land/properties in all study areas were statistically significant at $p = 0.000$. The results implied that there was a relationship between lack of reliable source of information regarding movement of people and different arguments raised by respondents. Respondents argued that land regularization caused increase in selling/transferring of land/property. This argument was also asserted by Gilbert (2009) [7] in his study on 'Mystery of Capital and the myths of Hernando de Soto' where he pointed out about increase of land transaction as one of the issues resulted from land regularization. Moreover, the study revealed lack of comparable information and poor system of documentation regarding selling or not selling of land after land regularization among key informants and house owners. This situation might be contributed by the fact that there was lack of reliable sources of information that people could rely upon. In addition to that, discussions with key informants in all study areas had quite opposite views compared to results from household surveys. The key informants and influential people at Hannanasif reported that there were very few house owners who sold/transferred their land/properties and moved to other

places, but not due to land regularization. Sometimes the cause could be inheritance issues and/or difficulties in distribution of wealth following divorce or death of a guardian especially for land/properties under joint or co-ownership.

One of the key informants gave out an example of a house in Hannanasif which was jointly owned by more than 10 people (family members) while the house had only 6 rooms. In such situation, it is a big challenge in case all owners decide to live in the house because the rooms would not be enough. If they decide to rent it out, it might create a lot of conflicts and tensions among family members. Such kind of arrangements made property management very difficult. Eventually they have to sell the property without even considering the issue of documenting.

5.4 Sources of Information for Tracking of land/property owners’ movement

The results from household surveys and key informants interviews showed different sources that people used when looking for information of those who sold out their land/property. Table 2 provides the source of information for tracking movement of land/property owners. Out of 157 respondents, 66(42%) reported that there were no specific areas to get information on transfer/sell of land/property. In Hannanasif, 50% of respondents asserted about this situation.

Table 3: Tracking transfer/sale of land/property after land regularization

Variables	Source of information on movement of land/property owners after regularization				Total	Chi-Square $\chi^2 = 31.118$ $p= 0.000$
	LGAs (WEO/MEO Offices)	Relatives living here	From the buyer	No specific areas to get information		
Hannanasif	6 (10)	6 (10)	17 (28.3)	31 (51.7)	60 (100)	
Mburahati Barafu	8 (12.9)	25 (40.3)	6 (9.7)	23 (37.1)	62 (100)	
Magomeni Mtwara	8 (22.9)	15 (42.9)	0 (0)	12 (34.3)	35 (100)	
Total	22 (14)	46 (29.3)	23 (14.6)	66 (42)	157 (100)	

* Significant at $p \leq 0.05^{**}$, significant at $p \leq 0.01$, ns Not significant
Source: *Research Data, 2015*

Since the results from Table 3 were statistically significant at $p \leq 0.000$, it implied that, there was a relationship between the

availability and reliability of information regarding movement of ownership of land/property after land regularization in all

study areas. But, there was no clear source that one could conclude to have reliable and realistic information as everyone had his/her own source to rely upon.

However, the results from household survey in (Table 3) showed that, 25(40.3%) of respondents in Mburahati Barafu and 15(42.9%) in Magomeni Mtwara confirmed that most of the information in relation to sell/transfer of land/property was provided by relatives who still lived in the areas. In addition to where people got information, results (Table 3) showed that some respondents from Hannanasif 17(28.3%) confirmed to have information on selling/transferring of ownership from the buyers while in Magomeni Mtwara, there was no evidence of any information from buyers. The results corresponded with the arguments raised by a key informant at Mtwara Mikindani Municipal Council who stated that they had no evidence reported or documented in register book which showed selling/transferring of land/property done in Magomeni during data collection. In this regard, it was therefore assumed that the most reliable information was the one provided by the buyer him/herself as he/she was found at the property itself.

Findings from Table 3 also could confirm the argument raised by influential people and key informants from both Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu that there was a limited number of owners who sold/transferred their land/property, as a result there was no specific place where people could get that information. Even though, there was no obligation for the owners to report or not report on when he/she sells the land/property. It was depends on which approach one used to sell/buy. The important source for LAS could be LGAs Offices at different levels, MEO/WEO rather than relying on relatives who sometimes may not have enough information.

Moreover, among all respondents (Table 3) from both study areas only 22(14%) out of 157 respondents said that information on selling/transferring of land/property could be obtained in WEO offices. This was a small portion of respondents who supported it. However, results from key informants showed that it was difficult to get such information from the WEO office because it was treated as confidential; as it was commented by one of the influential people that;

".....in most cases WEO/MEO knows most of the land/property owners, unless he/she was new to a specific Mtaa. If you go and ask him/her about the land/property sold and you are not a relative or one of the owners, WEO will be suspicious - why do you want such information. I am sure he/she won't provide the information unless it is involved in a police case or may be needed for research, like what you do. Otherwise this is normally treated as a confidential issue that is why we know people cannot be given such information" (Influential person, Hannanasif, 2015).

Nevertheless, all these assumptions resulted due to poor system of alignment of information/documentation between WEOs and Municipal Council Register Book. Such poor documentation made it difficult for a researcher to study or understand trends of movement of house ownership after land regularization as it was earlier reported by land regularization programs done in Lima by Payne (2008) ^[17]. A similar situation was challenged in the World Bank (2012) ^[22], where they mentioned the importance of the process of establishing database to see the trend of land regularization in relation to ownership. Likewise, Durand-Lasserve *et al.*, (2007) ^[6]

asserted land/property ownership issues especially for women.

The researcher experienced difficulties in cross checking the information provided by some of the key informants, influential people and household surveys as there was no reliable and consistent documentation in MEOs/WEOs in study areas. Such challenges were also pointed out by Enemark (2009) ^[7] and Kironde (2009) ^[14] as among the factors affecting good governance due to lack of supporting documents/information to back up some government decisions on LAS and associated issues. Similarly, Thambikeni *et al.*, (2015), Haussener (2014) ^[21, 9] emphasized on the importance of having information of LAS for different implementations.

Furthermore, an inquiry was made to cross check the available information in WEO offices in Hannanasif and Mburahati Barafu. Results from key informants in both areas revealed that there was no proper documentation for such kind of information. It also depended on the system that WEO had in filling/documentation. Sometimes for those who sold/transferred their property through WEO, they were the ones with the possible filled information. However, the researcher could not manage to see any filed document in relation to selling/transferring of land/property due to different reasons including private information. However, there were still no gender segregated data according to the given explanations

Besides that, key informants from Hannanasif showed that lack of records on sold/transferred land/property could be contributed by different processes that the sellers went through when selling their land/property. One of the observations raised by WEO offices in Hannanasif and even some of the key informants was that, some of the land/property owners used advocates to sell their land/properties hence they were not recorded in the formal system in LGAs:

".....some house owners do not want to sell/transfer their land/property through WEOs offices and prefer lawyers or advocates due to a number of reasons including 10% of the selling price needed to be paid to WEO office or sometimes they do not want people (WEO or a witness from same location) to know how much they will get from selling/transferring of their land/property....." (Key informants, 2015).

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study concludes that there is need to have strategic thinking on minimizing gender gaps within our systems. The study confirmed that women continually neglected in the existing LAS, despite the fact there is great emphasis on women equal ownership. The study also concludes that there was a significant gap noted regarding registration of land/property ownership from the Mtaa, Ward and Municipal levels where WEO/MEO had no obligation to document LAS related issues, which could potentially contribute to inconsistency and unreliable data. Some of the key informants did not see the relevance of having gender segregated data in the study areas. The study therefore recommends that the weaknesses found in documentation of gender segregated data need to be addressed by introducing a simple gender inclusive land register that would capture and align gender segregated data from Mtaa to Municipal levels to have

comprehensive and reliable land records for supporting planning and strategic decision making. Also, responsible officials in the land registration process should change their attitudes of ignoring gender segregated data, instead, should consider it as one of the important parameters in their register books.

7. Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank her supervisor Dr. Cosmas Haule for his academic support and shaping of this paper. The author would also like to thank very much her husband Dr. Vedast Makota for his lovely and moral support in developing this paper. Lastly but not least, she thanks Statoil Tanzania and colleagues who provided financial and moral support.

8. References

1. Bezu S, Holden S. Unbundling land administrative reform: Demand for second stage land stage land certification in Ethiopia. Norwegian University of Life Science (UMB), Centre for land Tenure Studies. Working Paper 2013; (3)13.
2. Connolly MR, Seymour E. Why theory of change matters? WCER working. University of Wisconsin – Madison, Wisconsin Centre for education research, 2015-2
3. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. In Mixed Methods Research. Edited by Bian H, 2011.
4. Derby W. Improving and Facilitating Land Title Registration Processes in Tanzania. TS7.15 Regional Experience in the Cadastre. FIG XXII International Congress Washington, D.C, 2002.
5. Durand-Lasserre A, Payne G. Evaluating impacts of urban land titling: Results and implications: Preliminary findings. London, 2006.
6. Durand-Lasserre A, Selod H. The formalization of urban land tenure in developing countries. Paper presented on May, 14-16, 2007. United Research Symposium. Washington DC, 2007.
7. Enemark S. Land Administration Systems- managing rights, restrictions and responsibilities in land. Aalborg University, Denmark. Map World Forum, Hyderabad, India, 2009.
8. Gilbert A. *On the Mystery of Capital and the myths of Hernando de Soto: What difference does legal title make?* University College, London, 2009.
9. Haussener G. Land Tenure Policy Implications in Tanzania (EA) on Small Scale Investors. Masterthesis to obtain the degree of Master of Advanced Studies in Real Estate. University of Zurich, 2014, 69.
10. ILC and IFAD. *Gender in agriculture sourcebook module 4: Gender issues in land policy and administration*; The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank 1818 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20433, 2008.
11. Kahuri SK. Engender land administration system: Mysore slum upgrading. Thesis submitted to the International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation in partial fulfillment of the requirement for Degree of Master of Science in Geo-information Management/Land Administration at ITC, Eschede the Netherlands, 2010, 130.
12. Kaarhus R, Benjaminsen TA, Hellum A, Ikdahl I. Women's land rights in Tanzania and South Africa: A human rights based perspective on formalization. Forum for Development Studies Journal. 2005; 32(2):443-482
13. Kanji N, Cotula L, Hilhorst T, Toulmin C, Witten W. Research Report 1. Can land registration serve poor and marginalised groups? Distributors Ltd, P.O. Box 119, Stevenage, Hertfordshire, <http://www.eldis.org>, 2005.
14. Kironde JML. Improving Land Sector Governance in Africa: The Case of Tanzania. Paper prepared for the “Workshop on “Land Governance in support of the MDGs: Responding to New Challenges” Washington DC, Ardhi University, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 2009.
15. Mwagae EW. Factors Hindering Realization of Women's Land Rights. A Case of the Luhya Community in Kakamega County, Kenya. A Research Report Submitted in Partial Fulfilment for the Requirement of a Masters of Arts Degree in Project Planning and Management of the University of Nairobi, 2013.
16. Obeng-Odoom F. Land reform in Africa; Theory, practice and outcome. The University of Sydney, Australia. Habitat International Journal. 2012; 36(1):161-170.
17. Payne G. Social and economic titling programs in urban and peri - urban; International experience and case Studies; Senegal and South Africa, Final Report. Submitted to SIDA, Global Land Tool Network and UN-Habitat, 2008.
18. Qian L. Evaluating land administration system from the perspective of good governance: A case study of Informal settlement in Kathmandu Valley. Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Geo- Information Science and Earth Observation of the University of Twente in partial fulfilment of requirement for degree of Master of Science in Geo information Science and Earth Observation. University Enschede, the Netherlands, 2014.
19. Sinha UP, Sinha R. Women empowerment and family management in tribal region. T.M Bhagalpur University, Bhagalpur. Published by Ashok Kumar Mittal, 2007.
20. Sittie R. Land Title Registration –The Ghanaian Experience Shaping the Change. XXIII FIG Congress Munich, Germany, 2006.
21. Thambikeni W, Sam A. Analysis of ICT application in Mitigating Land Conflicts. Case study of Tanzania. School of Computational, Communication Science and Engineering (CoCSE), Nelson Mandela – African Institution of Science and Engineering (NM-AIST), Arusha, Tanzania. International Journal of Computer Science, Security (IJCSIS), 2015, 13(11).
22. World Bank. Annual World Bank Conference on Land and Poverty Report, 2012
23. URT. Land Act No. 4. Government Printer, Dar es Salaam. Tanzania, 1999.
24. URT. Village Land Act No. 5. Government Printer, Dar es Salaam. Tanzania, 1999.