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Abstract

This research seeks to examine the process of displacement and resettlement of residents who had been affected by regularization process within Manzese and Buguruni wards in Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania. It aimed at analyzing the issues and opportunities faced by the affected residents during regularization. The regularization which involves two processes, tenure and physical upgrading has been extensively used in solving problems associated with unplanned and informal settlements within developing countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. It’s a process used to bring informal and unauthorized settlements into the legal, official and administrative structures of land management as well as improving the living conditions of its dwellers. In Tanzania, whereby more than 80 per cent of its urban residents live in informal settlement, the process had been practiced in order to provide basic services such as access roads, storm water drainages, street lights, water supply and public toilets within informal and unplanned settlements. Compared to previous strategies for upgrading such as slum clearance and site and services and squatter upgrading, regularization had been considered to bring positive results.

The main concern of this research is physical regularization which was implemented through Community Infrastructure Upgrading Project (CIUP) within sixteen settlements in Dar es Salaam city. During its implementation, about twenty households of tenants and house owners were displaced. This research being explorative focused on understanding the process of displacement and resettlement by using qualitative method. This was done through narrations of traced and found six tenants and four house owners within the affected settlements of Mnazi Mmoja, Mnyamani and Madenge settlements. It applied case study strategy whereby the settlements made the main case study areas and the individual displaced residents became sub cases. Experiences before, during and after displacement and resettlement were narrated by using in-depth interviews. The selected settlements were obtained through criteria sampling whereby the individual displaced residents were found by using snow balling approach. Also resettlement issues and opportunities faced by displaced tenants and house owners were analyzed and the emerging patterns of issues and opportunities were identified. The issues include
loss of access to common facilities, homelessness, marginalization and social disarticulation, family disintegration and joblessness. The opportunities include improved facilities, expansion of human competence and social opportunities, enhanced capabilities and improved social services. It was also realized that the issues suffered and opportunities accrued by house owners were different from that of tenants.

The research examined the process of displacement and resettlement through policy and legal frameworks which guided the regularization. It also used the justice and collaborative theories in formulating concepts for data collection, analysis and discussing the results. During the discussions it was realized that there were emerging gaps in the process as it was indicated within the experiences of individual cases. These gaps include that of lack of real participation and democracy, insufficient knowledge on compensation level, insufficient community participation especially with the affected tenants. The research provides an indicative knowledge on regularization process which can further be used in improving the planning process.

**Key words:** regularization, upgrading, displaced residents, informal settlements, resettlement, displacement, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Regularization can be thought of as a planned process destined at getting the informal and unauthorized settlements into the legal, official and administrative structures of land management. The process consists of two main approaches: the juridical (or tenure regularization) and physical (or material regularization) which is also known as upgrading (Mertins et al., 1998, and Lamba, 2005).

The regularization policy has become an accepted way of solving the problems associated with lack of planned settlements in most of the African, Asian and Latin American cities. International organizations such as United Nations Development Program (UNDP), UN-HABITAT and the World Bank substantiated that since the 1960s, cities in developing countries have faced an unprecedented rate of urbanization and increasing poverty which resulted into uncontrolled proliferation of slums within unplanned and under-serviced neighborhoods (Durand-Lasserve, 1996). These slums are occupied by unauthorized residents without any legal recognition or rights and that’s why they lack the most basic social amenities, such as clean water supply, sanitation, waste collection, and health facilities thus are exposed to diseases and natural disasters (The World Bank, 2001).

Researches on urban upgrading conducted by Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) show that through the process of upgrading, which in this context is defined as provision of basic infrastructure; the residents of regularized and formalized informal settlements will have better living conditions and tenure security as upgrading is a start to become a recognized inhabitant (The World Bank, 2001).

\[^1\] References to illegality in human settlements refers mainly to conformity with planning and construction norms and, more importantly, to tenure situations (Durand-Lasserve, 2006:1).

\[^2\] Based on the UN Habitat Program definition, these are defined as: i) residential areas where a group of housing units has been constructed on land to which the occupants have no legal claim, or which they occupy illegally; ii) unplanned settlements and areas where housing is not in compliance with current planning and building regulations (unauthorized housing) (http://www.who.int/ceh/indicators/informalsettlements.pdf).
These changes will attract improved rents, housing facilities and access to formal loans as it was suggested by the Peruvian economist Hernando De Soto though there are a number of critics and his ideas were proved to be wrong.

Nevertheless, studies on social and economic conditions for households living with insecure tenure show that urban poverty, land tenure and living conditions are strongly correlated (Almansi, 2009:390). That is why in most cases tenure upgrading and regularization projects, security of tenure has a direct positive impact on the mobilization of household resources at the settlement level (Durand-Lasserve, 2006:2). For example, in Thailand’s slum upgrading program the residents of Baan Mankong settlement started to feel head up with the fact that they are the rightful owners of one small piece of their nation or of the earth, and as landowners, people can now invest as much as they can on it (Boonyabancha, 2009:325).

On the other hand, informal settlements are no longer seen by public authorities as a transitory phenomenon, but rather as a permanent and lasting fact of life. An increasing number of countries in developing world look at regularization and integration of informal settlements to be a first step towards a new form of managing urban development (Durand-Lasserve, 1996). In Argentina for example, much of the cities’ population was housed in what might be termed as spontaneous urbanization, informal land sub-divisions with low-priced plots and minimum provision of infrastructures and services. In 1997 settlement upgrading program known as “promebo” was launched and its intension was to provide the quality of life for residents of the “villas” and informal settlements that lack infrastructure and basic services (Almansi, 2009:391; 401).

In Zambia, it is estimated that 70-75 percent of the urban population lives in informal settlements or slums, known as “compounds”. Lusaka, the capital and the largest of the Zambian cities, with a population of 1.2 million, has at least 37 of such “compounds”. Through community initiatives with the support from local and national policy the “compound” dwellers improve their own housing and develop basic infrastructure in their communities. They also aim to influence local and national

New Delhi, which is the capital city of India, has been experiencing a considerable presence of “illegal colonies” of settlements that have sprung up in the city owing to the lack of housing options for the urban poor. The Union Cabinet for the Master Plan 2012 for Delhi city made a landmark declaration of undertaking revision of procedure and guidelines pertaining to regularizing unauthorized colonies; thus paved the way for regularization of more than 1,500 unauthorized Delhi colonies that had come up during the last 30 years (India Housing, 2009).

The examples above show recognition of the regularization policy as a new strategy towards housing for urban poor. Though the policy has been so much appreciated it has as well resulted into displacement of few residents within the upgraded settlement in order to make possible for the upgrading process. This research focuses on describing how those few were displaced and relocated to the new settlements.

1.1 Research issue
As explained above, regularization has become a common policy for improving the housing conditions and security of tenure to those who are living in precarious settlements. But through the process and sometimes after the process of regularization some few and at times all the residents of that upgraded settlement can become displaced and need to be resettled in a different settlement. This could be due to the nature of the project or the unplanned settlements. In some unplanned settlements there is rarely any space vacant for the provision of public services, urban planning or any development process. The displacement in such a situation can also be due to market evictions as they are further explained in the other sections to come.

Even though it’s known that regularization can cause displacement and resettlement little is known about accommodation of those displaced residents. From the literature review, so far a lot has been written on how to resettle and accommodate people who have been affected by disaster events such as floods, earthquakes and
tsunamis. Limited number of research has been done on the resettlement of displaced residents from the affected households within informal settlements as a result of regularization or upgrading process. Also the past experience of the researcher in the regularization process brought the motivation about finding what happens during the displacement and resettlement of the few residents who made it possible for the implementation of the upgrading projects.

Literature review showed that, while there is a growing debate on formalization and regularization; not much attention has been paid to displaced tenants with regard to alternative housing and livelihood strategies and other economic and social basis. The land owners, who own the property and tenants, who rent the property do not share the same advantage of the resettlements. These people have different status on the property which is subjected to resettlement process; tenants rent through an agreed contractual terms, while house owners own the property.

Nevertheless displaced residents are resettled for the public interest that is to give way for the implementation of upgrading projects. But their fates are not well defined even in policy provisions. In Tanzania for example, all the concerned policies and acts are more focused on how the regularization has to be conducted. The policies also state about full, fair and prompt compensation but it’s not clear to whom and how and at what level that compensation can be done.

Although Tanzania has no policy on resettlement, it has adopted a resettlement policy framework which has been prepared by the World Bank. The World Bank is the main sponsor of the upgrading projects. It created the policy framework in order to facilitate the implementation of those projects. However, the framework has not clearly stated on how the resettlement area can be acquired.

Theories or even articles which explain resettlement and displacement of people from regularized projects are rare to be found. Ndiovu (2003), for example who is a lecturer in Land Management and Valuation in Dar es Salaam, in his PhD thesis he talks about the compulsory acquisition of land for public uses such as highway expansions, and other developmental projects. In his thesis he was much concerned
about the acquisition and the compensation process, but he didn’t touch on upgrading projects within unplanned settlements which are as well faced with land acquisition which result into property compensations. That means there is still a knowledge gap concerning resettlement and displacement of residents within upgrading settlements. That is why there is a need of finding out key considerations in planning a workable resettlements scheme. Thus, there is an urge to look closely on how resettlement process has been done. Also to explore the accommodation process of the few displaced residents within upgraded informal settlements as a result of physical upgrading which is more of the concern of this research. It is assumed that the majority of people who are displaced or evicted from the upgrading projects are likely to go back to other informal settlements which can result into more densification or reformulate new ones.

1.2 Rationale of the research
The purpose of this research is to characterize the process of resettling the few displaced residents from the regularized settlements within Dar es Salaam city. The main intention of doing this is to understand the regularization process that is how some of the residents who gave away their pieces of land/properties for the implementation of the physical regularization/upgrading projects, have been accommodated in a new area. Not much so far has been said about the resettlement process of those affected few residents from upgraded informal settlements.

This research in an explorative way, aims at providing knowledge on how the resettlement process was done during the displacement process. If this knowledge is not available, that is if this research was not done, probably there will be a contribution towards a viscous circle in informal settlement development as the displaced residents might be reforming new informal settlements elsewhere due to lack of alternative accommodation. It is also unfair and against social justice not considering the outcomes of some of the people who sacrifice their properties for the good of the rest of the community.

Knowledge on this process of displacement and resettlement informs more into the commonly practiced policy of regularization. The primary goal of physical regularization/upgrading is to provide a better living condition for the residents of
unplanned settlements without moving them away from the place they used to live. From the nature of unplanned settlements, it is very difficult to provide upgrading facilities without demolishing some of the houses and creating displaced residents within the intended upgraded settlement. This research is geared towards examining how the displaced residents; who had to let part or whole of their houses be demolished so as to make it possible for the provision of infrastructure, have been accommodated. If that knowledge is not known, then regularization might fail to provide a fair balance between individual and common benefits as suggested in principles of justice theory. The principles advocates on how appropriate distribution of benefits and burdens of social cooperation has to be achieved in processes such as resettlement. With such an advocacy, this research finds it suitable to apply Rawls theory of justice in its analysis.

The research also characterizes the process of accommodating displaced residents from regularized informal settlements in relation to what was provided by the communicative and collaborative planning theory. It analyzes the application of democracy in view of freedom of speech and rational arguments as advocated by the theory. This theory was found to provide the process on which justice, as advocated by Rawls can be achieved. In that way, the two theories were seen to have something in common as far as this research is concerned. The research as well documents different options of resettlements and their issues and opportunities to the displaced residents in relation to the residents’ previous settlements. It then suggests some policy reforms when it comes to resettlement options of the displaced residents from upgrading process. All these information obtained is assumed to add knowledge on the regularization as among the strategies on dealing with urban planning and management process.

Nevertheless, the findings may contribute towards achieving the seventh millennium goal, target 11 that is to achieve a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020. The accommodation process of the displaced informal settlement dwellers facilitates reducing the reformulation of other informal settlements within the city of Dar es Salaam and through that may contribute towards achieving the Millennium goal.
1.2.1 Research objectives
The objective of this research is to examine the displacement and resettlement process of the displaced residents from upgraded settlements within urban Tanzania - Dar es Salaam city. The specific objectives are:

- To understand the process of displacement and resettlement that can be used as an indicative input to policies and practitioners of urban development.
- To examine what options/types of resettlements displaced residents chose or had to take.
- To analyze issues and opportunities encountered by displaced residents during and after resettling.
- To analyze the participation and democratic approach within the process of displacement and resettlement.

As a second part of this research (that is PhD), will be dealing with the application of the knowledge into the planning profession. In that case, it will discuss the implications of physical regularization and its impacts on urban development as well as analyzing policies and socio-economic factors related to displacement and resettlement.

1.2.2 Research questions
The main research question is how the affected or displaced residents relocate in the process of implementing upgrading projects. The following sub questions facilitate in answering the main question:

- Where do displaced residents resettle?
- What are options of resettlement considered in the regularized settlements?
- Why such options of resettlement have been considered?
- What are the issues and opportunities faced by displaced residents in their resettled areas?
- How was the participation and democracy practiced in the displacement and resettlement process?

In the second part of this research (the PhD); will cover questions on how the policy provisions and legal formalities for regularization and resettlement can be implemented? And what are the impacts of those legal provisions on urban development and socio-economic status of the resettled residents?
1.3 Delimitation of the study
This research is about the few displaced residents from regularized settlements within urban Tanzania-Dar es Salaam city. The process of regularization itself is very wide and covers a number of steps and approaches which has to be adhered to. In order to be able to focus on the purpose, this research concentrated on the outcomes of physical regularization. That is what happened during the actual implementation of the project which resulted into physical upgrading. While doing that, it as well focuses on the issues which arose during that implementation process.

Also the study covers only one type of regularization process that is physical regularization. Though both physical and tenure regularization processes can create displacement of residents the focus of this study was on the physical regularization. Not only that the research was interested in the actual implementation of regularization projects on the ground, but this kind of regularization has a collective decision making as well as impact to the whole community unlike that of tenure regularization which is more on individual basis. The research is examining the resettlement process of displaced residents both land/property owners, tenants as well as local leaders within the upgraded settlements in order to provide cognitive knowledge on the regularization process on informal settlements.

1.4 Structure of the thesis
For the purpose of understanding the process of displacement and resettlement of some of the residents from upgraded settlement, this research report has been organized into the following chapters.

Chapter One is the introduction of the research issue. It deals with the background of the topic researched, the lack of knowledge concerning the researched issue, and the purpose of undertaking the research. It also endows with objectives, research questions, delimitation of the study and the structure of the thesis.
Chapter Two brings the views and experiences from different parts of the world on how the issue of regularization, displacement and resettlement is understood, practiced and perceived. This was achieved through literature reviews which covered different research on displacement, regularization, and resettlement. It also provides experiences of regularization in Tanzania.

Chapter Three describes theoretical framework whereby theories which relate to displacement and resettlement are discussed. Also research concepts and key variables and attributes were identified and discussed in relation to the context of the research. In this chapter the social justice and communicative and collaborative planning theory were discussed. Key concepts of displacement and resettlement were identified together with types of resettlement which can be opted. This chapter also answers research questions two and three on what options of resettlement can be considered and why such options.

Chapter Four is the research methodology adopted. It consists of research design and data collection methods used. It also discusses how the case study selection criteria and data collection and analysis methods have been applied. It discusses research validity, reliability and generalization from analytical data. It also provides the methodological limitations faced by the research being an explorative one.

Chapter Five provide general findings from the displaced and resettled residents from Mnazi Mmoja, Kilimani, Midizini, Mnyamani and Madenge settlements within Dar es Salaam city. It presents narratives of the affected residents which were able to be traced and found and willing to narrate the process in their new settlements. The chapter provides their experiences before, during and after displacement. It as well answers the first research question on where and how do the displaced residents go.

Chapter Six deals with the analytical reflections of the findings. Through the analysis, it answers second the and third research questions on issues and opportunities faced by the displaced residents in relation to their resettlement options. It also provides the emerging patterns from the field findings on issues and opportunities
faced by the affected residents. It describes the resemblance and divergence of those patterns in relation to different experiences of the two groups of affected residents that is land lords and tenants.

Chapter Seven provides reflections and discussions from theories, and framework provisions concerning resettlement with the empirical experiences. It also provides identified shortcomings from the discussions and theoretical concepts in relation to findings from different experiences faced by the tenants and house owners within Manzese and Buguruni settlements. The chapter answers the fourth research question on how was the participation and democracy practised in the process of displacement and resettlement within the selected case studies.

Chapter Eight provides summary, implications and the way forward of the research. It highlights further questions emerged throughout the research as well as the remaining knowledge gap which has to be filled with further research.
Chapter Two
Regularization, displacement and resettlement

This chapter intends to elaborate the issue of regularization and its result into displacement and resettlement of residents. The previous chapter gives the highlight of what is regularization and what this research deals with as far as the issue of regularization is concerned. Hence, this chapter provides more background from different literature on the regularization, and its concepts of displacement and resettlement; what it is, its approaches and its contribution as far as planning is concerned.

2.1 Displacement and tenure regularization
The process of regularization involves two main approaches, juridical and physical upgrading. The juridical (tenure regularization) approach which is advocated by the World Bank and other major donor agencies involves the award of individual titles on properties originally deemed informal. The projects implemented under this approach have the following key objectives: to provide settlers with the most secure form of tenure available; to enable households to use their property titles as a collateral in obtaining loans from formal sector finance institutions in order to carry out dwelling retrofits or develop businesses; to help local authorities increase the proportion of planned urban land and provide services more efficiently; to enable governments integrate informal settlements into the land tax system; and to improve the efficiency of urban land property markets (Payne, 2002:9; Midheme, 2007).

This approach of regularization, when implemented, brings changes in tenure security and taxation system which result into involuntary displacement of the urban poor who find it difficult to afford the outcome of such changes. This can be regarded as the problems resulted from regularization process as the urban poor fail to pay the required taxes. Likewise, landlords will have to increase their rents so as to compensate for the tax due to the local authorities, and other requirements which comes with the new and improved tenure status. Most of the time tenants fail to afford the increased rent and decide to vacate the house looking for alternative settlements that they can afford. That means another informal settlement which tends to be cheaper due to lack of basic facilities and being out of taxation systems.
Similarly, some landlords also fail to cope with the taxing systems and again; they are convinced to sell their properties to middle or high income earners who are attracted to live in an improved environment. As Rakodi (2001) stated, when discussing land tenure issues in developing countries, that depending on a wider land supply conditions, the exact type of tenure security instituted, and the infrastructure standard adopted, serviced plots and upgraded areas become attractive to higher income families, and driving out intended lower income families who are the intended beneficiaries. That is to say these low income families are displaced and remained with the option of moving to another settlement which is affordable to them, most likely to be an informal settlement.

Commonly, the majority of the informal settlements are located in prime areas i.e. very close to employment sectors, business centers, major transportation routes, and any other city residual lands. When these settlements become formalized, they tend to facilitate the penetration of commercial interests into regularized settlements. This results into displacing in its wake the original residents as a result of ‘down-raiding’ by higher income groups. The group is willing to pay high prices for a piece of land and that tempts land owners to sell out their properties and become displaced and need to resettle somewhere else (Varley, 2002; Midheme, 2007).

Also as it was stated by Durand-Lasserve ‘if a program creates small, serviced, regularized “cluster” in a large city where unsatisfied demand exists in middle class, it is probable that the initial low-income beneficiaries will be replaced by higher income groups’ (1996:47). He as well notes when discussing market-driven evictions processes in developing countries, that:

‘...without proper resettlement options, fair compensation and/or appropriate accompanying measures, market driven displacements or evictions have two main impacts: (i) they lead to the establishment of new informal settlements on the periphery of cities, far away from city centre, where informal land markets still operate and can provide low-cost accommodation arrangements; (ii) they tend to increase population pressure and density in informal inner-city settlements that are not yet-targeted for development. This usually results in deterioration in housing conditions and/or increases in housing expenditures and commuting costs for displaced households. (Durand-Laserve, 2002:11).
Possible negative consequences of regularization, where occupiers are given titles, could lead to the ramification of the poor bringing their land holdings into the formal land markets. Studies from Trinidad and Tobago (Belanger, 1998) and Zimbabwe (Ewing, 2004) seem to be in accord that regularization process could certainly leave the intended beneficiaries worse off. Particularly owing to the fact that such settlements invariably occupied prime locations whose co-modified land values would simply succumb to the market forces, triggering massive gentrification\(^3\) and attendant land use succession (Midheme, 2007:27).

### 2.2. Displacement and physical regularization

The physical (material regularization) approach is that which involves the spatial reorganization of informal settlements. The approach allows for the material creation and/or improvement of physical infrastructure, including dwelling structures; basic urban services such as water, sanitation facilities; social amenities like schools and health facilities. This process is also referred to as upgrading. In this approach just like the tenure regularization, as it was argued by Patel et al. (2002), it is hard to avoid some population displacement in any city where the government seeks to improve the provision of infrastructure and service for their population. This is why the process involves acquisition of land which will be used for infrastructure provision. In informal settlements the availability of unoccupied pieces of land is very rare. So, in order for the community to be provided with basic infrastructure and other social amenities, a number of houses have to be demolished so as to provide space for such an implementation. Since the whole process of upgrading is supposed to be done on a participatory approach, it is assumed that the community will find alternatives for resettlement of the affected residents. Preferably within or very close to their settlement in order to make them benefit from the regularization process as well. The aim of upgrading is to improve health and secure living conditions.

---

\(^3\) Gentrification is the process of rebuilding, renewing, and rehabilitation of depressed areas of the inner city as more affluent families seek to live near to the city centre, trading off space and quiet for access to the goods and services of the city centre. The process has been facilitated by those local authorities who have provided home improvement grants as part of an urban renewal programme. They are repaid by an increased rate, or council tax income. The original inhabitants move out as leases fall in, houses are sold, or landlords harass their tenants into moving. There is often a change of tenure from renting to home ownership ([www.answer.com](http://www.answer.com)).
environment for the residents of the settlement without being displaced (The World Bank, 2001).

In Kisumu Kenya for example, upgrading process is preceded by the community inhabitants through enumeration. The enumeration approach provide details on existing household and house structure, accurate information about the tenure status, and existing infrastructure and services. The approach was done by grassroots organization formed by those living in that settlement which is enumerated and mapped (Karanja, 2010).

Due to the nature of most informal settlement such a situation of accommodating displaced residents within the settlement can be difficult to achieve. In that case an alternative settlement has to be found somewhere else. Kisumu is an example where a detailed enumerations and maps were used to show a need for a space to be cleared for a new infrastructure, within or around the informal settlements. This was done in order to achieve upgrading with minimum displacement of the residents (Karanja, 2010:220).

2.3 Resettlement and regularization

Resettlement is the process which is referred to physical relocation of people and their houses and/or business activities (ERM, 2007:5). The displaced residents who can be land owners or tenants tend to lose not only their properties, but also their economic and social ties. Also, losing the environment they used to live in and start afresh in the resettled area. Cernea, (2000) who has done a number of researches in social research, policy works and development projects, stated that, the displaced residents through the process of resettlement often become landless, jobless, or homeless. This is due to the fact that displaced residents lose their piece of land which was used for housing and income generating activities. They also according to Cernea (2000), tend to be marginalized and encounter social disarticulation in their new settlement area. The displaced residents for a certain period of time are likely to be considered as outsider within the resettlement area. Nevertheless these displaced residents also lose access to common property resources such as schools, health centers, and therefore face disruption of formal education or health facilities.
As it was acknowledged by Ndezi and Cernea when discussing about resettlement, a project that involves involuntary resettlement represents a major challenge to governments. Without proper planning and management, resettlement may result into long-term socio-economic hardship for affected people and environmental damage to the location in which they are resettled. This situation may cause the affected population to become even worse off. As it was mentioned by Ndjovu when discussing compulsory land acquisition in the periphery of Dar es Salaam city, he said that land acquisition denies the affected people their means of livelihood and hence changes their lives forever (Ndjovu, 2003:9). That brings the issue of social justice and equity into development projects. Such potentially negative consequences may reduce development impact of the project and thereby tarnish the reputation of the long-term project (Ndezi, 2009; Cernea, 2000).

It is also known and accepted that resettlements in these informal settlements do happen. The resettlement usually causes reoccurring of other informal settlements and environmental destructions since there is no proper resettlement program. The International Bank for Reconstruction/the World Bank Infrastructure Group for example, acknowledges that:

“The issue of involuntary resettlement have become more intense in many cities as population pressure and land market rigidities are provoking further encroachment on environmentally vulnerable lands and rights of way. Fair and sustainable resettlement programs need to be designed with due regard to citywide land market policies and conditions, not as neighborhood enclave activities, since displaced households will often return to squatter status elsewhere. The cost and availability of alternative housing sites, access to employment, and security of tenure are key considerations for the welfare of resettled households and therefore for the design of workable resettlement programs” (The World Bank, 2000:79).

In Tanzania for example, regularization process has taken place in several regions such as: parts of Dar es Salaam city that is Manzese, Buguruni, Hanna Nassif and Vingunguti settlements; Mwanza in Isamilo and Ibungilo settlements; Morogoro;
Mbeya in Mwanjelwa settlements; Tanga and Arusha in Daraja Mbili and Ngarenaro settlements. In Dar es Salaam and Mwanza regions both tenure and physical regularization has taken place. Also in parts of rural Arusha, Babati district and Bariadi district (URT, 2008).

There are a number of policy provisions in related policies and the World Bank’s resettlement policy framework on how regularization has to be done. These provisions have a strong emphasis on community participation and full, fair and prompt compensation to the affected people. However there is no provision on how to resettle them or provision of resettlement area (URT, 2008). According to Durand-Lasserve (1996:51), Tanzania is among the ‘countries in developing world which have been considered having a laissez-faire policy or following up of regularization, limited capacity or interest for intervention. This situation can be the result of not knowing what is happening as far as regularization is concerned. That is why this research noticed a need for a cognitive characterization of the regularization process and its implication on displacement and resettlement of residents.

2.4 Why regularization?
Surveys conducted for international and governmental institutions such as the World Bank, have indicated a high level of demand and strong support for urban upgrading. Findings from those surveys indicate that in many countries there have been a dramatic shift in governance. The shift made the local governments take greater responsibility for the provision of municipal services in a participatory way. With democratization local governments are able to respond more effectively to the needs of their population. The local government has more power and is more interested in what happens in slums given the increasing voting power of poor communities (The World Bank, 2001).

Regularization has as well resurfaced in the international arena following the adoption of the Millennium Development Program. The program emphasizes improving the conditions of the urban poor taking a center stage in the UN agenda. UNDP is the only international organization which has so far admitted that there is a problem and it’s likely that it’s getting worse. It is speculated that, the slum population is expected to increase from 32 percent of the world population in 2001,
to about 41 percent in 2030 (Durand-Lasserve, 2007). On the other hand, the international ambitions in this respect have been specifically formulated in Goal 7, target 11. The goal 7 aim is ‘to have achieved by 2020, a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers’ (UNDP, 2005:19). This is very contradicting situation since this target would solve only 6 percent i.e. 6 million of the slum population in the whole world by 2020 (Durand-Lasserve, 2007:1).

Regularization is also taken as an advent of implementing ‘enabling strategy’ a concept which was introduced by British architect, John Turner as a way of addressing the problem of expanding informal settlements in developing countries (Cheema 1987; Vestbro, 2008). It is currently used as a strategy towards dealing with precarious settlements as well as reducing urban poverty. Regularization is also advocated by other international organizations by initiating programs such as cities without slums, better housing for all, safer cities in order to fulfill their goals. (www.undp.org/).

Regularization is a way of obtaining security of tenure. Residents in precarious settlements can change their status into a more secured one if the residents succeed in regularizing their settlements. ‘Perceived security may stimulate a positive environment for home improvements and economic activity. These two can improve living standards and help to lift people out of poverty through individual or collective efforts’ (Payne, 2002:153). Thus regularization is not only a way of providing the settlement with basic infrastructure which can improve the living conditions of residents in informal settlements; but also give them peace of mind as they feel less vulnerable to evictions. For example in India, the informal settlements dwellers cannot be subjected to eviction for at least ten years from the date of the upgrading projects have been implemented. They get a “no objection” certificate (Banerjee, 2002). That is gaining more security of tenure than before the process of upgrading. As it is indicated in figure 2:1, a squatter owner after regularization process is two steps towards more tenure security than the squatter owner who has not been regularized.
Figure 2:1: Urban tenure categories by Legal status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure categories</th>
<th>Tenure Security in Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement dwellers</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squatter tenants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squatter ‘owners’ un-regularized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants in unauthorized subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Squatter ‘owners’-regularized</strong></td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners-unauthorized subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal owner-unauthorized constructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants with contracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease holders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Payne, (2002:154)

2.5 Regularization and displacement in Tanzania

Tanzania is one of the countries in the Sub-Saharan region where the highest proportion of its urban residents live in informal settlements. Between 50 percent and 80 percent of its urban population live in informal settlements. In Dar es Salaam, over 70 percent of the estimated 3 million inhabitants (URT, 2004) live in such settlements (Kombe & Kreibich, 2000). Informal housing comprises more than 50 percent of the existing urban housing stock (Kombe, 2005:115).

The efforts for dealing with informal settlements started as early as after independence in 1960s whereby there was an influx of rural urban migration. The government failed to provide housing services to cope up with that situation. With increasing poverty in the rural and urban areas, the administrative and financial capability of the state has been diminishing. Thus it’s potential to provide subsidized rental housing and serviced plots; or expand opportunities for employment and income generation which commensurate with population growth has declined (Kombe 2005).
2.5.1 Slum clearance
In dealing with informal settlement the government at first applied ‘slum clearance’ policy. The idea was to clear away the city ‘eyesore’ of squatter housing and improve housing for the poor by developing high standard buildings on the cleared sites (Ndezi, 2009:78). But this strategy created more problem than solving. It created a number of displaced residents from the cleared slums who needed to be resettled. The high standard housing which was provided was not enough to cater for all the displaced slum dwellers. As a result, it created people without a roof over their heads. These people had no other alternative than creating another informal settlement elsewhere. With such poor results from the slum clearance strategy, the government then adopted a softer approach of providing serviced plots and housing.

2.5.2 Site and services and squatter upgrading
In 1972 the Government of Tanzania adopted a second approach known as Site and Services and Squatter Upgrading program which was financed by the World Bank. The government policy stipulated the recognition of squatter settlements as part and parcel of urban fabric. Hence legalize landholding by titling; providing a minimum level of social and economic infrastructure and services in squatter settlements (URT, 2000). The program also aimed at providing planned, surveyed and serviced plots for new residential areas. It also provided housing improvement and house construction loans in squatter settlements and in new sites and services areas respectively.

Compared to the slum clearance, the sites and services and squatter upgrading program had positive impact on housing delivery and urban improvements in the towns where it was implemented. In the process, the program created displaced residents from the upgraded settlements. These residents were resettled in the provided new sites which were planned and serviced. Again just like slum clearance, site and services and squatter upgrading program failed as the planned plots ended up in the hands of high income people while the targeted beneficiaries were supposed to be low income earners (Kironde, 1992b). This means the low income informal settlement dwellers had no alternative but once again, create new informal settlements elsewhere.
2.5.3. Community Infrastructure Program (CIP)
In the 1993, Community Infrastructure Program (CIP) was introduced as a new program. The CIP was based on more tolerance and encouraging settlement community based upgrading. In this program the government of Tanzania regarded informal settlements as the solution to housing problem for urban poor. The approach was appealing as it dealt away with unnecessary demolition and preserved the social and economic networks since the residents remained in their localities. This program was planned to take place within seven settlements but it was implemented in only three which are Hanna Nassif, Tabata and Kijitonyama settlements within Dar es Salaam city. Due to the nature of the upgraded settlements, the program did not create any displaced residents who needed resettlement. The upgrading involved the provision of basic infrastructure such as roads, drainage with no attention to housing construction (Ndezi, 2009).

In order to make the regularization process successful, a number of relevant policies and acts make provisions in supporting it, as discussed in the following section. Albeit a number of strategies for dealing with informal settlements have been implemented in Tanzania, the proliferation of informal settlements is on increase day after day.

2.6 Policy provisions on regularization in Tanzania
In Tanzania, there are a number of policies, acts and regulations which guides different activities within the country. As far as regularization is concerned there are a number of policies, frameworks and acts which have given provisions relevant for implementing regularization process.

2.6.1 The National Land Policy of 1997
The National Land Policy of 1997 guides all land issues within the country. In section 6.4 of this Policy, it was confirmed that existing unplanned settlements which in other words are referred as informal settlements, shall not be cleared but instead go through regularization. In doing so the policy statements no 6.4.1 subsections (IV) emphasizes the role of community organizations in the preparation and implementation of regularization schemes. This is due to the fact that informal settlements contain a considerable stock of houses and other buildings which must
be preserved. The aim of the government was to ensure that all urban residents are provided with basic services that are essential to human health (URT, 1997:28; 29).

2.6.2 The Human Settlement Policy of 2000
The Human Settlement Policy of 2000 is also among the relevant policy for regularization. In its section 4.1.4.1 it is pointed out that 60 percent of urban residents live in unplanned settlements and the number is expected to continue to grow due to the fact that there is rapid urbanization which is not accompanied with the provision of adequate shelter or serviced building plots. The policy statement section 4.1.4.2 subsection (i), (ii) and (iv) emphasized that the unplanned and unserviced settlements have to be upgraded. The upgrading should be done by the inhabitants through Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) with the government playing a facilitating role. The policy added that, in order to prevent further development of informal settlements the government will try to ensure timely planning, surveying and servicing of land ripe for urban development in the peri-urban and designate special areas for low income dwellers (URT, 2000:26).

2.6.3 The Land Act of 1999
The Land Act of 1999 is also in support of the regularization process. In its sections 57-60 the Act gives provisions on where and how regularization can be done. In some of its provisions for example in section 60 explains the contents of the regularization scheme. The scheme should make arrangements for the survey, adjudication and re-coordination of interests of land owners. It should as well make readjustments of plot boundaries. The scheme has to involve local authorities and people whose land is subject of the scheme. And, it has to make assessment and payments of compensation (URT, 1999:196-197).

2.6.4 The Urban Planning Act of 2007
The Urban Planning Act, of 2007 also stipulates how regularization process should be done. In its section IV subsection 23, explains about scheme of regularization. It states that: “Any area intended for a scheme of regularization shall be declared as a planning area under this Act. The draft scheme of regularization shall include a planning scheme determined in accordance with subsection (3), which shall involve the community” (URT, 2007:23).
2.6.5 The Resettlement Policy Framework of 2007

This policy framework was prepared by The World Bank’s Environmental Resource Management. For the purpose of implementing a ten year multi-countries Regional Communications and Infrastructure Program for Eastern and Southern African countries. The framework came up with the following objectives in order to facilitate the resettlement process. The project should minimize involuntary resettlement and land acquisition by exploring all viable alternatives. If the resettlement and land acquisition is unavoidable, the framework provides that resettlement and compensation should be made in a sustainable way in order to make sure the displaced person has been given the chance to share the benefits of the project.

It also stipulated that the displaced person has to be consulted and have an opportunity to participate in planning and implementation of resettlement and compensation program. Furthermore, the displaced and compensated person has to be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least restore them to the pre-displacement levels (RPF, 2007; 17-18).

In the discussed Policies, Frameworks and Acts above, the major emphasis have been on the involvement of the dwellers in community especially those who have been affected in one way or the other by the process of regularization. This is due to the fact that regularization has to be implemented through the idea of participation in order to achieve its goals and reduce its effects as it was stipulated by international organizations and different researchers. For instance; the French researcher Durand-Lasserve when discussing regularization in developing countries, states that decisions concerning planning and the adoption of standards must be made on the basis of shared participatory decision making (Durand-Lasserve 1996:53).

The Policies and Acts above give provisions on how the process of regularization has to be done. The Resettlement policy framework went further discussing and giving requirements on how to deal with resettlement process and compensation procedures.
These procedures and processes were supposed to be followed in Manzese and Buguruni whereby displacement of some residents was unavoidable during the implementation of the regularization projects within these informal settlements. Therefore, this research is eager to understand if and how the goals of the provided resettlement framework have been achieved within the affected settlements in Dar es Salaam city.
Chapter three
Theoretical framework

A theory is an explanation of observed regularities (Bryman, 1999:5). It is a collection of concepts which together provides an understanding of how an incident is built up and how it can be classified and used. Just like instruments are for human action, theories and concepts are tools for human thinking. A more stringent elaboration of theory is a system in which a number of concepts and propositions have been systematically ordered. Propositions are the basis of the researcher’s attempts to understand, explain, predict and propose measures that relate the phenomenon being investigated (Lundequist, 1999, in Lupala 2002:9). Theoretical framework also helps in establishing relevant field contacts depending on an understanding of a theory of what is to be studied (Yin, 2009). Richardson, (2004) added that theories are important to practice, and they will be of potential contribution if their approaches raised issues which can be engaged in exploration of the research.

As it was stated in the research issue there is a gap on theories which are related to, or which explain the phenomena of resettlement and displacement of residents in upgraded settlements. But there are some general theories which can be looked at. These theories include that of Rawls’ social justice and communicative and collaborative planning. The mentioned theories were considered suitable for this research as they share some common features, that is they both advocate the issue of democracy in order to bring equality in the society. The difference comes in the approach in which each theory is taking. The justice theory is providing factors which have to be considered in achieving the equality, while the communicative and collaborative theory is providing the process which has to be taken in achieving the same within the society. The two theories were also selected as they both discuss issues related to the resettlement policy framework provisions prepared by the World Bank in implementing upgrading projects in different countries as they both links to issues discussed in the theories. Both theories and the framework were used in understanding the empirical findings as they provided elements, concepts and attributes concerning equality in the real world. The theories were discussed in
relation to process of displacement and resettlement within the upgraded informal settlements and used in answering research questions.

3.1 The social justice theory

Rawls’ theory of Justice deals with justice as fairness. Whereby, he anticipated that the concept of justice as fairness will become useful and reasonable even if not that much convincing to a wide range of thoughts and political opinions as it is regarded to have idealistic ideas on the real world (Kukathas and Petit, 1990). There are a number of authors written about social justice, but this research suits more with the principles of Rawls’ theory of justice. The first principle of this theory is appropriate distribution of benefits and burdens of social cooperation, which is so much related with what was provided by the World Bank resettlement policy framework on making sure that both displaced and remaining residents share the benefits of the project.

Rawls’ theory specifies which division of advantages is appropriate in the society. In this principle justice is expressed in three ideas which are liberty, equity and reward for services contributing to the common good. He also advocates proper distributive shares and division of benefits. This principle single out which similarities and differences among persons are relevant in determining rights and duties and it specify which division of advantage is appropriate (Rawls, 1999). Nevertheless, justice as fairness has been considered as a tool for physical planning when the physical planning process put the economic welfare of the population at stake. This was mentioned by Ndjovu (2003), when discussing compulsory land acquisition in Dar es Salaam city.

The theory emphasizes on fair and rightful allocation of resources in relation to social diversity which is also among the objectives of the resettlement policy framework prepared by the World Bank displacement and resettlement process. It as well discusses the aspects of governing and organizing society and its consequences for people and their lives.

The main subject of this theory is basic structure of society, or more exactly, the way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages from social cooperation (Rawls, 1999:6). Rawls accepts that society is a cooperative enterprise for mutual benefits for all. He
expounds that it is also marked with conflicts and diverse interests due to social diversities. These conflicts and diverse interests specify rights and duties of people and determine appropriate distributive shares whereby no one should be advantaged or disadvantaged by natural fortune or social circumstances in the choice of principles (Bala, 2008:2 and Rawls, 1999:16).

Considering social justice theory in development projects Cernea argues that, a society which protects the rights and liberties of people and provides all the economic and social advantages to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged sections in the society could be considered just. In this context development projects in developing countries that are the basis of market economy, are expected to alleviate poverty by improving livelihood options (Cernea and McDowell, 2000). On the contrary such development projects, while displacing and resettling the population from one place to another, create process related poverty or the new poor in the society. As displacement not only lead into loss of properties but also social ties and livelihood strategies which are very important in reducing poverty harshness. Hence if development projects lead to impoverishment and create process related poverty; don’t such situations negate the very premise of social justice which is liberty, equity and reward for services contributing to the common good while moving on the path to urban development.

The second principle of social justice advocates democracy and participatory development, which is also a principle of planning processes. Here Rawls comes as an answer to address this concern where he says “social and economic inequalities have to be arranged so that they are both a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged and b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity” (Rawls, 1999:302). Considering this research the question was, democracy and participatory development considered sufficiently when it comes to displacement and resettlement of all displaced residents.

Taking an example of Bala (2008) when reflecting Rawls theory of social justice in involuntary resettlement in India, she writes that: “one important way of understanding development in the viewpoint of resettlement is, affected residents
has the right to real freedom that all citizens enjoy, to pursue the objectives that they have reason to value. In this sense the expansion of human competence can be broadly seen as the central feature of the process of development. A resettlement process in this case, in order to qualify as development output has to focus at a) enhancement of capabilities and b) expansion of social opportunities by addressing the social and personal constraints, which restrict people’s choices within the resettled areas” (Bala 2008:3).

Therefore enhancement of capabilities and expansion of social opportunities can be among important ideas to be considered when displacement is to occur. The same was advocated by the World Bank policy framework for resettlement that the displaced residents have to be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standard of living. This research will provide indications if there was any enhancement of individual and social competencies and expansion of social opportunities as reward for contributing towards a common good within the upgraded settlement in Dar es Salaam.

The social justice theory was used by this research in predicting an ideal situation whereby the community has equality, in sharing the benefits and burdens from the community development process. Meanwhile communicative and collaborative planning theory was also considered by this research since it has been given a status by several planning theorists as a way to enhance democracy and social justice in planning processes (Bond, 2011). In that case, this research extracted the process of how such a situation of being democratic and social just in planning can be achieved through the communicative and collaborative theory as discussed in the section 3.2.

3.2 Communicative and collaborative theory
According to Allmendinger (2002:16) there are a number of influences upon the approach of communicative planning. Among the most important ones is the work of Jurgen Habermas. He examines the concept of rationality and its relationship to problems of social actions, inter-subjective communication and social-historical change which result into the issue of rationality and power (Bond, 2011). The communicative planning entails planning through debate, argumentative planning,
inclusionary discourse and collaborative planning. At the heart of this communicative turn is an attempt to resolve the long recognized ‘problem’ of power, by creating planning processes grounded in principles of free speech and rational argument.

As according to Bond, the theory “is based on the premises that debate between all the relevant stakeholders oriented towards agreement is the most appropriate and democratic means of decision making in planning and urban governance” (Bond, 2011; 164). Just like the justice theory if there will be a freedom of speech and rational arguments then equality through democracy and participatory approach can be achieved in a society with social diversity such as that of Manzese and Buguruni.

Communicative and collaborative theories of planning as they were discussed by Allmendinger and Tewdwr-Jones, (2002) seem to gain recognition and have been strongly emphasized as a reaction against the old instrumental approaches. Communicative planning theory has been criticized as contextual deficiency. The depth of the theoretical roots are not acknowledged as well as neglecting issues of structure and its over-emphasis of the capacity of an individual agency. Therefore this theory is identified as directing insufficient attention to the dynamics of urban regions (Healey, 1997:30). It is partly for this reason the collaborative planning was formulated to integrates spatial and political sensibilities from urban political economy and elements of communicative planning theory (Harris, 2002:32). This theory is about why urban regions are important to social, economic and environmental policy and how political communities may be organized to improve the quality of their places (Healey, 1997: xii). The theory has also been criticized by its reliance on rational argumentation in the “ideal speech situation” and consensus building with regard to the issue of rationality and power (Bond, 2011; 163). The other critic is on the fact that self-interest may be shifted into a common good or unified interest which can be used as a basis for consensus building. Such a situation can result into a trap of privileging rational argumentation over other affective, emotional or embodied forms of talk (Bond, 2011; 167).

This research dealing with the improvement of unplanned settlements of Manzese and Buguruni looked upon the factors which entail how such political community
could have been arranged in order to improve their life in just or rather equal benefits to all its members. In other words, the two approaches of communicative and collaborative planning have potentials for improving intergroup relations and allowing planning practice progress in an inclusive and equitable way (Bond, 2011:166). The communicative and collaborative planning if applied; could have helped in facilitating the whole process of improving the living conditions for both those who remain in the settlement and those who have been displaced after the implementation of regularization. The intention is to see if the freedom of speech and rational argument was used in the entire process of displacement and resettlement.

Freedom of expression and logical reasoning as it was explained in the communicative theory is considered as one of the concepts which can facilitate the implementation of upgrading projects in a democratic and participatory way as it was emphasized by a number of policy provisions. It was also urged in justice theory that there should be liberty and equality; these can be archived through democracy and participatory considerations. This is because residents of unplanned settlements have to agree to give away part or whole of their properties to allow the upgrading process. Therefore, without freedom of expression and logical reasoning such a decision can be difficult to be made without regrets and having a feeling of carrying the burden for the benefit of others. In that case, the question which was looked at to the residents of Manzese and Buguruni upgraded settlements is; was there freedom of speech and rational arguments during the process of displacement, compensation and finding options for resettlement.

In reviewing the two theories which were found to be relevant and related to each other as far as regularization and displacement process is concerned. It was found out that there are five important elements which have to be looked at when dealing with displacement and resettlement especially in displaced residents within upgraded settlements. These elements include: fair and rightful allocation of resources, citizens’ rights to real freedom to pursue the objectives of their choices, democracy and participatory development, enhancement of individual competence and expansion of social opportunities. Together with these elements, it was also
significant to identify key concepts which were as well related with the reality in the regularized settlements in Manzese and Buguruni within Dar es Salaam city.

3.3 Key concepts
In this research there were two key concepts which needed to be linked with elements provided from the above theoretical perspective. These concepts include displacement and resettlement. Both concepts are the result of regularization process. The concepts are discussed in relation to the identified elements and they were looked upon in Manzese and Buguruni settlements. So as to examine the process of displacement and accommodation of displaced residents during regularization process.

3.3.1 Displacement
According to the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) handbook prepared by International Financial Cooperation (IFC), displacement may be either physical or economic. Physical displacement is the actual physical relocation of people resulting in a loss of shelter, productive assets or access to productive assets such as land, water, livestock, and forests (IFC, 2002). Loss of shelter and assets resulting from the acquisition of land associated with a project. This requires the affected person(s) to move to another location that is resettling. During this process it is argued that Economic displacement results from an action that interrupts or eliminates people’s access to productive assets without physically relocating the people themselves (ibid).

This research deals with the physical displacement which in one way or the other results into economic displacement as well. The fact is the informal settlement dwellers engage in informal business sector within or close to where they live. Therefore, losing a place to live, have an implication of losing a place for business as well. That will affect what has been articulated in the theoretical and policy frameworks as enhancement of individual competence and expansion of social opportunities unless other elements were considered in the process of relocation. These elements included that of democracy and participatory development whereby affected residents were free to express their objectives to pursue as well as given a
chance to expand individual competence through fair and rightful allocation of resources.

The process of physical displacement is associated with the following components as mentioned by Cernea, (1996) when discussing impoverishment, risks and reconstruction models for resettling displaced population in development projects. As according to Cernea, these components are likely to be faced by any displaced population. The question is; was the situation the same in accommodating displaced residents in regularized settlements in Dar es Salaam city? And were the components faced by all the affected residents in the same magnitude as it was provided in the reviewed theories? These questions are assumed to be answered from the empirical findings in Manzese and Buguruni.

**Figure 3:1 Conceptual framework-Displacement**

![Conceptual framework-Displacement](image)

### 3.3.2 Components of displacements

There are about seven components of displacement as they have been displayed in the conceptual framework in figure 3.1. These components have been described in the following sections as according to Cernea’s and others while dealing with displacement of other development projects such as mining, hydro dams and other industrial construction projects. Due to lack of information on resettlement within
upgraded settlements, the same components have been used in analysing resettlement within upgraded settlements in Dar es Salaam city.

**(a) Landlessness**

This component of landlessness has been explained by Cernea as ‘expropriation of land. It removes the main foundation upon which people’s productive systems, commercial activities, and livelihoods are constructed on. This is the principal form of de-capitalization and pauperization of displaced people, as they lose both natural and man-made capital’ (1996: 18). Land to an urban poor just like those found in informal settlements can be considered as the main resource which can help them deal with livelihood strategies. On the land, they can have a shelter to live in, economic activities which can give them income and social networks they can depend on.

For the case of displaced residents in regularized settlements it is likely that the effect of being displaced was more felt on the loss of manmade capital. That is the house structure which can be used as a residential as well as business place. In most cases house owners in the informal settlements use their houses as a source of income through renting out rooms. So losing the house means the loss of man-made capital and a place to live in, as it was stated by Cernea, (1996).

Also as most of informal settlements are located in strategic areas, this enables its dwellers to practice petty business activities within their door steps or verandas. In this little space that they occupy the informal settlement dwellers can put a kiosk, or prepare and sell buns or even food to those who pass by. So being landless in informal settlement in a city is more than losing a shelter but also losing a chance to enhance individual competences and expanding social opportunities. The two elements were described by Rawls’ theory to be very important to a just society. The individual competences and social opportunities are livelihood strategy which if deprived results into more poverty to the urban poor. As it was portrayed by Cernea, the component of landlessness is expected to be seen in Manzese or Buguruni upgraded settlements as a result of the displacement.
(b) Joblessness

The second component of displacement is that of being jobless. That is losing employment or any other source of income generating activity. This component was explained by Cernea as: “the risk of losing wage employment is very high both in urban and rural displacements for those employed in enterprises, services, or agriculture. Yet, creating new jobs is difficult and requires substantial investment unless fair and rightful allocation of resources is practiced for both displaced and remaining residents as it was advocated in social justice theory. Unemployment or underemployment among displaced population often endures long after physical relocation has been completed” (Cernea 1996:19). Joblessness is also expected to be experienced among the displaced residents in upgraded settlements within Dar es Salaam city.

In the context of this research, joblessness was expected to be felt through loss of capital, social opportunities and a chance to enhance individual competencies as it was associated with being landless and the actual loss of employment or loss of the environment which is suitable for a specific income generating activity. Displacement can create far distances from the employment areas which result into increase of travelling costs. This can be the case for the displaced residents in Manzese and Buguruni settlements as their previous settlements were very close to the city center. The location of informal settlements are in very strategic areas such as closer to the employment sectors, or business areas so that it can be easy and less costly for the urban poor to improve personal skills. Self-employed people i.e. petty traders, food vendors who are very common in informal settlements, are likely to lose social and business opportunities. This happens when they or their customers are displaced and make business less profitable and therefore create joblessness. Such a situation can to certain extent be avoided if, as it was advocated in communicative and collaborative theory, democracy and participatory development is practised in resettlement process. Also democracy and participatory development can reduce the creation of joblessness when resettling displaced residents in upgraded settlements.
(c) Homelessness

Downing (2002: 10) when discussing about mining-induced displacement and resettlement, explains that the pattern of new poverty persists in homelessness as another component of displacement risk. He defined homelessness as the “loss of house-plots, dwellings and shelter.” Cernea further explains that; “Loss of shelter tends to be only temporary for many displaced people; but, for some, homelessness or a worsening in their housing standards remains a lingering condition. In a broader cultural sense the loss of a family’s individual home, and the loss of a group’s cultural space tend to result into separation and status-deprivation” (Cernea, 1996:20). The question comes, could the same situation be found in some displaced residents in Mnazi Mmoja and Mnyamani settlements. The chapter on findings will confirm that.

In informal settlements the situation of being homeless goes beyond the loss of the housing structure but “a home” which is often associated with a profound loss of identity and cultural impoverishment. It has the symbolic importance of place, in terms of family cohesion and a remembered location for mutual support, not only from the household but also neighbouring households. Such a situation can result into loss of citizens’ rights to real freedom to pursue the objectives of their choices as it was advocated in social justice theory. As such a displaced resident can lose his/her identity which gave him/her an opportunity of conducting livelihood activities within the settlement where he/she was belonging to. Likewise social networks are very important means of surviving the urban poverty. Losing them by relocation of homes can cause more poverty than it was before. For example, loans, child care, food and accommodation can be accessible to poor households through social networks of support and reciprocity that exists within and between households and within communities (Cernea and McDowell, 2000). In other words, losing a home goes beyond losing a structure above the heads but also all the social ties and networks which are very crucial to the urban poor. The situation can happen that way depending on the resettlement options which were chosen or provided to the affected residents. It is yet to be found through the chapter on findings if the same was applied to Manzese and Buguruni displaced residents.
(d) Marginalization

Marginalization is among the components of displacement and resettlement risks. Its characteristics as explained by Fernandes (2000) who just like Cernea and Downing, was discussing displacement and resettlement on other development projects; are multiple due to the fact that the cultural status of displaced residents is reduced when they shift to new resettlement areas. In these resettled areas they are regarded as “strangers” and deprived of opportunities and entitlements. This situation is assumed to last for certain period of time, but still can result into both social and economic marginalization and its consequences are typically not considered in resettlement and compensation programs.

The complexity of marginalization is assumed to threaten displaced residents and entire resettlement communities as they fall into lower socio-economic eminence relative to their previous areas. This can result into loss of social opportunity and a chance to enhance individual competences as it was explained in justice theory (Rawls, 1999). Research has shown that such marginalization goes along with a loss of self-esteem, especially when the displaced become unknown and novice in the host communities as it was described by Downing, (2002) when discussing resettlement in mining projects.

It is assumed that, it will take a while before the so considered ‘newcomers’ or ‘outsiders’ as they were described by Downing to fit within the new society and be considered and trusted as part of the community. This situation is expected to deprive the new resettled residents’ opportunities to engage in socio-economic activities. As well as fair and rightful allocation of especially livelihood related resources within their new settlement and therefore cause social unjust and other economic hardships (Rawls, 1999). It will be interesting if this research will be able to find out such a situation to the displaced residents that is being marginalized and considered as strangers in their new settlement. It will be more interesting if the research will also find out if there are any provisions or regulations which are taken into consideration in such a social-economic displacement?
(e) Loss of access to common property resources

This kind of component not only can it be felt in rural areas whereby it is assumed that most of the livelihood assets are commonly owned, but also in cities where important assets are commonly provided and accessed. Moving away from such facilities, can create disturbance or change of a lifestyle of the urban poor and result into unfair and unrightfully allocation of resources. For poor people, particularly for the landless and asset less, loss of access to the common property assets that are available in or closer to previous community will affect income and livelihood levels. Such common resources include water sources, burial grounds, market/trading place, community halls. These resources can be within the informal settlement or can be accessed in a neighbouring community. Loss of access to such resources results in significant deterioration in chances to practice personal skills. Typically, losses of common property assets are rarely considered for compensation. These losses are compounded by loss of access to some public services, such as public transportation systems, water supply, schools and healthy centers which are very crucial to the urban poor (Cernea, 1996; Rawls, 1999). From this component it can be assumed that Manzese and Buguruni displaced residents could have face such a situation of losing access to common resources such as water supply, public transport, health facilities, electricity supply. These losses will be determined by the choice of resettlement areas. In that case, findings are supposed to provide on such a situation and how did they cope with difficulties and costs associated with it.

(f) Social disarticulation.

Social disarticulation is also a component of displacement and resettlement risk and its effect is very affirmative strong and disturbs the whole system of livelihood within the urban poor community. As it was explained by Cernea (1996) involuntary displacement is assumed to tear apart the existing social structure. It disperses and fragments communities, dismantles patterns of social organization and interpersonal ties; kinship groups become scattered as well. Life-sustaining informal networks of reciprocal help, local voluntary associations, and self-organized mutual service are disrupted. According to Rawls’ theory of justice such a situation is considered to be a net loss of valuable “social capital,” that compounds the loss of natural, physical, and human capital. Hence social disarticulation agitates social opportunities and
hinder enhancement of individual competences (Rawls, 1999). Cernea as well
describes the loss of social capital as “the social capital lost through social
disarticulation is typically unperceived and uncompensated by the programs causing
it, and this real loss has long-term consequences” (Cernea 1996:25). The situation of
dismantled social organization, interpersonal ties and life-sustaining informal
networks of reciprocal help could also be faced by the displaced residents in
Buguruni and Manzese settlements?

(g) Disruption of formal educational activities

As according to Downing, displacement and resettlement processes often cause a
significant interruption in the functioning of schools and in child access to education
during the period of relocation and for longer periods of time after relocation.
Empirical studies done by Downing on mining-induced resettlement show that a
number of relocated students often never return to school and instead join the labour
force at an early age (Downing, 2002:11). This can be due to factors such as
unavailability of school in the resettled area, the increase in travelling distances to
the previous school. Even change of lifestyle for the displaced families as a result of
loss of livelihood strategies such as employment or business activities can make
them not able to afford school fees, or any other costs associated with attending
school. In such a situation citizens’ rights to real freedom to pursue the objectives of
their choices is deprived and therefore go against what is considered to be social
justice (Rawls, 1999). The question for this component is could this situation be felt
by some of the displaced residents in upgraded settlements within Dar es Salaam
city?

The above seven components of displacement and resettlement risks are expected
to be found within most resettlement process in the urban locale. This research
closely analyses these components through the ten identified displaced residents
within the Manzese and Buguruni settlements.

Though these components are common to resettlement situation it is assumed that,
the level of their effects to displaced residents differ depending on the type of
resettlement which has been opted. Therefore it is important to identify different
types of resettlement which could have been opted for, by the displaced residents in Manzese and Buguruni settlements.

3.3.3 Resettlement
According to the World Bank Report on Resettlement policy framework prepared for Regional Communication Infrastructure Program (RCIP), resettlement has been associated with physical relocation of the project affected persons. This process may require assistances such as moving allowances, residential housing or rentals whichever is feasible and as required, for ease relocation (RCIP, 2007).

In Manzese and Buguruni, it is expected that moving allowances for all the displaced residents, residential housing for some landlords and rentals for all the tenants will be required during resettlement process. But these requirements depend on the resettlement options that were taken by the affected residents. In that case, it is important to analyse the resettlement options which can be available in such a situation. Due to lack of information regarding displacement and resettlement caused by upgrading projects, this research adopted information which were provided for other development projects sponsored by the International Finance Cooperation (IFC).

3.3.4 Resettlement options
According to the Resettlement Action Plan prepared by International Finance Cooperation (IFC 2002), there are a number of resettlement options which can be implemented. These options depend on the availability of land and other resources. Also negotiation and consensus seeking among the residents within the previous settlement and resettlement areas can determine the option of resettlement. These options can be categorized into two; resettlement within the settlement and resettlement outside the settlement.
Table 3.1: Options for Physical Resettlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>No resettlement</th>
<th>On-site resettlement</th>
<th>Partial resettlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement within the settlement</td>
<td>The option of no resettlement should be considered if alternatives are too expensive or policy objections cannot be met</td>
<td>Where the population densities are relatively low, it may be possible to consolidate members of an affected community in a single area thus making room for project facilities without having to relocate the community to another site</td>
<td>Where the whole site is not required for project facilities, it may be possible to minimize or isolate land take. As a result, only a fraction of the affected community may require physical relocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 2</th>
<th>Resettlement to nearby and multiple sites</th>
<th>Resettlement to margins of developed areas</th>
<th>Relocation to distant sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement outside the previous settlement</td>
<td>Where full resettlement is necessary, the impact of displacement can be minimized by relocating affected people to several small sites near the affected areas: such an option depends on the structure of the community and the land market.</td>
<td>The margins of developed areas offer cheaper land than more central locations but these areas still have access to utilities and infrastructure within the central locations</td>
<td>Land cost and availability often favours the selection of resettlement sites far from project facilities, but have more challenging disadvantages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Davidson et al, 1993 (in IFC, 2002) and modified by the author.

Table 3.1 illustrates resettlement options for development projects, such as mining, industrial construction, hydro power plants and other development related projects. The same options were used as a guideline in finding out what options can be adopted in upgrading project in Manzese and Buguruni, as it is as well a development project. The options have been further explained and illustrated in the following subsections.

(i). Resettlement within the settlement

This first category of resettlement has three options namely:

1. No resettlement at all

This is when there is partial demolition or partial acquisition of a piece of plot which leave the residents or the owner with some space which can allow him/her to continue living in the same plot. Sometimes the land owner might have enough space within the same plot for extension to replace the demolished part and continue living in the same location. Also when the compromise is not
reached or there is lack of resources for compensation, then there will be no resettlement and other options might be thought of (IFC, 2002).

2. On-site resettlement
This kind of resettlement happens within the same settlement but in a different location depending on the availability of land within the same settlement. This option works in a settlement which is not that densely populated that is there are available portion of land or alternative accommodation within the same area (IFC, 2002).

3. Partial resettlement.
Just like the first option of no resettlement, partial resettlement can be done where the whole site is not required for the project facilities. That means there will be available portions of land within the same settlement which can accommodate the residents whose land or houses has been affected. Therefore, it can be possible to shift the residents from their plots but within the same settlement (IFC, 2002).
(ii). **Resettlement outside the settlement**

This category has as well three options:

4. Resettlement to nearby single or multiple sites

When it happens that the whole settlement is required for the project, then the displaced residents can be accommodated in different small available sites which are close to their former settlements. The implementation of this option depends on the community structure, the availability of land and land market within the neighboring settlements. This option is frequently done in order to minimize the impact of displacement and enable the displaced residents to continue share the benefit of the project (IFC, 2002).

5. Resettlement to the margins of developed areas

Just like the previous option resettlement to the margin of the developed area depends on the availability of land which can accommodate the affected residents. This option enables the affected residents to continue using the facilities available to the developed area and benefit from other social ties they use to have. In this option all the affected residents are accommodated in the same area that means there is a possibility for them not to lose their socio-economic ties completely (IFC, 2002).
6. Relocation to distant sites.
Land cost and availability consideration often favour the selection of resettlement sites far from project facilities. The disadvantages of such sites include lack of employment and business opportunities and wider social support networks. The cost of infrastructure provision is likely to be high. And, social services will have to be specially provided. This option tends to be unaffordable but mostly feasible due to challenges of land market and unavailability of land in prime location. It is as well the option which brings more challenges to the resettled residents.

As it was illustrated in the diagrams above, the resettlement options can be applied within unplanned settlements which have to be upgraded. As mentioned by IFC (2002), the type of resettlement option can be chosen depending on the negotiation and consensus seeking between the residents of affected settlements and those within the resettlement settlement. In that case such options can be applicable in upgrading projects within Dar es Salaam city.
The identified types of resettlement options therefore answered the second research question which was on what are the resettlement options which can be considered in a regularized settlement.

Depending on the type of resettlement which has been opted in Manzese and Buguruni settlements as it is not yet known, but it should be among the six options discussed above; the magnitude of the displacement effects are expected to vary. Not all the components as provided by reviewed theories and literature will be equally faced by all the displaced tenants and landlords. This is due to the fact that resettlement can occur within the same settlement, or closer to the settlement or, at a distance away from the previous settlement as it has been discussed in the different options above. In that case the magnitude of the effects will depend on the option of resettlement chosen. The resettlement options chosen and its associated magnitudes of issues and opportunities will be vividly explained and described in the finding and analysis chapters ahead.
Chapter Four
The research methodology

This research is explorative in nature as there is not much written on the topic of displacement and resettlement associated with upgraded projects. It applied qualitative research methods (see appendix 1), as it deals with experiences of individual few displaced residents from upgraded settlements in Dar es Salaam city in analyzing what happened in such a project. The experiences of those residents have been used in examining the resettlement process in the selected regularized informal settlements in Manzese and Buguruni wards. It as well explored the type of resettlement options which have been realized by the displaced residents. Also issues and opportunities faced as a result of the resettlement option were analyzed using justice and collaborative planning theories as well as policy frameworks provided. In order to come up with different experiences of displacement and resettlement, a thorough selection of research strategy, data collection and analysis methods were made so as not to miss important information in examining the resettlement of the displaced residents from the regularized informal settlements.

4.1 Research design
A research design is a “conceptual structure within which research is conducted, measured and analysis of data” (Kothari, 2004:31). The design decision happens to be in respect of among other things what techniques of data collection will be used. This research, which has the “how” as the main research question, describes why the displaced residents were displaced and how they resettled in different settlements within or outside their previous settlements and the Dar es Salaam city in general. That makes “where” and “what” to be part of the main question of the research as well. That is where displaced residents did resettle? What are the types of resettlement opted by displaced residents? Why such options? What are the issues and opportunities faced by the displaced residents in their relocated settlements? And how was the participatory and democracy practiced in the displacement and resettlement process?
The issue of resettlement caused by regularization is very contemporary and it is happening every day in real life situation. According to Yin, there are several strategies of doing social science research. These include experiment, survey, history, case study and the analysis of archival information. Yin adds that, “a selection of a research strategy depends on three conditions: the type of research questions posed, the extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioral events and the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical phenomena” (Yin, 2009:9) as detailed in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Relevant situation for different research strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Form of research question</th>
<th>Required control of behavioral events</th>
<th>Focus on contemporary event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>How, why?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from Yin, (2009:8)

Among the five types of research strategies mentioned above, case study is preferred when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, and when the degree of focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real life context (Yin, 2009:8). Together with what Yin has provided, this research suits case study strategy. The selected case can facilitate an in-depth study of a phenomenon, to this research displacement and resettlement processes. Also, being an explorative research, rather than a study which one can draw generalized conclusion, this research was suitable for the case study strategy which its generalization is on the contextual bases. Therefore, this research applied case study strategy in examining the process of displacement and resettlement even though many social scientists believe that case study is not suitable for such but rather used for preliminary research methods and it cannot used to describe or test propositions.
4.2 Selection of a study area

In selecting a case study area a purposeful sampling was applied. As according to Patton “the logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information rich cases for an in depth study. Information–rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry, thus the term purposefully sampling” (2002:230). Following Patton’s argument four criteria for selecting an information rich region was formulated. These include:

1. The proliferation of informal settlements within the region which urge for different upgrading efforts
2. Number of implemented upgrading projects which created displacement and resettlement
3. Availability of information to the researcher
4. Proximity and familiarity to the researcher.

Regularization took place in a number of regions within Tanzania, such as: Mwanza, Morogoro, Mbeya, Tanga, Arusha and Dar es Salaam. In order to come up with one region among the rest the above four criteria were applied.

Table 4.3 Criteria for selecting study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/ N</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Morogoro</th>
<th>Mbeya</th>
<th>Tanga</th>
<th>Arusha</th>
<th>Mwanza</th>
<th>D.S.M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Proliferation of informal settlements within the region which urge for upgrading efforts</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>&gt; 70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The number of implemented upgrading projects which created displacement and resettlement</td>
<td>1 settlement</td>
<td>1 settlement</td>
<td>0 settlements</td>
<td>1 settlement</td>
<td>0 settlements</td>
<td>16 settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Availability of information to the researcher</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Proximity and logistics costs</td>
<td>Less costly</td>
<td>More costly</td>
<td>Less costly</td>
<td>More costly</td>
<td>More costly</td>
<td>Less costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the results of selection criteria adopted for purposeful sampling it was preferred that this study should take place in Dar es Salaam city in Tanzania; see map 1 for location of Dar es Salaam city.

The city has been preferred because; compared to other cities and regions in Tanzania as according to the selection criteria, it has proliferation of informal settlements covering more than 80 percent of its total population; as according to data provided in the report by UN-Habitat on City Wide Action Plan for Unplanned and Un-serviced Informal Settlements in Dar es Salaam city, 2010. Also the city has more number of settlements that implemented upgrading projects which created displacement and resettlement compared to the rest of the regions in Tanzania that is, about 16 settlements (Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), 2004). That is to say it has many projects/programs compared to other regions which aim at improving the settlements’ living condition.

This shows that the city has more experience on that issue compared to other regions. Also, since many projects have been done, it means the availability of information about those projects will be easier and quicker to be accessed compared to those other regions whereby one or two projects have so far been implemented. Nevertheless, the distance and logistic factors also favor Dar es Salaam to be selected since all the concerned ministries, main donors, stakeholders and authorities concerning the issue of informal settlement upgrading projects are found within the city.
4.3 Background of the selected study area- Dar es Salaam city

Dar es Salaam is the largest city in Tanzania. Its population has grown from 1.4 million in 1988 to nearly 4 million to date (Un-Habitat, 2010). This urban population growth is a result of both migration and natural increase. The City is bordered by the Indian Ocean on the east and by the Coast Region on the other side (URT, 2004). It is comprised of three municipalities, Kinondoni, Ilala and Temeke.
Over 80 percent (or 3.2 million out of the approximately 4 million) of Dar es Salaam’s population live in unplanned areas. These areas are characterized by haphazardly constructed buildings, insecurity of tenure, and lack of basic urban services (UN-Habitat, 2010). There have been a number of efforts to upgrade the living standards existing in unplanned areas. Some of these efforts include Sustainable Dar es Salaam City Program and Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program, The Cities Alliance, Safer Cities, Environmental Planning and Management, Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project (SDP) and Solid Waste Management (RAP, 2004).

Since this research is dealing with regularization and particularly physical regularization, Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) and Sustainable Dar es Salaam Program (SDP) were the potential case studies given that they both deal with upgrading of informal settlements through infrastructure provisions.

4.3.1 Sustainable Dar es Salaam Programme (SDP)
The Sustainable Dar es Salaam Program (SDP) started in 1990 under the support of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Un-HABITAT. The overall objective of the SDP was to promote environmentally sustainable growth and development in Dar es Salaam City. The promotion was by strengthening local capacities to plan, coordinate, and manage urban development in a way that would enhance availability and use of natural resources and reduce exposure to environmental hazards.

The SDP formulated issue specific working group for the implementation of the identified priority issues. Among the issues on which a working group was formulated was that of upgrading and providing basic services and infrastructure in the selected settlements which included Hanna Nassif, Tabata, and Kijitonyama (SDP, 2004).

The key output of this working group was the implementation of a demonstration project. This project was that of Hanna Nassif community-managed and labour intensive infrastructure upgrading project. Lessons learnt from the project were used to replicate the process in other settlements such as Kijitonyama and Tabata neighbourhoods.
These projects include The Hanna Nassif Community managed Upgrading project which was implemented in 1992-1999 and the Community Infrastructure Program (CIP) in 1995-2000 covering Tabata and Kijitonyama communities.

4.3.2. The Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP)
The Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) was introduced in Dar es Salaam city in 2001 as a community driven Infrastructure Upgrading Program targeted at unplanned settlements. It was operating under the auspices of the City council of Dar es Salaam (Local Government Support Project-LGSP) under the sponsorship of The World Bank. It was a project under the Regional Communication and Infrastructure Program for Eastern and Southern African countries (RPF, 2007). It has implemented upgrading projects within sixteen settlements within Dar es Salaam city on its first phase of the project and covered a population of about 167,000 people (Resettlement Action Plan, 2004).

The CIUP main objectives include facilitating capacity building to the local authorities on upgrading of unplanned settlements through infrastructure and service provision. To facilitate capacity building within respective communities in view of enabling participation in planning, investment and management of infrastructure and services: To facilitate improvement of living conditions of low income residents through upgrading of existing infrastructure and other services (Resettlement Action Plan,[RAP] 2004).
The CIUP project Phase I (2005-2008) and II (not yet started) is expected to cover an area of 1,100 hectares within 9 wards that have a total of 31 sub-wards and a total population of 330,000 people which is about 10 percent of Dar es Salaam city population (RAP, 2004). The upgrading involved the construction of infrastructure such as access roads, drainage structures and public toilets. Such construction works resulted into demolition of some existing houses and other structures which necessitated the displacement and resettlement of residents within the upgraded settlements (ibid).

The CIUP Phase I started 2005-2008, it covered five wards and sixteen sub wards or settlements within the three municipalities of Dar es Salaam city. See table 4.4.
### Table 4.4: CIUP Phase I implemented settlements and potential case study settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Sub-wards</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilala</td>
<td>Buguruni</td>
<td>Mnyamani</td>
<td>Three houses were totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madenge</td>
<td>One house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malapa</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vingunguti</td>
<td>Mtambani</td>
<td></td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinondoni</td>
<td>Manzese</td>
<td>Manzese Uzuri</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kilimani</td>
<td>One house was totally demolished which happened to be a church therefore no displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midizini</td>
<td>One house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muungano</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mnazi Mmoja</td>
<td>One house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temeke</td>
<td>Chang’ombe</td>
<td>Chang’ombe A</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chang’ombe B</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toroli</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandali</td>
<td>Sandali</td>
<td></td>
<td>One house was totally demolished but the displaced residents were not found (died)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mpogo</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mwembeladu</td>
<td>No house was totally demolished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 4.4 Sampling procedure

The study area has been selected, that is the Dar es Salaam city. Two projects were identified as potential case study areas seeing that they both dealt and have implemented physical upgrading projects within unplanned settlements. These programs are the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) and Sustainable Dar es Salaam Program (SDP).

It was then important to select a sample which would be used in data collection process. Patton (1990) discusses a number of sampling strategies as they are explained in table 4.3.
### Table 4.5: Sampling strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><strong>Random probability sampling</strong></td>
<td>Representativeness: Sample size a function of population size and desired confidence level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Simple random sample</td>
<td>Permits generalization from sample to the population it represents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stratified random and cluster sample</td>
<td>Increase confidence in making generalization to particular sub-groups or areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>Purposeful sampling</strong></td>
<td>Select information rich cases for in depth study. Size and specific cases depend on study purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extreme or deviated case sampling</td>
<td>Learning from highly unusual manifestations of the phenomenon of interest, such as outstanding, successes/notable failures, top of the class/dropouts, exotic events, crises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intensity sampling</td>
<td>Information rich cases that manifests the phenomenon intensely, but not extremely, such as , good students/poor students; above average/below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maximum variation sampling purposefully picking a wide range of variation on dimension of interest</td>
<td>Document unique or diverse variations that have emerged in adapting to different conditions. Identify important common patterns that cut across variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Homogeneous sampling</td>
<td>Focus, reduces variation; simplifies analysis; facilitates group interviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Typical case sampling</td>
<td>Illustrates or highlight what is typical, normal, average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stratified purposeful sampling</td>
<td>Illustrates characteristics of particular subgroups of interest, facilitates comparisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Critical case sampling</td>
<td>Permits logical generalization and maximum application of information to other cases because if it’s true of this one case its likely to be true of all other cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Snow balling or chain sampling</td>
<td>Identify cases of interest from people who know people who know what cases are information rich, that is, good examples for study, good interview subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Criterion sampling</td>
<td>Picking all cases that meet some criterion, such as all children abused in a treatment facility. Quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Theory based or operational construct sampling</td>
<td>Finding manifestations of a theoretical construct of interest so as to elaborate and examine the construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Confirming and disconfirming cases</td>
<td>Elaborating and deepening initial analysis, seeking expectations, testing variation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Opportunistic sampling</td>
<td>Following new leads during fieldwork, taking advantages of unexpected, flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Random purposeful sampling (still small sample size)</td>
<td>Adds credibility to sample when potential purposeful sample is larger than one can handle. Reduces judgement within a purposeful category. (Not for generalizations representativeness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sampling politically important cases</td>
<td>Attracts attention to the study (or avoids attracting undesired attentions by purposefully eliminating from the sample politically sensitive cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Convenience sampling</td>
<td>Saves time, money and effort. Poorest rationale; lowest credibility. Yields information-poor cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Combination or mixed purposeful sampling</td>
<td>Triangulation, flexibility, meets multiple interests and needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Patton, (1990: 182-183).

This research adopted a combination of two sampling strategies, shaded by color green in the table 4.5. At first it applied a criterion sampling whereby it was able to select a project which was suitable for the research that is the CIUP project. Then
the same criteria were applied in order to select settlements which were affected in such a project. It is not all the settlements which implemented the physical upgrading projects displaced residents who needed resettlement. The few affected settlements were then identified and became sub-cases for the research. The criteria set for the selection of the project and affected settlements have been described in table 4:6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>CIUP settlements</th>
<th>SDP settlements</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Informal settlements as an object of upgrading projects (within more than two informal settlements)</td>
<td>Sixteen informal settlements</td>
<td>One informal settlement</td>
<td>The SDP had only one informal settlement, i.e. Hanna Nassif; the other two were planned settlements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type of regularization projects tenure or physical</td>
<td>The project was physical regularization</td>
<td>The project was for both physical and tenure regularization</td>
<td>Regularization took place in Hanna Nassif only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have implemented its physical regularization projects</td>
<td>In sixteen settlements within three municipalities</td>
<td>One settlement in one municipality</td>
<td>CIUP is expecting to cover seventeen settlements in its second phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Caused total demolition of properties which created displaced residents in the process of upgrading</td>
<td>Twenty two properties were affected</td>
<td>No property was badly affected-</td>
<td>More than twenty house owners and tenants were displaced in the CIUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Types of relocation needed after displacement i.e. within or outside the settlement</td>
<td>Mostly outside the settlement</td>
<td>No resettlement needed due to partial demolitions</td>
<td>About six houses were demolished and cause relocation for six house owners and about twenty tenants in the CIUP project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preferred project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Due to its effects on a large number of population compared to the other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the criteria for selecting a suitable project, Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) was preferred compared to Sustainable Dar es Salaam Program
Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) implemented a project which provided settlements used as case study in understanding the resettlement of displaced residents from regularized settlements. The CIUP was also preferred most since its project dealt with physical upgrading. The upgrading was through provision of access roads, street lights, public toilets and storm water drainage, which created displaced residents who needed resettlement outside the settlement.

When it comes to settlement selection, this research concentrated on the CIUP phase I which has already been implemented within sixteen (16) sub wards of the three municipalities within Dar es Salaam city (See table 4.4). Among the sixteen sub wards or settlements the researcher selected those which have created displacement and resettlement to some of its residents. As it was indicated in table 4.4, not all the residents were displaced and resettled. In that case there are settlements which implemented the physical regularization and yet did not cause total demolition of house and therefore did not cause any displaced residents.

During the pre-field visits carried out in August-October, 2010 within the sixteen settlements which implemented the CIUP project, it was found that only 4 sub wards had displaced residents who needed different options for resettlement. The settlements included Midizini and Mnazi Mmoja in Kinondoni Municipality and Mnyamani and Madenge in Ilala Municipality as indicated in Table 4.4. The displaced residents from these settlements were traced and found.

After selecting the affected settlements in the selected case study project, another sampling procedure known as snowballing sampling was applied. By snowballing it means the researcher started asking key informants about someone. And the asked key informants mentioned other people, like neighbors who might have more information about the asked person, and the neighbors mentioned other people, such as a relative, till the person is found. This strategy was applied in order to trace and locate the displaced and resettled residents and find out where and eventually get their story on how they have been resettled. This sampling strategy made use of the Mtaa Leaders, neighbors, relatives or friends of the displaced and resettled residents. The strategy was applied in the six potential settlements in three
municipalities (as indicated in table 4.4) in order to be able to trace them. It was very rare to locate displaced residents within the settlement and in one location. Therefore, by asking a number of key informants, that is neighbors, relatives, and local leaders, the information was accumulated that is, the snow ball grew bigger.

4.5 Data collection methods

Being an explorative, this research applies deductive approach that is started looking at a social setting whereby an idea of regularization was implemented and had some issues. There after theoretical discussions were made in order to provide questions and elements to be looked after. Also insights on patterns and regularities were formulated out of the theoretical reflections. The insights were explored to a broader generalization that contributes into data analysis and identification of gaps (Bryman, 2004).

Since this research aimed at understanding resettlement process of displaced residents during the implementation of regularization projects, mainly qualitative data which show sequence of events of individual displaced residents were used. In rare cases, a bit of quantitative data were also used in analyzing displacement and resettlement of affected residents within the selected case study settlements. According to Ten Have, (2004:3&5) qualitative research within social sciences is used to study “commonalities” i.e. common properties, within a relatively small number of cases of which many aspects are taken into account. It offers complex descriptions and tries to explicate webs of meaning.

The research dealt with ten affected residents within upgraded settlements and analyzed the whole process of displacement and its issues and opportunities. The issues included becoming homeless, jobless, marginalized, family disintegration, loss of access to common resources and social disarticulation. The opportunities accrued include; increase on social opportunities, personal competence as well as improved properties. All these were faced after resettlement. This research looks upon commonalities among the affected residents and therefore come up with a description of both issues and challenges associated with such events of displacement and resettlement.
Therefore, in order to be able to capture the common properties within a small number of affected residents as it was stated by Ten Have (2004), this research adopted a narrative approach. In narratives different individual stories are collected through in depth interviews and make up the main narration which described the displacement and resettlement process (Lerise, 2009). These narrative stories were corroborated with other data collection methods such as: literature review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, non-participant observations, mapping, and photographic registration.

**Literature review**
In this research literature review was one of the main sources of acquiring secondary information from other empirical research. From this kind of literature reviews potential projects were obtained. Also information about the phenomenon of the research as well as theoretical perspectives related to this research was obtained. Through the literature review an entry point in mapping the state of the art and experiences from different countries around the world concerning regularization, displacement and resettlement process was provided. It also facilitated identification of useful theories, concepts, and knowledge gaps which were later applied within the local context. Literature review also provided a major input in the construction of narratives as it offered extracts which were used as evidence in narrations.

**Interview**
Interview is the most popular technique of doing qualitative social research. A number of individuals were consulted in a way that is less restrictive and standardized than the one used in quantitative research. Kvale (1996) defines an interview as a conversation which is structured with a purpose. Lupala, (2002:85) explains that, it is more than usual spontaneous exchange of views in normal conversations but it is a careful probing of questions and listening approach with a purposes of obtaining thoroughly tested knowledge. As according to Cadstedt (2006), interview is an efficient way of obtaining a lot of information within a short time. Also, it is one of the important sources of information in case study design as provided by Yin, (2009). In this research interviews were made during the settlements selection. This type of interviews were conducted to the ward executive
officers, Mtaa leaders and the neighbours of the displaced residents during the pilot study in the six potential settlements within Manzese, Buguruni and Sandali wards. Through the interviews identification of settlements with displaced residents who were traceable and possible to be found was selected. The interviews also set grounds for tracing the affected residents by providing information on their availability within a short time. Through these interviews the researcher was able to know whether a settlement qualify to be selected as a case study or not.

**In depth interviews**

In-depth interviewing is a qualitative research technique that involves conducting intensive individual interviews with a small number of respondents. It is done in order to explore their different perspectives on a particular idea or situation (Boyce and Neala, 2006). Despite the fact that it is focused, and discursive, an in depth interview allows the researcher and respondent freedom to explore an issue within the framework of guided conversation. In that case, in-depth interviews are useful when detailed information is required about a person’s experience, thoughts and behaviours. It even applied when exploring new issues in depth (*ibid*).

In this research in depth interviews were applied to displaced residents in order to get their experiences in displacement and resettlement process. The selected and found residents provided their experience through this method. Therefore, house owners and tenants were the main respondents in this method. The researcher was aware of the possibility of biasness during the interviews as the effected residents might exaggerate the information with the idea that the research will rectify what was already done. In order to overcome that, the researcher used the local leaders who were escorting the researcher in locating the displaced residents to make such a point clear. The local leaders informed them that, this research is only seeking information of what has happened.

**Focus group discussions (FGD)**

Focus group discussion is when a researcher conducts discussions with a group of people from eight to twelve. The selected group of people is known to have had a certain experience about a selected issue or topic for the purpose of generating information or ideas concerning the discussed issue (Bryman, 2004).
The discussions are in a conversation manner but the facilitator follows a certain set of questions derived from the case study protocol. The facilitator also encourages the participant to express their perceptions, attitude and point of views (Sheuya, 2004). When it comes to this research, the respondents for this kind of method were a group of ten people comprising of local/Mtaa Leaders, Mtaa executive officers, and members of community planning team (CPT) at the street level. They all had vast experience on the CIUP project. These people were used by the project to inform, mobilize and coordinate the rest of the community member during the implementation of the project.

**Observation, mapping and photographic registration**

In documenting displacement and resettlement areas, non-participant observations and photographic registration was employed. This approach helped in showing evidences of characteristics and basic features of displacement and resettlement areas. Mapping was used in showing the location of the demolished houses within the settlement during displacement. Also mapping was applied in showing a rough location of the resettlement areas in relation to the previous settlement. This technique facilitated in the analysis of the issues and opportunities faced by the displaced residents within their new resettlement areas. This was done by showing the distances covered from the former settlements to the resettlement areas in relation to the city center.
Table 4:7: Summary of methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Literature review</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>In depth interview</th>
<th>Key informant interview</th>
<th>Non participant observation</th>
<th>Focus group discussion</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
<th>Photo graphical registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where were displaced residents resettled?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the types of resettlement opted in regularized settlements?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why such types of resettlement have been opted?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the issues and opportunities faced by displaced residents in their resettled areas?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How was the participatory and democracy practiced in displacement and resettlement process?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the impacts of legal provisions on urban development and socio-economic status of the resettled residents?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How policy provisions and legal formalities for regularization and resettlement are implemented?</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
■ Signifies that the method was very important and primary
□ Signifies the method was secondary that is, applied to supplement the primary methods

Note: The coloured questions are to be covered in the second part of the research (PhD).
4.6 Data analysis
In qualitative research, data analysis is concurrent with data collection and it is a process of transforming data into findings (Patton, 2002). That is, one begins analysing data with the first finding obtained from the first interview, the first observation, the first document accessed in the study. Simultaneous data collection and analysis as Bryman (2004) termed it, is iterative. To be precise, interaction between data collection and analysis enables the researcher to make modification on the data collection methods before finalizing the whole process. This enables a qualitative researcher to use the opportunity to gather more reliable and useful data. With such an opportunity of doing both data collection and analysis at the same time, data analysis became an inductive strategy. That is, one begins with a unit of data (any meaningful word, phrase, narrative, etc.) and compares it to another unit of data, and so on all the while looking for common patterns across the collected data (Merriam 2002:14 and Patton, 2002).

Since this research also used narratives as a data collection method it as well applied it as data analysis approach whereby individual stories were formulated. Narrative analysis is also an approach of qualitative data analysis whereby it emphasises the stories that people employed to account for events which have been collected from different data collection mechanisms (Bryman, 2004). In this research sequence of events were used as another analytical tool whereby stories on events occurred before, during and after displacement and resettlement were structured and made the narrative analysis.

4.7 Unit of analysis
Unit of analysis is the primary focus of data collection which has to be prior decided by the researcher (Patton, 2002). Units of analysis may comprise individual persons, small groups, families, subcultures, formal organisations, agencies or communities, neighbourhoods, cities, states even nations if the focus is on international programs (ibid). In this research unit of analysis was displacement and resettlement process within the upgraded settlement. The process that each individual displaced resident either a house owner or a tenant went through was the unit of analysis. Therefore, each individual displaced resident was considered to be a sub-case.
The stories about their experiences on being displaced and resettled was important data in describing the process of resettlement of displaced residents from the regularized settlements within Dar es Salaam city.

4.8 Reliability and validity
Reliability is a measure of degree to which a different researcher if applying the same procedure as a previous researcher in repeating and not replicating the same case the findings and conclusion will be consistent (Yin, 2009, Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). The aim of doing reliability check is to minimize errors and biases in a research. In order to achieve reliability, this research used the tactic of documenting the research procedures as among the tactics suggested by Yin, (2009) to achieve reliability. The research demonstrated the procedures used in data collection methods. That is by using in-depth interviews and a voice recorder whereby all the interviews were recorded orally and also in writings.

Validity is concerned with the accuracy of the data obtained and how it represents the concepts of the study. It aims at minimizing subjectivity during data collection and analysis (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003). This research applied three different processes; which are construct validity, triangulation and corroboration. For the case of construct validity, this research used multiple sources of evidences about exactly the same issues, which provided convergence of facts during the data collection process.

The other process of achieving validity was triangulation which is a process of collecting data by again using multiple sources whereby the information or facts obtained from each source are corroborated with each other (see figure 4:3). Since case study design usually applies multiple data collection methods (Sheuya, 2004; Yin, 1994) triangulation was easily achieved.

This research for example had a number of data collection methods which includes literature review, interviews, focus group discussions, observations, mapping and photographing. The stories gathered from displaced residents were compared to the information obtained from focus group discussions. These sources were compared during analysis and interpreted for the purpose of corroborating the findings.
The third way of improving validity is by providing the draft research report to be reviewed by selected participants and informants in the case study. This process also facilitated in corroborating essential facts and evidence provided and enhanced accuracy of the case study (Yin, 2009). Due to shortage of time, this approach was not applied in this research.

**Figure 4:1: Corroborating by using multiple sources of data**

![Diagram showing multiple sources of data](source: Yin 2009, modified by the author)

4.9 Generalization
The basis for generalisation in qualitative study is analytical generalisation (Yin, 2009). In qualitative research the researcher's goal is to expand and generalise to theories, not to establish the frequency with which a phenomenon is likely to occur in a population. The power of understanding in qualitative research is based on a detailed knowledge of the particular, and its fine distinction in each perspective (Stake, 1995). Even a single case, if studied in sufficient depth and with sufficient insight, may provide the basis for a theoretical explanation of a general phenomenon. Though there is a problem of generalizing from a case study. According to Colorado State University case study is considered to have inherent subjectivity which comes from qualitative data as they are considered being subjective. Therefore, case study can only be generalized to particular context.
In this research, generalization was made from data analysis through the concepts obtained from justice and collaborative planning theories. The resettlement policy framework was also used in the analysis whereby gaps and issues were identified in relation to theories and framework provisions. By doing that knowledge can be obtained from each individual experience of the displaced and resettled resident through the eyes of communicative and collaborative theory as well as the principles of justice theory. The knowledge can as well as be used in informing policy makers and planning profession by giving indicative ideas of what is happening in the regularization process in general terms.

4.10 Methodological limitations

Even though the research intended to explore the experience of displacement and resettlement from both displaced tenants and house owners, however, it was not possible to trace all the displaced tenants as they were not entitled for any compensation and they were not even being considered for resettlement. In that case, in this research, it was not possible to trace all the affected tenants and gets their views. For example, about twelve tenants were displaced within the selected settlements but only six were traced and found. Unlike tenants all the eight property owners were traced and found within the time limit of this research.

Also the study faced the problem of unwillingness of the respondents to be interviewed. Some of them were uncomfortable in answering some of the questions related on money issues such as the amount of compensation received or their income. Others were completely uncooperative and refuse to be interviewed. Also, some respondents were uncomfortable in letting their properties to be photographed. In that case it was difficult to show and compare the situations during and after displacement.

There was also another exceptional case whereby all the family members of the displaced house owner passed away. Such a situation limited this research to get indicative ideas of the displacement and resettlement process from that particular settlement as it was the only house which was totally demolished and displaced all its residents.
Chapter Five
Narratives from displaced residents

This chapter provides empirical evidence of displacement and resettlement of residents from the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) projects within Manzese and Buguruni wards in Dar es Salaam city. Responses are described in relation to the narratives provided by individual respondents before, during and after displacement and resettlement. In that case the chapter is giving the answer to research question one on where do they displaced residents resettle.

The narratives were then described hand in hand with two options of resettlement that is resettlement within or outside the previous settlements. In the process of describing the narratives issues related to displacement and resettlement were identified. The issues were then deployed to characterize the process of displacement and resettlement within Kilimani, Mnazi Mmoja, and Midizini settlements in Manzese ward and Mnyamani and Madenge settlements in Buguruni ward.

Map 5.1 Location of the case study settlements in Kinondoni and Ilala
5.1 Responses from Manzese settlement
Manzese ward is located in Kinondoni Municipality, approximately 7 kilometers from the city center. It is composed of six sub-wards/settlements. These include: Uzuri, Muungano, Mvuleni, Midizini, Mnazi Mmoja and Kilimani. Among the six sub-wards where Community Infrastructure Upgrading Project was implemented, only one settlement that is Mnazi Mmoja created displacement and resettlement of its residents. The other two, that is Kilimani and Midizini caused total demolition of houses but did not create displacement or resettlement. One of the houses in Kilimani was a church and the other in Midizini was yet to be finished. Hence, the following narratives cover only Mnazi Mmoja settlement. In this settlement a house owned by Bibi Chiku Mbuni was totally demolished and caused displacement and resettlement of herself, her family as well as three tenants namely Bi Hawa Chobo, Said Kongoele, and Hassan Mndolwa.

Map 5.2 Location of Manzese ward and its settlements

4 A sub-ward is a section of the settlement within a ward. It is the smallest unit of Local Government in Tanzania with a population of approximately 5000 people.
5.1.1 The case of Bi Chiku Mbuni, house owner no. 1 from Manzese

Bibi Chiku is a daughter of the late Bi Zubeda binti Ibrahimu Mbuni who was the house owner of house no. MZS/MM/131 which was completely demolished in Mnazi Mmoja settlement, within Dar es Salaam city. Before she retired in 1983, she was working with the Registry of houses here in Dar es Salaam.

Map 5.3 Mnazi Mmoja settlements showing the location of the demolished house of Bi Chiku.

Before Displacement

Bi Chiku was born in Songea region, eighty three years ago and she is a Ngoni by tribe. She had a house in Mnazi Mmoja settlement whereby she was living with her mother, grandson, a daughter in law and three great grandchildren. This is her story of displacement and resettlement.

Bi Chiku narrated that;
“In 1968 me and my parents came to Dar es Salaam city from Songea region and bought a plot, a farm at that time in Manzese ward, at Mnazi Mmoja sub-ward and built a house where we have been living in until 2008. The plot/farm by then measured 30 by 20 meters and it was large enough to build a six roomed house (a Swahili type). The house was built with modern and permanent building materials, which are cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets”.

Bi Chiku continued explaining that; even though their house was meant for family to live in, it also had three tenants occupying three rooms out of the six rooms. The tenants were paying TZS 8,000/= per month per room, equivalent to 5.5 USD according to the 2010 exchange rate\(^5\). While staying in Manzese Bi Chiku explained that within a 10-15 minutes walking distance they were able to access social facilities such as a primary school, a police post and a public bus stop to different parts of Dar es Salaam city. She was able to access a market, hospital and other shopping center at a walking distance in an area called Tandale within the same Manzese ward. Her main source of income was food vending at Gerezani area within Karikoo which is approximately 15 kilometers from Manzese, as well as the rent from the three sublet rooms. Bi Chiku was unable to remember how much she was getting per month on her food vending activities. But through informal interview conducted by the researcher to one of the food vender in Mwenge Dar es Salaam, it was revealed that an average of TZS 10,000/= (about 6.9 USD) a net profit can be obtained per day.

**During Displacement**

Bi Chiku narrated that she was aware of upgrading project which was taking place within her settlement. She said that;

“I heard about upgrading project from the Mtaa Leader who convened a general meeting within the settlement with the intention of informing all the residents”.

---

\(^5\) The exchange rate used was 1 USD = 1450 TZS
Bi Chiku continued explaining that after knowing about the ongoing upgrading project a few days later; Mtaa Leader together with road experts from the Kinondoni Municipality came to Bi Chiku’s place and informed her that, her house is among the houses which have to be totally demolished in order to construct an access road. Bi Chiku then continued narrating that;

“After the experts from the Municipality completed the valuations of properties to be demolished, I was called by the Municipal Officials and I was given a cheque of TZS 11 million (equivalent to USD 7,500) as my compensation and I was asked to start demolishing the house”.

Furthermore, Bi Chiku narrated that, together with her other six family members they started demolishing the house with their own efforts without any assistance from neither the community members nor the Municipal/project officials. Just like any other displaced residents Bi Chiku with some of her family members which include her mother, grandson, her daughter in law and three great grandchildren had to relocate to her farm house in Kiluvya within Pwani region in a settlement called Makurunge. The settlement is within 28 kilometers from her previous house in Manzese Mnazi Mmoja. Bi Chiku continued narrating that;

“I had to relocate to my farm by using the money I received for compensation. I used the same money for relocation expenses as well as building a temporary house I call it a “banda” in my farm in Makurunge in order to avoid becoming homeless”.

When she was asked if there were any resettlement options given by the Mtaa/Project Leaders she said that after being informed about the demolition of their house and being given the cheque for compensation she was then advised by the Municipal Officials not to buy a house within Manzese. Instead she should consider buying plots in a new settlement called Goba which according to Bi Chiku, is the same distance as her existing farm in Kiluvya.

---

*A ‘banda’ is a Swahili word meaning a small house or a hut.*
She narrated that the TZS 11 million (USD 7,500) she received as compensation was not enough for buying a plot in a suggested settlement, Goba and construct a house. The same amount of money was also used for demolition and relocation expenses such as packing and transportation of their belongings.

According to Bi Chiku the TZS 11 million (USD 7,500) was not enough and she could have been satisfied if the amount could have been at least TZS 20 million (equivalent to USD 15,000). She added that if not that amount of compensation then the Municipal Officials could at least assist the displaced residents in demolishing their houses and relocating them to their new settlements. Bi Chiku lamented that;

“I spent about TZS 5 million, (about USD 3,400) for demolition, packing and transportation expenses.”
The same compensation money I also used to pay movement allowances to my three tenants; whereby each of them got TZS 70,000/= (equivalent to USD 50). I also had to give some token amount of money to my relatives who were living with me in our house before demolition so that they can seek for another place to stay. As the ‘banda’ I built in my farm in Makurunge was not enough to accommodate us all”.

According to Bi Chiku, the process of demolition was done within a year after being compensated which to her was too quick to build a decent house and resettle. Given that there was no any other assistance despite the compensation money that was given to her. She also added that it was very fortunate that she had a farm in Kiluvya which she bought while she was still working.

Bi Chiku continued narrating that;

“If I was given a chance to suggest how the process of demolition and relocation should have been done I would have preferred demolition to be done by the project people. Or, the project should cater for the demolition expenses. Also the project should set aside a relocation area, whereby the plots have been surveyed and serviced. If that is not possible, the project should buy suitable plots for each demolished house owner according to our preferences. And, the compensation should be fair and just”.

**After displacement and resettlement**

Bi Chiku narrated that before the displacement together with her late mother, she was also living with her aunt and her two children who are cousins to her. Bi Chiku then lamented that;

“Due to demolition my relatives that is my aunt and two cousins had to go their own way as the resettled ‘banda’ in Makurunge was not big enough for all us. So, the family had to disintegrate; everyone went to her/his own way!”
When it comes to standard of life after displacement Bi Chiku lamented that;

“My living condition has been worsened, due to the fact that the ‘banda’
I resettled to is smaller than my previous, demolished house. That is
only two rooms and it is yet to be finished. Although I have a bigger
plot, to be precise, a farm compared to the plot we owned at Manzese,
but due to my old age I am not strong enough to engage myself into
farming activities. My economic status is very bad as I have no other
sources of income. I just depend on my grandchildren to give me
something to eat”.

Bi Chiku added that she could have used her current personal competence which is
doing petty trading at home. But she has no capital for such an activity. If she had
she could have been selling soft drinks to school children as a primary school is
located about 2 kilometers from her home. In that case her ability to engage herself
in income generating activities was impaired and she became jobless.

When it comes to social disarticulation, Bi Chiku said;

“I associate very well with my new community members; I have even
joined a social group called ‘Jikwamue’ which is currently engaged in
selling powdered soap. Our group is comprised of old ladies just like
me. We have no strength to practice farming which could have been
appropriate for us since we have big farms. The only thing we can do is
to buy powdered soap and divide it into smaller portions and sell it to
Makurunge community members. We decided to do such an activity
since our settlement has no social facilities; it is very difficult even to
buy soap for daily cleanliness”.

Bi Chiku added that in order to get meat and other groceries she has to travel 8
kilometers from her home to a settlement called Kiluvya where she can get such
services. When it comes to medical services she said herself and the rest of
Makurunge community are getting health services from Tumbi Hospital which is 12
kilometers from her home. There are no dispensaries or health centers within her reach. When asked about disruption of education services Bi Chiku said;

“During resettlement my two grandchildren were disturbed as they were schooling at Manzese then they had to shift to Kiluvya. Luckily within our new settlement there are both primary and secondary schools and now they are continuing with their education, one is in form IV and the other in Standard VII this year. If I compare my life before resettlement and now I think the project was unfair to me. Though the main goal of the project was good, that is, aimed at improving the living conditions of the Manzese people but to me as an individual I was not helped. If I was well considered I, just like the rest of the Mnazi Mmoja community, could have enjoyed an improved and better life”.

Bi Chiku explained that she could have relocated somewhere else where there were social facilities. But, she couldn’t afford buying a plot and construct a house with the same amount of money given as compensation. That’s why she opted settling in her previous farm where there is no water supply or public transport.

Bi Chiku explained that;

“It takes three hours to walk from my home to the main (Morogoro) road where I can get public transport to town or to the nearest hospital in Kibaha. The only mode of public transport are motorcycles which cost TZS 2,000-3,000/= (equivalent to USD 1.5-2) per trip. This mode of transport is less frequent and one has to call them from the main road. When it comes to water supply, I get my water from an area known as “Maili Moja” and it costs TZS 20,000 (USD 13.5) per 1,000 liters, TZS 30,000 (USD 20) per 2,000 liters and TZS 45,000 (USD 30) per 3,000 liters. The 1,000 liter for me and the three grandchildren I am living with, can last for only seven days”.
Bi Chiku finished her narration by saying that resettlement made her family disintegrated. She said that, her daughter-in-law who is a widow, and her older grandchild whom were living together before resettlement could not tolerate their new life in Makurunge. They decided to leave Bi Chiku with her great grandchildren who are still schooling and they settled in Kulivya where there are social services and more economic opportunities.

5.1.2 The case of Bi Hawa Said Chobo; tenant no.1 from Manzese settlement
Bi Hawa Said Chobo is a Matumbi by tribe, originating from Kilwa which is located in the southern part of Tanzania. She is illiterate and could not remember exactly when she was born, but her daughter Bi Rehema Bakari, who was there during the interview, estimated her age to be about 60 years. Bi Hawa is among the three tenants who were displaced after the house they rented was totally demolished to provide an access road within Mnazi Mmoja settlement.

Before displacement and resettlement
Bi Hawa narrated her story as follows:

“I have been in Mnazi Mmoja settlement since 1984. The reason for me to migrate from Kilwa to Dar es Salaam was to find employment opportunities in informal sector. Before coming to Dar es Salaam I was married and I had three children; two females and one male. My husband passed away that’s why I decided to come to Dar es Salaam to start a new life. All my children have attained primary education, but I did not have a chance to go to school”.

She continued her story by saying that;

“After my arrival in Mnazi Mmoja settlement, I rented a room in Bi Chiku’s house in which I lived there for more than 10 years with my mother and my three children. I engaged myself in petty trading activities of selling charcoal at the veranda of the house. I was paying a room rent of TZS 8,000/= per month (equivalent to 5.5 USD). The room
was big enough to accommodate two beds with the size of 3.5 inches and other household appliances. The house was built of cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. I had access to social services such as primary school, hospital, market, police post, bus stop for public transport within 20-30 minutes walking distance”.

During displacement and resettlement

Bi Hawa continued her story by saying that she was not aware of the upgrading project within her settlement. She said that;

“The information about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program reached me through fellow residents who were informed by Mtaa Leaders in public meeting which I did not attend. As a tenant I was not involved in the project since, I was represented by the house owner. But about a year later, I was told by the house owner that the house was going to be demolished hence we should be ready for that. I was also told by the house owner that I will be given money which will facilitate me to find another room elsewhere and, transportation allowance. However things did not go as I was told. I was given TZS 70,000/= (equivalent to USD 50) only by the house owner, which was not enough to pay for a new room somewhere else”.

Bi Hawa continued her story by saying that apart from receiving that amount of money she did not get any assistance from either the Project Team or Mtaa Leaders. She had to leave the house to pave way for the owner to demolish it for project implementation. She said that the process of displacement caused her family to disintegrate. It was during this time that one of her children, her son, was separated from the family by going back to their village in Kilwa. The reason was, the room acquired after relocation was not adequate to accommodate all of them. In the previous house, the son was sleeping in the corridor free of charge. In the new house there was no such a corridor and the room was even smaller, enough to accommodate one single bed of 3 by 6 inches and a small table. Hence the process of displacement caused Bi Hawa’s family to disintegrate. Bi Hawa lamenting that;
“The amount of money I received was not enough to find a new room to rent since most of the house owners claim one year advance rent payment. After negotiation with the new house owner it was reduced to a six months advance payment. I chose to stay in Manzese because it is the place where I can conduct my livelihood activities, that is petty trading of charcoal outside my room”.

**After displacement and resettlement**

When Bi Hawa was asked to compare her life in the former house and the present one, she said that there was no difference when it comes to access to social facilities. She had just moved to the second house from her previous one. That is she was within the same settlement. When comparing the previous room and the present, Bi Hawa said that, she is living in a smaller room than the previous one. It is more dilapidated than the previous one though it is made of cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. She is also paying much more than the previous room, that is, TZS 15,000/= (equivalent to 10 USD) per room per month. This is almost twice as much as her previous rent.

Furthermore, Bi Hawa Chobo said that the process of displacement and relocation was not fair to her. As a tenant, she was not informed about the project.
Also the amount of compensation paid to her was not enough to enable her to find another room to rent. She said the rooms were more expensive and the landlords preferred advance rent payments of 10-12 months which is too much for a poor tenant like herself.

5.1.3 The case of Mr. Said Mwinchande Kongoele, tenant no.2 from Manzese settlement

Mr. Said Mwinchande Kongoele is 31 years old male, married with two children, aged ten and seven years old, Yao by tribe, originated from Mtwar region. He is a plumber, working with Dar es Salaam Water and Sanitation Cooperation (DAWASCO) as a casual labor. He said that in his former settlement he was close to Mpakani primary school which is about 200 meters from where his home was. But now in Mabibo the same school is about 600 meter. In this school was where his children were attaining their education.

Before displacement and resettlement

Mr. Said Kongoele was the second tenant of Bi Chiku Mbuni who was displaced in order to pave way for Community Infrastructure Project implementation in Dar es Salaam City. Mr. Said started his narration by saying that;

“I came to Dar es Salaam in 1990 from Mafia where I was working as a plumber. In Dar es Salaam I settled at Mnazi Mmoja settlement from 1990 to 2006, because it was easier to get a room to rent. Besides, it was closer to DAWASCO Magomeni branch, which was my working place. I usually used to walk to my work place. I shifted from Mafia to Dar es Salaam in search of employment as I am a plumber. When renting at Bi Chiku, I used to pay TZS 8,000/= (equivalent to USD 5.8) per month per room. The room was big enough to accommodate a 6 by 6 inches bed, a sofa and a coffee table. It was built by cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets.

When it comes to accessibility to social facilities Mr. Kongoele narrated that:
At Mnazi Mmoja I had access to social facilities including, hospital, primary school, police post, market, water supply system and reliable public transport within a walking distance”.

During displacement and resettlement

During displacement and resettlement process, Mr. Said, just like Bi Hawa Chobo had about the project through his fellow residents of Mnazi Mmoja. He narrated that;

“I heard about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program through residents who were informed by Mtaa Leaders during a public meeting held in mid-2007 within the settlement. As a tenant I was not involved in the project since, I was represented by the house owner. Later I was informed by the house owner that the house is going to be demolished. Therefore I and other tenants should look for alternative rooms to rent”.

With regard to assistance which he was supposed to get in facilitating his movement during displacement Mr. Said said that:

I was further told that I will be given some money that enables me to find a room elsewhere and facilitate transportation costs. The relocation fund was reported to be TZs 300,000/= (equivalent to 207 USD). During compensation things did not go as informed before. I was given TZS 70,000/= (equivalent to 50 USD) only by the house owner which was not enough to get another room as well as other relocation costs”.

Mr. Said further said that apart from receiving that amount of money he did not get any assistance from the Project Team, Mtaa Leadership or house owner. He had to leave the house as soon as possible so that the owner of the house could start demolishing the house. He narrated that:

“I shifted to another settlement called Mabibo which is adjacent to Manzese ward. I had to find my own means of financing the relocation.”
In this new settlement I was paying TZS 15,000/= (equivalent to 10 USD) per room per month. I stayed in Mabibo for about a year then I moved back to Manzese where I got a room at Midizini settlement. I had to come back to Manzese as I am used to the settlement; actually I stayed there for more than ten years”.

In Midizini, Mr. Said was paying the same amount of rent that is TZS 15,000/= (equivalent to 10 USD) per room per month as it was in Mabibo. He was still doing plumbing works in Magomeni.

**After displacement and resettlement**

The process of displacement did not cause any family disintegration to Mr. Said, though there was a time that his children were attending school in Manzese while staying in Mabibo. It was a bit far for them to walk than when they were in Mnazi Mmoja. Since they have moved back to Manzese, he said the kids are not walking that far anymore.

Mr. Said compared his life in former settlement and present. He said in terms of access to social services there is no any noticeable difference everything is still the same as he managed to come back to Manzese. The situation was also the same in terms of customers for his plumbing activities and distance to his working area. He concluded his narration by saying that;

> “Being a tenant I cannot comment if the project was fair or beneficial to me. I am a tenant, and my importance comes with the rent that I pay. If I don’t pay I am evicted. In that case I am not involved in this development issues as I am a temporary resident in the settlement. The rights and regulations for tenants should be followed and be given due consideration by the Local Leaders. As for now, our value in the city is the rent that we pay and nothing more”.
5.1.4 The case of Mr. Hassan Mndolwa, tenant no.3 from Manzese settlement

Mr. Hassan Mndolwa was the third tenant in Bi Chiku Mbuni’s house within Mnazi Mmoja settlement. He is a Sambaa by tribe, originating from Tanga region. He is 24 years of age, single and working in an informal garage as a welding expert within Mnazi Mmoja settlement.

Before displacement and resettlement

Mr. Mndolwa had been in Manzese for six years (from 2000 to 2006) when the house he was renting was demolished to pave way for road construction in the settlement. Before coming to Manzese, Mr. Mndolwa was living in Mzambarauni in Gongo la Mboto ward, some 15 kilometers from Manzese ward. Mr. Mndolwa was very uncomfortable with the interview to the extent that he did not want to get seated and couldn’t tolerate to finish it. He ran back to his working place, a garage very near to the office of Mtaa Leaders of Mnazi Mmoja settlement. When he was asked why he came to settle in Mnazi Mmoja all the way from Tanga to Dar es Salaam, he said he was looking for employment opportunities especially in informal sector. This is because there are more opportunities in Dar es Salaam than in Tanga. He specialized in metal welding activities and his level of education is standard seven which is difficult to get job in the formal employment sectors.

During displacement and resettlement

Mr. Mndolwa while standing narrated his short story on the displacement process as follows;

“When I arrived in Manzese I was not yet married though am still single till now. I managed to rent a room in Bi Chiku’s house which was later demolished to pave way for road construction. I was paying a rent of TZS 7,000/= (equivalent to 4.6USD) per month per room. The house was built with cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. I accessed social facilities such as hospital, police post, market and various shopping centers within a walking distance”.

Mr. Mndolwa said that he heard about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program through fellow residents who were informed by the Mtaa Leaders in public
meeting that were convened within the settlement mid-2007. Just like the other previous two tenants, Mr. Mndolwa also said that he was not called in the meeting as he was represented by his house owner. Also, he later was informed about relocating the house due to demolition to pave way for road construction.

When Mr. Mndolwa was asked to narrate his story during displacement and relocation, he was very uncomfortable and seemed to be in a hurry to go back to his work. When asked if he was compensated for displacement he said he cannot remember. Then when asked if he got any assistance for displacement and relocation, he quickly said that:

“I was given six months’ notice by the house owner to look for alternative room to rent, and I did that. Since I was single I had no pressure of thinking about where to go with the family. So there were no any worries of disintegration since I don’t have any family”.

After displacement and resettlement

Mr. Mndolwa said that he is presently living in Manzese Bakheresa about a kilometer away from his previous settlement. He was still walking to his work place and he was paying a rent of about TZS 15,000/= (equivalent to 10 USD) per room per month, more than twice as much as he was paying at Bi Chiku’s house. He said he could not give his opinion on whether the process of displacement and resettlement was fair to him since it happened long time ago and he had forgotten.

5.1.5 Narratives from Local Leaders

After listening to the stories of affected residents from Manzese, it was important to hear from the Local Leaders as they were directly involved in the project. The narrations from Mtaa Leaders were obtained during a focus group discussion conducted at Mnazi Mmoja Mtaa leadership office. It comprised of eight respondents who included the current Mtaa Chairperson, Mtaa Executive Officer, and six members of Community Planning Team (CPT). The discussion was done partly to corroborate the information obtained from the individual displaced residents and partly as a way of getting the other side of the story about the process of
displacement and resettlement within the settlement from Local Officials’ point of view.

Mzee Mussa Mmanga, who was a Community Planning Team member, started the narrations as follows;

“The Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) was introduced in early 2005 through a public meeting held here in Manzese. The meeting was supposed to include all the Mnazi Mmoja residents, CIUP team and officials from Kinondoni Municipality. In that general meeting we were asked to select zone representative who would be informing their zone people about the project as well as participating in the whole process of implementing the project as community planning team”.

Plate 5.5. Mtaa chairperson giving a general introduction

Plate 5.6. CPT member explaining the history of CIUP in Mnazi Mmoja
Another CPT member, Bi Maria Mapunda continued with the discussion by narrating what happened after the selection of the zone representatives and how they formulated the Community Planning Team (CPT). She narrated that;

“After being introduced to the CIUP project, we zones representatives were asked to convene public meetings in our respective zones for the purpose of informing the rest of the community about the project. As Community Planning Team (CPT) we were selected amongst residents residing in the Mnazi Mmoja sub-ward together with our Local Leaders”.

According to the discussions the Mnazi Mmoja Community Planning Team (CPT) comprised of twenty members whereas eight were the Local Leaders and the remaining twelve were normal residents of Mnazi Mmoja. In order to get the twenty representatives, the participants of the discussions explained that, the sub-ward was divided into four zones whereby in each zone three CPT members were elected as representatives and had a responsibility of being a link between the community and Project Officials. The participants also explained the reaction of the community members when introduced to the project implementation ideas. Bi Maria continues explaining that:

“During introductory meetings within our zones, residents had various reactions towards the project. Some were very positive about it; some were just reluctant and others were negative. Those who opposed had thoughts that they won’t be compensated with loss of their properties”.

Bi Maria also added an explanation about their duties as the CPT members. She said that:

“As CPT members we had a duty of convincing the community to accept the project including the contribution of TZS 30,000/= (equivalent to 21 USD) per house. This contribution was meant to cover 5 percent
of the project implementation costs. Another contribution was for the community to be willing to give their land for public uses when needed to do so”.

The discussion continued with an explanation on how affected properties were identified and demolished for the implementation of the infrastructure project. The CPT members narrated that the properties which were totally or partially demolished were selected /identified through survey. The surveys involved CPT members of that particular zone, and representative from Mtaa Leaders, Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) staff and experts from the Municipality. The surveys identified minimum planning standards which were followed in order to provide infrastructure within the settlement. The standard was formulated in order to avoid much demolition as the project aimed at keeping most of the residents in the same place. Also the demolition would have increased the project costs as it was expensive to provide compensations for each affected property either fully or partially demolished.

With such an identified minimum planning standards, some few properties were found totally on the way on which a road was supposed to pass and some were partly into it. The ones which were completely falling on the way were marked with an X for total demolition and those which were partly into the way were also marked with an X with the extent of demolition.
Another CPT member, Bi Halima Mgana added that:

“House/property owners had different reactions in the surveying process. Some of them feared that their houses were going to be demolished without adequate compensation. Others rushed to build on the vacant land so that in case their plots were taken, they can claim more compensation. Others were resistant to the process, by deleting the X mark or reducing the extent of demolition”.

Plate 5.9: Demarcation on a house showing the extent of demolition

The other participants, of the Focus Group Discussion Mr. Ally Mkasi and Riziki Chaula who were zones representatives from two different streets in Mnazi Mmoja added that;

“The process of displacing residents from their settlement for infrastructure provision was rational and participatory. There was freedom of speech whereby house /property owners were free to express their feelings towards demolition and compensation. All these processes were done through public meetings, and sometimes affected residents had a chance to negotiate their satisfactions with project team”.

From the researcher’s point of view, what the CPT members were explaining in the discussions seemed to be what they were instructed during the introductory seminar. The Community Planning Team (CPT) was formed in order to bridge the project officials and the community. In that case the CPT members were narrating what was provided in the Resettlement Policy Framework, which was used as a guiding tool towards the implementation of the project. That is why the above narrations were to some extent contrary to responses from the affected land owners and tenants.

Nevertheless, the four CPT members continued explaining how the identification and demolition of the affected properties was conducted. The CPT members explained that;

“Furthermore, before demolition process was executed the following procedures were followed. When identifying/selecting the properties/houses to be demolished; all properties which were obstructing the proposed access road were identified through measuring right of way of the particularly road and marked with X. Then property valuation followed: the valuation of every property selected for demolition was done by Municipal Valuation Officers in order to make the compensation fair as it is stated in the concerned regulations, Resettlement Policy Framework being one of them”.

It was also explained that after valuations of the affected properties, the unsatisfied property owners were given a chance for negotiation with Community Planning Team (CPT) members; Municipal Experts and CIUP team until the consensus were reached. The CPT members then continued saying that:

“Then the actual compensation followed. This was made by issuing bank cheques to affected house owners who were asked to open bank account at National Microfinance Bank (NMB), Magomeni Branch. The final activity was that of demolition of houses and relocation of the displaced residents. This process was done individually by the property owners or tenants using the compensation money they had received”.
In the course of the discussion, the CPT members described their roles as community planning team as well as Mtaa Leaders in the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) project. They explained their roles to be: Creating awareness and educating the people of their respective zones on the importance of the CIUP project to be implemented in their settlement. The CPT also urged the affected house owners to release their land as soon as possible in order to facilitate the implementation of the project. The CPT also ensured that all properties that were earmarked for partial or total demolition were demolished as according the demarcation made by the Municipal Experts. They also had a duty of collaborating with the Municipal Authorities to demolish properties whose owners were reluctant in demolishing their property while already received compensation. The CPT also had a role of collecting the 5 percent contribution which was agreed to be paid by each house. When asked about the response of the community on that, they said that the response from normal residents was very low, only the business houses like restaurants and bars that were willing to pay the contribution.

According to the participants of the Focus Group Discussion (FGD), the actual resettlement in Mnazi Mmoja settlement took place in 2006/07 when the project was on the implementation phase. After each affected resident was compensated the individual person was given a maximum of one year to leave the settlement and settle anywhere he/she found convenient. There was no land set aside for resettlement neither by the Municipal Authority nor by Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) team for displaced residents. When asked why there was no resettlement arrangement, they responded that it was not part of the project. The project provided only compensation and each affected individual was free to find a suitable place for themselves. The CPT members even gave an example of Bi Chiku Mbuni, whose house was totally demolished, and she opted to go to her farm in Kiluvyya where she is living till to date. The participants of FGD also emphasized that;

“The Mtaa Leaders and Community Planning Team (CPT) members had no role in the displacement and resettlement process. The World Bank as a main sponsor of this project stated that people who were
eligible to be compensated on the process of resettlement were the affected house owners and tenants. House owners had to be paid according to the value of their property as indicated in valuation report. The tenants were given movement allowance by their house owners that will help them to shift their properties to the resettlement place of their own choice”.

The participants also added that the process of compensation was not as open and participatory as it was for other processes such as identification, demarcation or even demolition. The compensation involved the affected house owners and the Municipal Officials, in the absence of the CPT as well as Mtaa Leaders. Hence the FGD participants failed to comment whether the payments were done as stated in the evaluation reports or not.

Mzee Omary, who is among the Community Planning Team (CPT) Member and the chairperson of one of the Mitaas in Mnazi Mmoja settlement, concluded the discussions by explaining that;

“Displacement and resettlement of the residents within Mnazi Mmoja settlement was democratic and participatory for only 35 percent the remaining 65 percent was not. This is because the number of CPT member was reduced day by day during the actual implementation of the project. It started with twenty CPT members whereby eight were Mtaa Leaders and the remaining twelve were zone representatives”.

The Community Planning Team (CPT) also explained that their participation in the project implementation was also affected with the reduced number of CPT member with the reason of insufficient funding for CPT daily allowances. The CPT members explained that:

“Within no time we were told that there is a shortage of funding therefore the available money was not enough to pay for the daily allowances for the twenty CPT members. Therefore, the number of CPT members was reduced from twenty to two in order to reduce
costs. The absence of CPT members in the actual implementation contributed in ineffective implementation of the project. It gave a room for other people to vandalize the project for personal and political interests. For example, some properties which were earmarked for demolition were not demolished till 2011. This hindered the implementation of the project.”

Furthermore, the participants of the discussions also revealed their concerns about the standard of infrastructure which was provided in the absence of the CPT participation, they said that:

“All, some of the infrastructure was provided below the agreed standard. For example, the poles for street lights were falling down one by one each day before even the project was handed over. When officials were asked about the situation no answers were given to such cases. The absence of CPT in the implementation sites reduced transparency and therefore affected democracy”.

The focused group discussion finalized the narratives from the Manzese settlement. Different narratives from different cases reveal that, the displaced residents were showing their grievances and dissatisfaction towards the project. It can be assumed that, it was because the affected residents did not benefit from the project as they thought they would. Nevertheless, the Local Officials were explaining on how the project was supposed to be conducted according to the donor’s requirements. Also they showed dissatisfaction as well when it comes to the actual implementation of the project and during the compensation process. This was because the intended participatory and democratic approach of the project was not practiced as it was supposed to. That resulted into downfall of the project implementation as well as unfair compensation and resettlement process.

5.2 Narratives from Buguruni settlements
Buguruni is a ward in Ilala district within Dar es Salaam city. It comprises of four subwards/settlements that is Madenge, Mnyamani, Malapa and Mtambani. The Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) was implemented in all the
four settlements but it created displacement and resettlement of residents in only two of them. These settlements include Mnyamani whereby three houses were totally demolished in order to facilitate the provision of public toilets. The fourth house was from Madenge settlement which was demolished to pave way for provision of an access road.

**Map 5.4 Location of Buguruni ward and its settlements**

The infrastructure project in Buguruni involved the construction of access roads, public toilets, storm water drainage systems and refuse collection points. These projects caused total demolition of the four houses in the settlement.

The affected properties include the house of Bi Nuru Hega in Mnyamani, which had six rooms, all rented out. The other house belonged to Mzee Pindu also in Mnyamani, which had four rooms. Two rooms were for his family and the other two were rented to two tenants. The third house belonged to deceased Mzee Mohamed
Salum from Mnyamani settlement. The property was inherited by his son Mr. Salum Mohamed, who was found within the same Mnyamani settlement. Mr. Mohamed refused to be interviewed as he couldn’t see how the interview would benefit him. One house was in Madenge settlement belonged to Mr. Salehe and Mrs. Zainabu Zogolo.

Map 5.5: Location of demolished houses in Mnyamani settlement

The following narrations are for the three house owners, and four tenants of Bi Nuru as the other tenants of Mzee Pindu and Mzee Salehe Zongolo were not found. It was informed that they had relocated far away from Mnyamani and Madenge they could not be traced.

5.2.1 The case of Mzee Said Sultan Hariri (Mzee Pindu), house owner no.1 from Mnyamani settlement
Mzee Pindu is among the three people in Mnyamani settlement whose houses were demolished to pave way for the implementation of Community Infrastructure
Program (CIUP). He is a Zaramo by tribe, born in 1943 in Chole village in Kisarawe district within coastal region. He is married with seven children and five grandchildren. He retired in 1995 as a dark room expert at the local newspaper company known as the Daily News Cooperation. His main sources of income were his salary, rents from his rooms, farming and petty trading.

**Before displacement and resettlement**

Mzee Pindu narrated his story before resettlement process as follows:

“In early 1960’s I shifted from Kisarawe, my district of domicile and came to Dar es Salaam to look for a job. In 1969 I bought a plot at Buguruni within Mnyamani settlement. In 1970 I constructed my first house of four bedrooms, using mud and poles for walls and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. After the construction of this house I settled and established my life in Mnyamani. I was working with Daily News cooperation as a messenger and later on I was promoted into Dark room expert within the same company. In 1995 I retired from job employment for Daily News and I got my pension which I used it to build another house on the same plot in Mnyamani settlement, opposite to the old house”.

Mzee Pindu narrated that from his pension money he managed to build a modern house with six bedrooms with cement blocks for walls and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. He and his family that is his wife, seven children and five grandchildren moved to the new house and rented out all the four rooms in the old house. The four tenants were paying TZS 15,000/= per room per month, equivalent to 10 USD. His main sources of income before displacement were his salary, house rent collected from the four tenants and petty business done within his premises.

With regard to accessibility to social facilities, Mzee Pindu said that there were two schools; two police posts and a health center within Mnyamani settlement. He also added that there were some shops, a market, water supply and a bus stop within
200 meters away from his residence. Mzee Pindu did not involve himself in any social group or network although they existed within his settlement.

Plates 5:10 and 11. Showing the remains and plot where Mzee Pindu’s four rooms house was located.

**During Displacement and resettlement**

Mzee Pindu continued narrating his story during the process of displacement. He said that he was informed about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) through Local Leaders that there would be an upgrading project in their settlement. He said they were urged to accept the project by contributing to it either by giving their land for public uses or cash to cover the 5 percent of the project costs. Mzee Pindu explained that:

“The announcement said that if anybody has an alternative place to go he/she can sell his/her house to the project so that the land can be used for the implementation of the project. Since I was not able to improve on my old house of mud and poles, in 2007 I agreed to sell it to the project for 8 million shillings (equivalent to USD 5,520). In 2008, I relocated to my long time farm in Chanika and built a small hut for me to live in”.

Mzee Pindu continued his narrations by explaining the plans he had after relocating to Chanika. He narrated that:
“In Chanika I started farming activities as I was retired and also started building my bigger house so that my wife, kids and grandchildren could come and live with me when it is finished. At that time, I was satisfied with the amount of compensation I was paid as I wanted to improve on my farming activities and have a bigger and modern house for my family to live in it”.

Unfortunately, Mzee Pindu refused to let his new unfinished house to be photographed. However, since relocation Mzee Pindu was not able to resume to his normal life. He cultivated his farm and harvested enough for his home consumption only. He said he is not getting many returns from his efforts due to climate changes resulting into extended droughts which affect the yield of his crops.

**After displacement and resettlement**

Mzee Pindu narrated that immediately after receiving his compensation he moved to his farm in Chanika. He said it was the closest he could have afforded to go in order to be near to Mnyamani, his old settlement and where his family was still residing. He added that it was cheaper for him to relocate to his farm that he bought in 1988 when he was employed and use the compensation money to construct a new house. He also wanted to concentrate more in farming activities which he referred as his personal competence. He was cultivating oranges, mangoes and coconut together with other seasonal crops such as maize, sweet potatoes and cassava. He continued with the construction of his farm house which, according to him, is more modern with a master bedroom, living room, big kitchen, five other bedrooms and worshiping place (a mini mosque). Mzee Pindu continued his narration with a disappointing voice, by saying that;

“I have not been able to finish building my dream house as such my wife and children are still in Mnyamani and therefore my family has been disintegrated. Life after displacement has not been the same because the house is yet unfinished. My current income generating activity is farming which is unpredictable. In addition I get TZS 25,000/= (equivalent to 17 USD) per month per room as I rented out
four rooms out of six in my house in Mnyamani so that I can increase my income and support my big family”.

With regard to his access to social facilities in his new settlement, Mzee Pindu said that; He could access facilities such as, market, police post, a bus stop for public transport and hospital about 2 kilometers away from his house. He continued narrating that his relocation did not disrupt any education services for his children since they did not move with him to the new place. He added that, he feels at home in this resettlement area but has not yet joined any social networks although they do exist. Mzee Pindu finished his narration by saying that;

“I accepted the amount I was given as compensation because I wanted the money in order to invest on housing improvement and starting farming activities. I neither received any assistance from the project nor from any community member during displacement and resettlement. That made me use the same amount of money for such process instead of investing on my projects. I feel okay in my new community although I miss my family as they have not yet joined me since the house is not yet finished”.

5.2.2 The case of Mzee Salehe Zogolo and Bibi Zainabu Ramadhani Zogolo, house owner no. 2 from Madenge settlement

Mzee Salehe and his wife Bibi Zainabu Zogolo are among the people in Madenge settlement within Buguruni ward whose house was totally demolished to pave way for implementation of Community Infrastructure Program (CIUP). Mzee Salehe and his wife are both Zaramo, the husband is 87 years while the wife is about 80 years old. They were born in Kisangida Kisarawe in Coastal region. The couple had no children and their main source of income was Bi Zainabu’s salary while working with cashew nuts processing company, rooms’ rents and petty trading. Here is their experience of displacement as it was narrated by the husband, Mzee Salehe.
Before displacement and relocation

In 1946 Mzee Salehe and his wife moved from Kisarawe District and came to live in Buguruni Madenge. His wife, Bibi Zainabu was employed in TANITA an industry dealing with processing of cashew nuts. Then they bought a plot at Buguruni Madenge and constructed a residential house of four bedrooms and a sitting room. The house was built with mud and poles for walls and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. In their house they had three tenants who were occupying three rooms. Mzee Salehe and his wife occupied the other room and a sitting room since they were just the two of them, with no children. Mzee Salehe continued narrating that:

“At that time our three tenants use to pay TZS 4,000/= (equivalent to 2.8 USD) as rent per room per month. Even though our house was dilapidated it was accessed to social facilities like Amana hospital, two primary schools, water and electricity supply, a police post and a public bus stop within a distance of 100-500 meters from our house”.

Map 5.6 Location of the demolished house of Mzee Salehe Zogolo in Buguruni Madenge
During displacement and resettlement

Just like the previous house owners, Mzee Salehe heard about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) through Mtaa Leaders. The Mtaa Leaders were required by the Ilala Municipality to convene a public meeting and inform the residents about the project so that they become aware and be willing to share the cost of implementing it. Mzee Salehe added that they were informed through the public meeting that the project costs have to be shared by the community. Mzee Salehe added that:

“We were told that the Madenge community member has to contribute 5 percent of the total project cost. In that case, every house had to contribute TZS 30,000/= (equivalents to 20 USD). The amount could have been paid at once or in installments”.

In 2006 Mzee Salehe’s house was earmarked for demolition to pave way for road construction. Mzee Salehe said that they were compensated about TZS 5.1 million (equivalent to USD 3,517). The amount which Mzee Salehe said wasn’t enough to build a new house. That’s why they decided to buy a house in Buguruni Kisiwani so as to reduce costs of construction.

Mzee Salehe continued narrating that demolition of the house to give land for infrastructure did affect their life socially and economically. The couple’s source of income was mainly petty trading and house rent they collected from the three tenants. Mzee Salehe said that displacement did cause disturbance to him and his wife even though it somehow helped them to transform their life, from dilapidated house to a new and modern one. Mzee Salehe narrated that:

“We used the money we received for compensation to buy a house in Buguruni Kisiwani, about 2 kilometers away from the demolished house. The new house is built with cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. It as well has three bedrooms.”
After displacement and relocation

Mzee Salehe finished his narrations by saying that, displacement has caused them social disarticulation. This is because they have lost their neighbors who were helping each other in times of problems. He added that they also feel marginalized since they have resettled in a society which have different ethnic group from theirs. Hence they are regarded as strangers and that made them feel uncomfortable within their new settlement.

Generally, Mzee Salehe is grateful with the CIUP project as it facilitated them to have a better house with sanitation systems. The previous house did not have any. He said they use to empty their liquid waste when it rains, but now they have a proper toilet with sanitation system. They also have two tenants in their house one pays TZS 7,000/= (equivalent to USD 4.8) per month per room and the other one pays TZS 10,000/= (equivalent to USD 6.9) per month per room, since their rooms differ in sizes.
5.2.3 The case of Bi Nuru Hega, house owner no.3 from Mnyamani settlement

Bi Nuru Mohamed Hega is a Zaramo by tribe, aged 36 years old. She was born in Chanika, Ilala district, about 30 kilometers away from Buguruni-Mnyamani settlement. Since both of her parents passed away, Bi Nuru takes care of all the family properties in Buguruni as well as those in their home land Chanika. She narrated her experience of displacement and resettlement as follows:

**Before displacement and resettlement**

“In early 1970’s my father came to live in Buguruni. He then bought a plot at Buguruni Mnyamani in 1975. He constructed a residential house of six bedrooms by using mud and pole for walls and roofed it with corrugated iron sheets. In that time my father was working with National Milling Cooperation which was supplying foods such as rice, maize, beans, wheat etc. The house was occupied by part of our family and four tenants. The rest of our family was still in Chanika. The four tenants by then, were paying TZS 4,000/= (equivalent to USD 2.8) as rent per room per month. After the death of my father in 1994 I inherited that house, and rented all the six rooms and I moved back to Chanika to live with the rest of the extended family”.

Bi Nuru added that in 2006 she was approached by the Mtaa Leader, and informed that she had to let her house be demolished with a compensation so as to pave way for construction of public toilet in Mnyamani settlement. She continued narrating that:

“The demolition of the house did not affect me that much since by that time I was already living in Chanika. The house was fully occupied with tenants; they were the ones who got displaced. I can even recall one of my tenants who was also a distant relative, Mzee Kinyago faced difficulties in getting an alternative house to rent for his family. He was the last tenant to relocate from the house”.
During displacement and resettlement

Bi Nuru continued narrating that she knew about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) through the tenant who was also related to her, Mzee Kinyago. She explained that:

“Mzee Kinyago was a head tenant of my house. He was responsible for collecting all the rents from the other tenants and also taking care of the house on my behalf. This is because I was living in Chanika, which is about 25 kilometers from Mnyamani.”
He was responsible of all affairs related to the house. Mzee Kinyago was sent by the Mtaa Leader to inform me that the project acquired my house to pave way for infrastructure provision. Mzee Kinyago also informed me that those who are willing to give away their houses would be compensated for the loss of their property.

After receiving the information from Mzee Kinyago about the implementation of the project in Mnyamani, Bi Nuru Hega explained that she thought it was a good idea to let her house being demolished for the benefit of the Mnyamani people and hers as well. Since the house was getting old and she had no means of renovating it. She narrated that:

“Since my house was old, constructed with mud and poles it was very much dilapidated and I had no other sources of income to improve it. I thought it was a good deal to give it away and get some money to improve our house in Chanika which we are living now. After the house was valuated, I was entitled to be compensated the amount of TZS 8 million (equivalent to USD 5500)”.

Bi Nuru continued narrating that in 2008 she was given her bank cheque and she was at the same time required to demolish her house and handled the empty plot to the project.

**After displacement and resettlement**

Bi Nuru did not experienced issues related to displacement and relocation as she was already living in Chanika even before displacement. In that case, she said that she benefited from the upgrading project since she was able to use the money she got for compensation to improve their house in Chanika. She added that the improved house had four bedrooms and a sitting room. It was built with cement blocks and roofed by corrugated iron sheets. She admitted that the project was fair to her since it facilitated her to build a modern house and strengthened her small business activities in Chanika.
5.2.4 The case of Mzee Ally Athmani Kinyago, tenant no.1 from Mnyamani settlement

Mzee Ally Athmani Kinyago was born 74 years ago in Kazimzumbwe village within Kisarawe district. He is also a Zaramo by tribe. He came to Mnyamani settlement in 1970 looking for a market for fruits vending business. He is still a petty businessman married with five children. He finished his primary education in 1950s. His wife is illiterate, his four children have reached standard seven and the 5th born is now in class seven. Mzee Kinyago’s main source of income was fruit vending in Mnyamani market as well as petty trading activities done by his wife at home. The wife sells buns, fried cassava, etc.

Before displacement

Mzee Kinyago was one of the four tenants in Bi Nuru Hega’s house. He was renting three rooms out of six, and paid TZS 8,000/= (equivalent to USD 5.5) per room per month. Mzee Kinyago started his narration by saying that:

“The house I was renting was constructed with mud and poles and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. It had no electricity but was accessed with social services such as a primary school, hospital, shopping center, market, police post, water supply and a bus stop for public transport within 200-500 meters. I was also a member of a social network called “kuzikana” which was dealing with assisting each other during death and funeral services within the settlement”.

During displacement

As according to Mzee Kinyago, he was informed about the upgrading project when he was contacted by the Mtaa Leader and Project Officials and asked to set an appointment with the house owner who lived in Chanika. He was also informed that the project had to demolition the house to pave way for construction of a public toilet. Just like the other tenants in Manzese, Mzee Kinyago lamented that he was not involved in the project. He continued by narrating that;

“I was not so much involved in the upgrading project. I only knew about it when I was asked to inform the house owner that she was needed by
the Mtaa Leader and Municipal Officials. When the house owner came, she was asked to sell the house to the project so as to provide a space for access road. The house owner agreed and she informed me and the rest of the tenants that we had three months’ notice to look for alternative house to rent since she had sold the house to the upgrading project”.

Mzee Kinyago continued saying that he, like the rest of the affected tenants were not compensated even a single cent. They just looked for alternative houses and relocated without any assistance from neither the house owner nor the Mtaa Leaders.

**After displacement and resettlement**

According to Mzee Kinyago, he was lucky to secure a house within the same Mnyamani settlement. He was able to rent two rooms for TZS 15,000/= (equivalent to USD 10) per month per room, which is almost twice as much compared to the previous house before resettlement. Mzee Kinyago continued his narrations by saying that:

“Compared to the previous house, the current two rooms I am renting were unfinished and dilapidated, but I had no choice but to renovate them at my own costs. I had to do that because I was afraid that I would become homeless since the three months that we were given to relocate were too short”.

Plate 5:15: The unfinished rented room of Mzee Kinyago.

Plate 5:16: Mama Kinyago preparing buns for sale.
When Mzee Kinyago was asked about his economic status after relocation, he lamented that;

“I feel that I am worse than before displacement and resettlement. This is because I used all my savings to get and renovate the house I am renting now. Also I have not been able to work for one and a half years now since am suffering from kidney problems. My main activity is still petty trading; with my sickness I can only do small business like selling buns and other bites outside my house. I cannot continue with fruit vending in the market as I used to do since I came to Mnyamani”.

When it comes to access to social facilities, Mzee Kinyago had not missed anything since he was still within the same Mnyamani settlement. Mzee Kinyago concluded his narrations by saying that:

“As a tenant, I think the process of displacement and relocation was not fair to us. We were chased away without any compensation. We were required to relocate within a very short time using our own efforts and resources. I have not benefited anything from the relocation but rather lost all my savings in the expense of getting a place to settle.”

When he was asked for his opinion on what should the process of resettlement could have done for them as tenants, Mzee Kinyago said:

“The project should have compensated the tenants since it’s not possible to get a house/room to rent without paying a year’s rent before moving in. It was very difficult for me to afford such amount of money. Also we, tenants should be assisted in transportation costs in the course of relocation process. As from my own experience I had to hire people to help me carry my belongings to the new house. I was lucky that the new house was within the same settlement otherwise I couldn’t have afforded the transportation costs”. 
When it comes to social disarticulation Mzee Kinyago said that at the moment he is staying with his wife and three grandchildren in two rooms that he is renting. Previously he was staying with his two sons who have relocated to another settlement. He said he misses them as they used to stay together as one big family in the same house. Mzee Kinyago said that as a tenant, he was not involved in community development activities, he, just like other tenants was informed on what was going on and nothing else.

### 5.2.5 The case of Mr. Simon Lucas, tenant no. 2 from Mnyamani settlement

Mr. Simon Lucas Gabriel is twenty eight years old male. He is a Luguru by tribe, coming from Morogoro region. His parents shifted from Morogoro to Dar es Salaam in 1989, when he was five years. In Dar es Salaam they settled at Buguruni Mnyamani since they found it easy to get a rented house. The reason for his parents to shift from Morogoro to Dar es Salaam was to find employment especially in the informal sectors. This is because in Dar es Salaam the opportunity is wide compared to other regions. Mr. Simon was still single though he was living with a woman and had a child together. His level of education is standard seven and he was a driver in public transport buses famously known as “Daladala”.

### Before displacement and resettlement

Mr. Simon was also among the four tenants of Bi Nuru Hega whose house was totally demolished to give land for the implementation of Community Infrastructure Program (CIUP) in Mnyamani settlement. Mr. Simon started his narrations this way;

“In 2006, I completed my primary education that is standard seven. Then, I rented a room nearby the house where my family was living. After a year, I decided to stay with a woman and we had a child together. I was paying TZS 8,000/= (equivalent to USD 5.5) as my rent per month. My room was big enough to accommodate furniture and other utensils. The house was built with mud and poles and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. In 2008 that house was demolished to pave way for the construction of public toilets”.
When it comes to social services, Mr. Simon explained that, he was accessed with a primary school within 500 meters from where the house he was renting was. He actually got his primary education from that school. The settlement had other facilities such as, police post, health center, business center and a marketplace within 200-400 meters away from his house. Mr. Simon was not a member of any social network even though he admitted that they existed in his settlement.

**During displacement and relocation**

Mr. Simon continued his narration by saying that he heard about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) through other residents who were informed by Mtaa Leaders in public meeting. Just like the rest of the tenants, Mr. Simon also being a tenant was not involved in the project since he was represented by their house owners. But in late stages of the project, he was told that the house is going to be demolished hence he and other tenants should find an alternative place to rent. Mr. Simon continued narrating that:

“Towards displacement and reallocation I and the other tenants were told that we will be given an amount of money. The money will be used for finding a room elsewhere and also cover transportation costs during relocation. But when compensations were done, things did not go as we were told. I received TZS 10,000/= (equivalent to USD 6.9) only as a one month rent from the house owner. The mount was not enough to cater for even transportation costs”.

Mr. Simon Lucas said that apart from receiving that amount of money he did not get any assistance from either the Mtaa Leader or house owner. He still had to leave the house so as the owner can demolish it for the project implementation.

**After displacement and relocation**

Mr. Simon continued his story on relocation by saying that;
“The process of displacement caused family disintegration to me. When the house was demolished I was not able to secure a room for me, my child and her mother to live in as a family.

As Mr. Simon was not ready for relocation, he had to disintegrate his family in order to avoid becoming homeless. Mr Simon narrated how his family got disintegrated by saying that:

“The child had to go with her mother back to her parents. And I had to go back to live with my parents as well. After a year, I had enough money to pay for a rent and I got a room in Buguruni Malapa. In this new settlement, I am paying the rent of TZS 20,000/= (equivalent USD 13) per room per month. I also have to contribute another TZS 10,000/= (equivalent to USD 6.9) for electricity supply every month. This is very expensive for me since I am working as an assistant driver in a ‘daladala’

Mr. Simon then compared his life in the former settlement and present. He said that there is a slight difference in terms of accessibility to social services and distance to his working area. For example in order for him to reach his working area it takes about an hour walking distance or he has to pay TZS 300/= (equivalent to USD 0.20) for public transport. While in his previous settlement it was only about fifteen minutes walking distance. Social services such as water supply is scarce compared to the previous settlement they get it once a week. He was accessed by a primary school and a police post within 30 minutes walking distance.

Mr. Simon concluded his narration by saying that the process of displacement and relocation was not fair at all but he as a tenant had no choice since the house owner decided to do what she had to do. He narrated that;

“My opinion is that if something like this happens another time, tenants have to come together with house owners so that we agree on how they can help us look for alternative place to go as quick and smooth as possible. The past experience was unfair, we as tenants had to take
some time to resume to our normal life. It was difficult for me to afford another room for renting somewhere else. That's why I had to be separated from my child for one year as she was with her mother; I missed to see how she was growing”.

5.2.6 The case of Bi Nuru Joseph Malila, tenant no. 3 from Mnyamani settlement

Bi Nuru Joseph Malila is a forty years old female, a Hehe by tribe from Iringa region. She is divorced with two children aged 26 and 21 years old. She is a food vender in Mnyamani settlement. In 2000 she relocated from Iringa region to Dar es Salaam and settled in Mnyamani settlement. She said she preferred to settle in Mnyamani since the settlement can accommodate low income people like her. Also the settlement is closer to the highway (Mandela road) where she is selling her food. Here is her story on displacement and resettlement process within her settlement.

Before displacement

Bi Nuru narrated her story as follows:

“I do food vending business famously known as “mama ntilie”. I am a divorcee with two children who are on their own now. I have attained primary education that is; up to the level of standard seven and so are my two children. I, together with other five tenants was renting in Bi Nuru Hega’s house within Mnyamani settlement”.

As according to Bi Nuru, the house was of poor quality and she was paying a rent of TZS 5,000/= (equivalent to USD 3.5) per month. Bi Nuru said while staying at Bi Nuru Hega’s house she was accessed by social facilities and services such as primary school known as Madenge, hospital called Plan, a business center, market place, police post, water supply and bus stop for public transport within 100-200 meters. Even though there are a number of social networks within her settlement, Bi Nuru said she was not a member of any.
During displacement and relocation

Bi Nuru Joseph continued narrating her experience during the process of displacement as follows:

“I was not aware of upgrading project which was taking place within my settlement. I was just informed by my landlord that, I together with other tenants have to vacate the house within three months as the house has been sold. I was never been consulted for any community development issues within my settlement”.

When she was asked if she was compensated as the house was demolished, she said that she only stayed for three months without paying rent while she was looking for an alternative house. But she did not receive any cash or any other assistance for her relocation process.

After displacement and relocation

When the house was demolished, Bi Nuru was able to get a room to rent in the next house from the one she used to live. In that case there were no changes in accessibility to social services and facilities. She also maintained the same neighbors. She only lost those who were staying within the same house as they moved to some other houses within and outside the settlement.

Bi Nuru also explained that;

“If I compared my previous room rented in Bi Nuru Hega’s house, the current one is better in terms of building materials. The current room is built of cement blocks and roofed with corrugated iron sheets. It is also connected to electricity supply. I am paying TZS 20,000/= (equivalent to USD 13) per month which is four times the amount I was paying at my previous house. The house is very expensive to me but I had no choice as I was running short of time and that room was available, so I had to take it”.

Due to the fact that she is within the same settlement, Bi Nuru is continuing with food vending business as her source of income within the same place that is along
Nelson Mandela road at Buguruni. There she sells food such as rice and tea in the evening from 7pm to 11pm. She said she is lucky that she has maintained her business location as well as customers.

Bi Nuru also narrated that:

“As a tenant, I think the process of displacement and relocation was not fair to me as I was not consulted nor compensated simply because I don’t own the house. The house owner can decide anything, anytime and I as a tenant cannot go against it”.

To conclude her story, Bi Nuru Joseph said she did not benefit anything from displacement and relocation as her life is still the same, besides she is paying rent four times more than before.

5.2.7 Narrative from Local Leaders

Just like it was in Mnazi Mmoja settlement, after listening to narrations from affected residents, a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted with nine respondents in Mnyamani Mtaa leadership office. The respondents consisted of Mtaa Leaders and the members of Community Planning Team (CPT). The purpose of the discussion was partly to corroborate information obtained from individual displaced residents. Also to get another side of the story that is, official information about the displacement and resettlement of displaced residents in Mnyamani. Bi Faidha Malizi, who is the secretary of Mtaa Leadership, started the discussion by giving a short introduction about the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) in Mnyamani. Bi Faidha stated the following:

“In Mnyamani CIUP was introduced in mid-2005 through meetings, convened by the CIUP Team and Experts from Ilala Municipality to the Mtaa Leaders. The CIUP project Team and Municipal Experts introduced the project to the selected Mtaa Leaders and other representatives of the community through workshops and several meetings. After that introduction the Mtaa Leaders were asked to convene the public meeting and introduce the rest of the community about the project.
The participants also explained that after the introductory meeting, the community was asked to choose representatives from streets identified as zones within Mnyamani settlement. The zones representatives were used to make it possible for awareness creation within the whole community. The representatives selected from the created zones formulated Community Planning Team (CPT). The members of this team were selected among residents residing in the settlement and it comprised of 10 members whereby 5 were males and 5 females. The participants explained that the gender and street representation was regarded in selecting the representatives. That was done that way in order to make the project as participatory as possible. To get this number of CPT members the settlement was divided into five zones on which each zone select two representatives, one male and the other female. These members acted as the link between the community and the project Officials.

Plate 5:17: Some of the participants of FGD in Mnyamani
The other participant of the FGD Mr. Wazir, who is among the zone representatives, continued the discussions by explaining how the community members reacted toward the project. Mr. Wazir said that, when the residents heard about the project implementation in their settlement had various reactions towards it. Some were positive while others seemed to be reluctant. Mr. Wazir said that it was easier for the CPT members to convince the community to share the costs of implementing the project.

It was explained that in order to implement the project the community was supposed to cover 5 percent of the total project cost, the Local Government 5 percent and the main financier the World Bank, the remaining 90 percent. The 5 percent from the community was supposed to be obtained from every house within the settlement by contributing TZS 30,000/= (equivalent to USD 20.6).

Another participant Bi Rehema Omari added that, though the residents in Mnyamani were very much reluctant in contributing to the 5 percent, the CPT found other sources like visiting business men within the settlement and asked them to top up the difference.
Mr. Juma Mbaruk, who is also one of the zone representatives, explained the procedures used to identify, evaluate and demolish the properties which were earmarked for total or partial demolition. He explained that:

“Flexible planning standards were set for provision of various infrastructures which were supposed to be provided within the settlement. Then surveys were done to identify properties which were totally or partially falling within the proposed infrastructure. These properties were marked with an X.

As according to Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program’s coordinator, the project implemented flexible planning standards in infrastructure provision within the informal settlements so as to avoid many demolitions. That was because the project aimed at retaining the residents within the settlements, also it was very expensive for the project to pay compensation for both partial and total demolitions caused by the project implementation. In that case demolition was minimized by providing flexible planning standards.

The CPT members then continued explaining about the valuation of the affected properties. Mr. Mbaruk continued saying that:

“After demarcations the negotiation and valuation for compensation followed. In this process some of the residents wished to earn much money as compensation and therefore they rejected the first valuation figures. These residents negotiated with the CPT and the project Team to redo the valuation”.

The members in the FGD explained that the whole process of displacement and resettlement was rational and democratic. To prove this, the FGD participants gave an example of one incident when a displaced house owner was to be compensated TZS 7 million (equivalent to USD 4,830) for his totally demolished house. The house owner expressed his dissatisfaction and the compensation was raised to the amount of TZS 11 million (equivalent to USD 7,586).
Before concluding the discussions one of the FGD participants, Mzee Omary mentioned that their roles as CPT in the CIUP project, included the following: to convince the people to release the land for public use such as roads, drainage system, and public toilets, once they were asked to do so; to ensure that all properties marked with an X were demolished; and to make sure that the 5 percent contribution was collected from the community members.

According to the participants of FGD, the resettlement in Mnyamani took place in 2006 to 2007 when the project was on the implementation phase. That happened specifically after compensations were given to the affected resident. The house owners were given three months after receiving the bank cheque for compensation, to handle in an empty land to the project team. The house owner was then supposed to relocate anywhere he/she found convenient.

During the discussions it was confirmed that there was no land set aside for resettlement neither by the Municipal Authority nor CIUP Team. The participants gave an example of Mzee Pindu whose house was totally demolished and decided to go back to his farm in Chanika, Kibada where he was living till the date of the interview. The participants added that Mtaa Leaders and CPT members had no role in the displacement and resettlement. They said that the World Bank as the main sponsor of the project stated that people who were eligible to be compensated on the process of resettlement should be the affected house owners and tenants. House owners were paid according to the value of their houses as shown in valuation report while tenants were supposed to be given fare that helped them to shift their properties to other places. The participants of the FGD explained that all these costs were included in the bank cheque. Hence the house owners were to compensate their displaced tenants.

The members of FGD concluded that the process of compensation was not as open as the identification of demolished properties. They said that the process did not involve the CPT members hence they failed to comment whether the compensation payments were done as it was stated by the World Bank or not.
As it was the case of Manzese settlement, the narratives provided by the affected displaced house owners and tenants, showed that there were dissatisfaction in the whole process of displacement and resettlement. For the case of house owners, some were not able to fulfill their expectations after given the compensation. This is because; the amount given was not enough as they previously thought it was. For example Mzee Pindu, took the total demolition of his house as an opportunity to get a new big and modern house in his farm in Chanika, it was unfortunate that he was unable to accomplish his plans. But for Mzee Zongolo and Bi Nuru Hega, the displacement helped them to fulfill their wishes of having a modern house in their resettlement areas. The explanations from the Mtaa Leaders were somehow contradicting with what was mostly narrated by the individual affected displaced residents. This can be due to the fact that, the Local Leaders were somehow explaining how the project was supposed to be conducted and not the actual implementation. Also due to the fact that the CPT was not that much involved in the compensation process, it was difficult for them to comment or clarify on such an issue.

This chapter has provided the field findings as they were narrated by the affected residents and the local leaders, with some insights and clarifications from the CIUP and Municipal officials. The next chapter is going to give the analysis of these findings with relations to the justice and collaborative planning theories.
Chapter Six
Emerging patterns from displaced households

This chapter deals with analysis of findings obtained from individual displaced residents within the two wards that are Buguruni and Manzese. It is more concerned with the scrutiny of issues that emerged from individual displaced residents being tenants or house owners in relation to concepts provided in the reviewed theories. The aim was to see whether there are patterns or commonalities which emerge within a settlement or between the affected groups with regards to the issues and opportunities encountered during the resettlement process. This is done in order to identify similarities or differences between group of residents be it owners or tenants, or resettlement options that have been chosen.

The key components in articulating these patterns or similarities are those which have been derived from theoretical framework (Cernea, 1996, Cernea, 2000, Downing, 2002, Bala, 2008 and Rawls, 1999). They include loss of access to common resources, social disarticulation, family disintegration, marginalization, joblessness, homelessness, landlessness and disruption of formal activities as negative effects. Also opportunities gained through the process were analyzed, including improved livelihood options, expansion of human competence, enhanced capabilities, expansion of social opportunities, improved properties and improved social services. By such analysis the chapter answers research question two and three concerned with issues and opportunities faced by displaced residents in relation to resettlement options they chose.

6.1 Patterns of issues from resettlement process
The findings in chapter five give an indication that there was a difference between affected tenants and house owners. The major difference was on where these residents had to resettle. Tenants had two options, within or outside their previous settlement, while house owners were mainly outside and far from their previous settlement. This option resulted into difference in issues faced by each group. Therefore it is important to examine the relationship between these two patterns of issues and establish factors which have resulted into such a pattern.
6.1.1 Resettlement outside the settlement
Through the explorative approach, the findings obtained from in-depth interviews indicate that all the house owners resettled outside the settlement, ranging from nearest being 2 kilometers and the far most being 28 kilometers away from the previous settlement. The far most, that is Bi Chiku Mbuni, moved from Mnazi Mmoja, in Manzese and resettled in Makurunge in Kiluvya which was 28 kilometers away from Manzese. The second far most are Mzee Pindu and Bi Nuru Hega, of Mnyamani settlement in Buguruni. They both resettled in Chanika which is 20 and 25 kilometers respectively, away from Mnyamani settlement. The closest of them all is Mzee Zogolo from Madenge settlement, he and his wife resettled in Buguruni Kisiwani which is 2 kilometers away from Madenge settlement.

Map 6.1: Location of resettlement areas of house owners.
According to interview results, to each individual house owner it was found that all the four house owners had a common reason of resettling outside the settlement. The reason was they were not able to find alternative plots which they could afford with the money they got for compensation within their former settlements. This is due to the fact that, in informal settlements such as Manzese and Buguruni, it is not possible to find an empty plot. In that case further investments are made by buying existing houses. For the case of Manzese for example, according to information obtained from Kinondoni Land Officer, a house occupying a minimum plot of 20 by 40 meters can be sold from TZS 10 million to TZS 50 million (equivalent to USD 6,900 to 34,500) depending on its location and condition. In that case, these house owners had no choice but went back to their previous owned plots or farms outside the City’s built up areas. Mzee Zogolo who was able to buy a house in Kisiwani was an exceptional case. He was able to do that since that settlement is not that much developed and it is mostly inhabited by the native people of Dar es Salaam. That’s why he was facing the problem of marginalization due to difference in ethnic groups.

As a result of resettling to their previous plots/farms, these house owners avoided some of the issues which were discussed by Cernea and others to be associated with resettlement outside their settlements. These issues include that of becoming landless and homeless. But they were affected with other factors such as jobless, marginalization, socially disarticulated, family disintegration and loss of access to common resources, as indicated in table 6.1. The synthesis in the tables in this chapter is based upon the author’s interpretation and categorization of the interview material. Even though it is known that these issues could have face them or any other urban dweller as they are also associated with urban life and modernization, they were mentioned by the affected residents to be the result of displacement and resettlement processes.
Table 6.1 Issues affecting resettled house owner outside their previous settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Bi Chiku</th>
<th>Mbuni</th>
<th>Mzee Pindu</th>
<th>Bi Nuru Hega</th>
<th>Mzee Salehe Zogolo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Loss of access to common resources</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Social disarticulation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Family disintegration</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Disruption of formal activities</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Interviews with house owners, February-May, 2011  
**Key:** √-Yes; ×-No

### i. Loss of access to common resources

As a result of resettling outside their settlements three out of four house owners lost the opportunity of accessing common resources which were available in their previous settlement. For example Bi Chiku, according to the interview done on 2nd of February 2011, she said that within 10 to 15 minutes walking distance she was able to get social facilities such as water supply from a common water kiosk, a health centre, a primary school, a police post and a bus stop for public transport linked to different parts of Dar es Salaam city. Also she had access to a market, hospital and other shopping centre at the same walking distance in an area called Tandale within the same Manzese ward.

At her resettled settlement in Kiluvya, Makurunge Bi Chiku had to go 8 to 12 kilometers away from her home to get access to some of the common resources she used to get within 15 minutes’ walk. In the interview Bi Chiku was complaining that, it was very difficult even to buy soap for daily cleanliness. In order to get meat and other groceries she had to travel 8 kilometers to a settlement called Kiluvya where she can get such services. When it comes to medical services she and the rest of Makurunge community have to go to Tumbi Hospital in Kibaha which is 12 kilometers from her home. She added that it has become very expensive to get water supply. Since she gets it through trucks from an area known as “Maili Moja” and it costs TZS 20,000 (USD 13.5) per 1,000 liters, Tshs 30,000 (USD 20) per 2,000 liters and Tshs 45,000 (USD 30) per 3,000 liters.
Another house owner, Mzee Pindu in Chanika also faced a similar challenge of not being able to access common resources as he used to while staying in Mnyamani. Mzee Pindu said that previously his children had easy access to two primary schools. He was also accessed with two police posts and a health center within Mnyamani settlement. He also explained that, in his former settlement there were some shops, a market, piped water supply and a bus stop within 200 meters away from his residence. In Chanika, which is his new settlement, Mzee Pindu could hardly get access to facilities such as schools, market, police post, public transport and hospital. These services were accessible to him about 2 kilometers away from his resettlement house.

When it comes to Mzee Salehe Zogolo who bought a house in Kisiwani, also faced the same challenges. Mzee Zogolo narrated that, his house was accessible to social facilities such as a hospital, two primary schools, water and electricity supply, a police post and a bus stop for public transport within a distance of 100 to 500 meters away. He added that, in Kisiwani, the resettlement area, which is relatively a new settlement does not have social facilities, Mzee Zogolo and his wife usually walk about 30 minutes back to Buguruni Madenge and get access to common resources such as hospital, a bus stop for public transport and piped water supply.

Bi Nuru Hega who was a house owner in Mnyamani had a different story when it comes to access to common resources. Since she was residing in Chanika even before resettlement, she couldn't tell a difference in the availability of common resources, to her that was not an issue what so ever, since she technically did not resettle.

**ii. Social disarticulation and marginalization**

According to Cernea, (1996) social disarticulation disperses and fragments communities, dismantles patterns of social organization and interpersonal ties. It is a loss of valuable 'social capital'. Downing, (2002) explains that marginalization is a loss of self-esteem as a result of being considered as ‘new comers’ or ‘outsider’ within the community. These two components were also among the issues mentioned to be faced when resettlement outside the settlement occurred.
In this research, social disarticulation and marginalization was faced by only one affected residents from Madenge settlement. This can be assumed that it’s because this house owner bought a house. He did not go back to his previous plot/farm like the other three. Such a situation made him considered as a ‘stranger’ within that new society as he had no relations with that settlement before buying the house. For those who had farms/plots previously, they were already part of that society though they were not residing there but they were known and considered to be as part of the community.

Mzee Zogolo complained that he and his wife felt out of place in that new settlement. They felt fragmented from the community they used to live and help each other in times of need. Resettlement also disturbed their interpersonal ties with the neighbours. Mzee Zogolo recalled in his interview that even though they had no children in his marriage but he and his wife were helped with their neighbors’ children as they were part and parcel of that community. To Mzee Zogolo and his wife, resettlement also tore apart their social relations. He explained that, they felt marginalized as they had resettled in a society which is completely new to them, hence they were regarded as strangers and that made Mzee Zogolo and his wife felt uncomfortable and out of place immediately after resettling in that settlement.

iii. Joblessness

According to Cernea, joblessness is a way of losing employment or any other income generating activity. In that case it can as well affect in a way those who are outside employment sector such as retirees. It is among the challenges faced during resettlement outside the settlement (Cernea, 1996).

In this research since the three out of four house owners were retirees resettlement did not cause impact to them in terms of employment, as they were all out of formal employment before resettlement. But somehow the resettlement hindered one of the displaced residents, Bi Chiku Mbuni to continue with her income generating activities. These activities were her source of income after retirement in her previous settlement. Bi Chiku explained that, although she had a bigger plot/ a farm,
compared to the plot she owned while at Manzese, due to her old age she was unable to practice farming activities. She complained that her economic status had been worsened as she had no other sources of income. Bi Chiku was solely depended on her grandchildren to support her with her daily expenses. She added that she could have engaged herself with petty trading at her home, but she had no capital for such an activity. If she could have had capital she could start selling soft drinks to primary school children as the school is located only 2 kilometers from her resettlement house. That means school children would have been a ready market for her goods as they usually pass at her doorstep while going or coming back from school. She lamented that her ability to do such an activity have been impaired and hence she had become jobless. At the time of this interview Bi Chiku admitted that she had no capital to start such an activity. The funds she had was used for resettlement process.

iv. Family disintegration

According to Cernea (1996) and Downing, (2002) family disintegration is also one of the challenges faced when displaced households get resettled. It happens when family members had to split due to lack of enough space to live in for all of them, as they used to before resettlement. The disintegration can be for short, as well as long period of time.

In this research such a situation happened to two out of the four displaced house owners. These house owners are Bi Chiku Mbuni and Mzee Pindu. Bi Chiku suffered family disintegration after resettlement due to two situations. The first situation is when she was immediately relocated to Makurunge in her ‘banda’ which was too small to accommodate all the seven people of her household. These people included herself, her late mother, grandson and his wife and her daughter in law, who is a window of her late son and her two grandchildren. That means seven people in two roomed ‘banda’. Nevertheless, her other relatives that is her aunt and her two children who were living together while in Mnazi Mmoja had to find another place to live and so got disintegrated from the rest of the family. Also, later on after resettlement, Bi Chiku’s grandson and his wife, and the daughter in law could not tolerate the life in Makurunge with limited access to social service. They both
relocated to Kiluvya which is about 8 kilometers from Makurunge. Bi Chiku was left with her two grandchildren since her mother passed away a year after they had resettled.

When it comes to Mzee Pindu, his experience of family disintegration was different. Mzee Pindu had to leave his family, a wife and seven children and three grandchildren in their other house in Mnyamani. Mzee Pindu did that since he was not yet finish, according to him his bigger and modern house in their farm in Chanika. Mzee Pindu was still living alone in Chanika. According to interview with him, Mzee Pindu complained that he is missing his family, but he has no choice but to continue staying in Chanika so that he can practice farming since it is his major source of food and income which supports his big family in Mnyamani.

The family disintegration faced by these two house owners has result into split of households. Even though these household changes can be considered as part and parcel of urbanization and modernization but they somehow increase expenses within the urban life style. For example, Mzee Pindu had to take care of himself in Chanika as well as his family in Mnyamani. This increased expenses within the household budget. Also the family disintegration can result into loss of parental care. This situation was felt by the two grand children of Bi Chiku who were left with Bi Chiku by their parents while they were still very young.

### 6.1.2 Resettlement within the same or nearby settlement

Resettlement within the same or nearby settlement is another option of resettlement as it was described by International Finance Corporation (IFC, 2000). This kind of resettlement can either be no resettlement at all, that’s when there is a partial demolition which makes the other part of the house habitable. Such a resettlement option was experienced by all the houses which were partially affected by the project. These types of affected residents were not the concern of this research. The other type of resettlement is the on-site resettlement which happens when resettlement is done within the same settlement but in a different location. This is the type of resettlement which was opted by most of tenants who were affected by
displacement within Manzese and Buguruni. With such an option, they faced a different pattern of issues related to resettlement process.

As indicated in map 6.2, the new location of the displaced residents is not that far from their previous ones. With such a small spatial difference issues associated with resettlement are also expected to be less than those who went far from their previous settlements.

**Map 6.2 Location of tenants’ resettlement areas in relation to their previous ones.**

From the analysis of the field findings, there is an indication that tenants were much affected with issues of homelessness and family disintegration for a certain period of time. The tenants did not experience issues such as jobless, marginalization, disruption of formal activities as well as loss of access to common resources.
This is due to the fact that they managed to remain within the settlement or moved to nearby settlements. By such an option the tenants had, they did not suffer much of the issues which are likely to happen when moving far from the previous settlement as it was summarized in table 6.2.

**Table 6.2 Issues affected tenants within or nearby the settlement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/ N</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Bi Hawa Chobo</th>
<th>Hassan Mndolwa</th>
<th>Mr. Said Kongoela</th>
<th>Mr. Said Joseph</th>
<th>Bi Nuru Kongoele</th>
<th>Bi Nuru Kongoele</th>
<th>Mzee Kinyago</th>
<th>Mzee Simon Lucas</th>
<th>Mzee Simon Lucas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Family disintegration</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Disruption of formal activities</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Social disarticulation</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>Loss of access to common resources</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Interviews with displaced tenants February-May, 2011

**Key:** √ = Yes; × = No; - = Not applicable

As table 6.2 gives an indication that tenants by resettling within or nearby their previous settlement faced less issues related to resettlement compared to house owners who had to go far away from their settlements. In other words tenants faced minimum disturbance associated with change of location due to resettlement. Issues related to landlessness did not apply to them since they never owned any land even before displacement.

### i. Homelessness

According to Downing, homelessness can be loss of shelter which might be for a short or long period of time that can result into group’s cultural separation and status deprivation (Downing, 2002). In Manzese and Buguruni, unlike house owners who didn’t suffer from homelessness, two out of six tenants were faced with this issue. The two tenants had different reasons for being homeless. Bi Hawa Chobo for example, faced this issue through her son who was previously living with her in Bi Chiku’s house. Although Bi Hawa was renting just one room in which herself and her
mother was staying, also her son was living in the same house and used to sleep in the corridor of the main house. This was possible arrangement as a result of good social ties and networks which Bi Hawa had with her house owner. However the new house has no such a corridor and the room is even smaller. In that case Bi Hawa’s son became homeless and had to return to their home village in Kilwa.

For the case of Mr. Simon Lucas resettlement made him and the woman he was staying with, and their child homeless. Mr. Simon could not afford to pay for another rental room immediately after displacement. Consequently the three of them were technically homeless and they had to separate, and went to live with their parents. The woman and the child went back to her parents’ home and Mr. Simon went back to his parents’ home as well. Mr. Simon explained that the three of them had to separate and return to their parents’ homes as he was not compensated and had no enough money at that time of displacement. After one year Mr. Simon had enough money to pay for rent and he got a room for renting in Buguruni Malapa whereby his partner and their child joined him. Mr. Simon complained that the one year separation made him missed to see how her daughter was growing. Mr. Simon was homeless for one year from the day he was displaced, if his parents were not in the city, it seems him, the mother of his child and the child could have been totally homeless and end up living in the streets as a result of not being able to resettle without compensation.

**ii. Family disintegration**

As Cernea (1996) and Downing, (2002) explains, family disintegration is when a family lose a place to stay and have to separate in order to avoid permanent homelessness. This is another issue which was faced by three tenants from Manzese and Buguruni settlements. It was somehow triggered by the fear of becoming homeless. This situation was faced by Mr. Simon Lucas when he disintegrated his family and returned to his parents’ home in fear of becoming homeless and lived in the streets. In the same way, Bi Hawa’s family disintegrated when her son had to return back to their home village since he had no place to sleep.
Mzee Kinyago also faced the similar issues. He was renting the same house with his two sons, who were married and lived together in that same house. The sons were renting one room each and Mzee Kinyago had two for him, his wife and grandchildren. But as a result of resettlement, it was not possible to get four rooms for rent for all of them. In that case the two sons with their family had to look for alternative rooms to rent elsewhere. That caused Mzee Kinyago’s family to disintegrate. Mzee Kinyago lamented that, before resettlement he was staying with his two elder sons who had relocated to another settlement though not so far from where he lives, but still he miss them as they used to stay together as one big family. This kind of family disintegration should not be blame to the resettlement process, since the two sons were old enough and had their family, in that case not leaving with or close to their parents it’s a normal practice, but Mzee Kinyago took it as a consequence of displacement. Such an incident indicates that there was normal life incidences which with coincidence happened during the displacement process and it was considered to be the result of it. This can be due to the fact that the affected residents wanted to show as much as possible how the displacement had caused them trouble so as to get the sympathy from the researcher or any other concerned authorities.

6.2 Patterns of opportunities from resettlement process
When discussing the issues related to resettlement, it was seen that issues faced by affected displaced residents were different between tenants and house owner. This was the result of resettlement options which were available for them. In analyzing opportunities it appears that also these two groups of affected residents have different shares of opportunity accrued during resettlement process. As mentioned by Cernea, (2002); Bala, (2008); and Rawls, (1999), there were a number of opportunities which could have been earned when resettlement was taking place. These opportunities include: improved livelihood options, expansion of human competence, enhanced capabilities, expansion of social opportunities, improved properties and improved social services.

Categorization of the interview material along the concepts listed above give an indication that tenants and house owners do not share same opportunities from the resettlement process. The opportunities faced by house owners were different from
those gained by tenants, with an exception of only one which is improved properties. Theoretically, house owners gained many opportunities compared to tenants. The opportunities included that of improved livelihood options, such as renting rooms, petty trading or doing farming activities. Also they had an opportunity of expanding their human competence and enhanced capabilities through gaining more pieces of land which could have been used for agriculture or even building more houses for renting. In reality, these opportunities could not be enjoyed by the entire group depending on their personal capabilities and incapacities, like old age or lack of capital. Expansion of social opportunities was felt when some of the house owners joined social groups and conducted self-help activities brought by the situation they were in. This can be the result of moving far away from the previous settlement. But all in all, each individual displaced resident had experienced these resettlement opportunities different from one another as it is described in the following sections.

i. Improved livelihood option

According to Cernea and McDowell, an improved livelihood option is when the resettlers are given economic and social advantages which will facilitate them to alleviate poverty. It is very obvious that when displaced, the affected residents are likely to lose not only their properties but also social ties and livelihood strategies which help in reducing poverty hardship (Cernea & McDowell, 2000).

For the case of land owners they somehow had an economic advantage since they all moved to bigger pieces of land where they could practice other activities such as farming. For example Bi Chiku, if she was not that old and had enough capital, she could have practiced farming in her big farm as well as conducting petty trading. The same applied to Mzee Pindu, who narrated that by being in Chanika he can feed his big family in Mnyamani through farming. Mzee Zongolo as well, despite the fact that he faced marginalization as he moved to his new settlement and considered as a stranger in the community, but he and his wife as well were renting two rooms with the higher rent than in their demolished house, as the house was new and modern than the previous one.
ii. Expansion of human competence

Expansion of human competence as it was referred by Bala (2008) involves the opening up one’s ability or skills in dealing with individual issues of development. In order for resettlement to contribute into such a development human competence has to be improved if not expanded.

For the case of this research all the tenants’ ability to develop individually remained the same. This was because they did not add any skills, but rather increased expenditure due to higher rents that they had to pay in their resettled rooms. This could be the result of not changing their resettlement area, but moved to houses within an improved settlement and therefore higher rents. This can be due to limited options and short time for relocation as most remained within or nearby the settlement. But house owners, managed to improve their ability to develop by given a chance of practicing farming, or even petty trading activities. This was possible through the improvement of location as it was the case to Bi Chiku Mbuni who was 2 kilometers away from a primary school, or provision of capital as it was for Bi Nuru Hega who used some of the compensation money to expand her petty trading activities.

iii. Enhanced capabilities

Enhanced capabilities as referred in Bala (2008), is also part and parcels of facilitating development when resettlement occurs. By enhancing capabilities means the same as improved skill, or potential in developing either individually or as a community.

In this research it was seen that, as it was the case in improved livelihood and expansion of human competence tenants had no such an opportunity. Actually some tenants’ situation became worse than before since they had to pay more rents in their current rented rooms than in their previous ones. For the case of house owners, by being able to possess big plots or farms they had a potential to expand their houses for other uses or even selling a piece and use the money for other development activities.
iv. Expansion of social opportunities

According to Bala expansion of social opportunities refers to spread out of social prospects or possibilities to develop by tackling social or personal constraints (Bala, 2008). When it comes to resettled house owners and tenants in Buguruni and Manzese it was found out that tenants retained the same chance of tackling individual constraints to develop while most of the house owners had an improved chance. With the exception of Mzee Zogolo, who was marginalized by being considered a stranger in his new settlement the rest had opportunities to join social networks like Bi Chiku with ‘Jikwamue’ group in Makurunge, and Mzee Pindu with community self-help groups existing in Chanika.

v. Improved properties

The analysis indicates that the distribution of opportunities differ between tenants and house owners, as well as individual members of each group. It has been noticed that there is no much benefits which has been accrued by tenants as a group or individually. It could be said that both tenants and house owners groups in some sense gained improved properties. In the case of tenants especially, this refers to the rooms they are renting after resettlement. Some of the tenants only had an opportunity of renting in a room with an improved quality compared to their previous dwellings. For example, Mr. Simon relocated to a room built with sand-cement and roofed with corrugated iron sheets and had electricity supply for lighting. The same situation was faced with Bi Nuru Joseph of Mnyamani and Mr. Said and Mr. Hassan of Manzese. With exception on Mzee Kinyago and Bi Hawa they were renting in more dilapidated houses than the ones they were before. The rest of the tenants had improved their rooms though they also had to pay almost twice as much than their previous rents. Even the two tenants who relocated to more dilapidated rooms also paid twice as much since the settlement was improved with the implemented upgrading project. The increased rents imply the increase of household expenses which might result into un-affordability. The lack of affordability might necessitate the tenants to find other alternatives such as moving away from the settlement and find or formulate affordable settlement, most likely informal with less improved condition as the ones which had just been upgraded.
When it comes to house owners, all of them had somehow managed to improve their properties though some of them, such as Mzee Pindu was yet to finish his house but at least they all had an intention of doing so. Bi Chiku who once owned a house built with mud and poles now has one though small, with cement blocks. This also applied to Bi Hawa, Mzee Zogolo and and Mzee Pindu.

vi. Improved social services

This was the opportunity which all the tenants benefited out of it and all the house owners did not. Resettlement options that each group had to take were the main reason for such a result. Tenants remained in the settlement or even moved to a better one within or nearby their former settlement which is within the city. By doing so they had a chance of maintaining their social ties, accessing common resources which were available and also maintained their livelihood strategies, being it petty trading business or even employment in formal and informal sectors. For example Bi Nuru Joseph in Mnyamani and Bi Hawa Chobo in Manzese moved a house away from their previous houses and they continued with their petty trading business within the same places they were doing before. Mzee Kinyago from Mnyamani and Hassan Mndolwa from Mnazi Mmoja both moved like five-ten minutes’ walk away from their previous houses and also if not being ill Mzee Kinyago could have continued with fruits vending activities in Mnyamani market. Mr. Mndolwa continued with welding activities in one of informal garages in Mnazi Mmoja settlement. With the exception of Mr. Simon Lucas who moved back to his parents for about a year as he couldn’t afford resettlement, but later on he managed to get a room to rent in another settlement within Buguruni.

The house owners had no option of remaining within the city or did not afford a serviced plot whatsoever. This is because; within upgraded settlements there are hardly empty plots to be sold. New occupiers within such settlements accessed land by buying existing dilapidated or old houses in the settlements. As it was explained by the Kinondoni Land officer, in Manzese a house in a minimum sized plot can be sold with a price ranging from TZS 10 million to 50 million depending on its location. Also a serviced plot in peri urban areas can range from TZS 7 million to 20 million depending on its location and availability of services. In that case house owners lost
their access to social services by resettling in settlements far away from the city center where services were not yet provided.

6.3 Converging issues and opportunities
The aim of this section is to establish common patterns of issues and opportunities which have emerged in resettlement process. These issues and opportunities were derived from the theories and policy frameworks which had been reviewed; as well as experiences faced by displaced residents when resettled as revealed during interviews. The similarity of issues and opportunities were noticed in two different ways. First, the analysis gives an indication that house owners suffered more than tenants. That is, the house owners though individually, suffered from loss of access to common resources, joblessness, family disintegration and disruption of formal activities. While tenants suffered from family disintegration and homelessness. Secondly, it was also indicated that both house owners and tenants shared one issue that is family disintegration. This situation gives an indication that there are many similarities within groups than in individual terms. This can again be as a result of difference in resettlement options which were either within or nearby the former settlement opted by tenants and resettlement outside the settlement which was option for the house owners.

When it comes to opportunities, the similarities are seen more within groups and less individually. The analysis demonstrates that house owners gained more opportunities than tenants as it was in issues. The house owners had opportunities such as improved livelihood options, expansion of human competence, enhanced capabilities, expansion of social opportunities and improved properties. Tenants had a chance to achieve two opportunities, that of improved social services and improved properties. Also the opportunities accrued were the same within individuals of the same group. All house owners shared the same opportunities which were different from what all the tenants had. Just like it was for the case of issues, it happened that the two groups shared same opportunity, which was that of an improved property.

6.4 Diverging issues and opportunities
Just like in the previous section on converging issues and opportunities, this section aims at identifying the diverging issues within both groups of affected displaced
residents. The divergence was identified among the individual members of the same group or between the two groups of tenants and house owners. The findings show that house owners had divergence among themselves when it comes to issues. Each individual house owner faced her/his own issues with the exception of loss of common access to resources and family disintegration which was shared among house owners. This can be the result of the fact that each house owner went to a different settlement from the previous one and far away from the other house owners. The issues faced depend on factors such as age, affordability level and ability to utilize social opportunities.

For the case of opportunities there was much divergence between the tenants and house owners groups. The house owners had more similar opportunities while tenants had less but also similar opportunities amongst themselves. The analysis also indicated such a divergence to be the result of the resettlement options. Tenants being within or nearby the same settlement while house owners went far away from their former settlements. Even though the house owners did not resettle in the same or nearby settlements, but they had similar opportunities. This can be a result of the nature of resettlement areas they mostly chose. That is in their previous farms/plots outside the inner city. The location of their resettlement shared characteristics such as far away from the city, lack of services and infrastructure, and less populated. As it was explained by Davidson et al (1993) in International Financial Cooperation (IFC, 2002), resettlement outside and far away from the previous settlement, is a feasible option due to land market and availability of land in prime location, though it brings more issues to resettled residents.

This chapter has indicated that issues and opportunities resulted from resettlement and the option chosen had both converging and diverging patterns. The convergence and divergence happened within the same group of affected residents as well as amongst the individual members of such groups. That is to say, each individual displaced resident had a different experience from the group he/she belongs to. That is why this research had individual displaced residents as cases in order to examine the process of displacement and resettlement processes.
Chapter Seven
Theoretical reflections and discussions

This chapter provides a discussion on empirical findings from displacement and resettlement of displaced residents from the two wards of Manzese and Buguruni; with reflections from the World Bank’s resettlement policy framework provisions as well as Rawls principles of justice theory and collaborative planning theory. The policy framework was the guiding tool for the implementation of the upgrading projects within the Dar es Salaam city. As it was explained in the research issue, Tanzania had no policy framework regarding displacement and resettlement of displaced residents, though it has a number of provisions on the regularization process. The World Bank, being the main sponsor of the project, came with the framework which was to be adopted with reflections to the local situation. In that case the findings from the field were expected to reflect such provisions. Also, Rawls’ theory of justice and collaborative planning theory were used in formulating aspects which were looked at in the actual fieldwork. The concepts obtained from these two theories have been used in analyzing, discussing and reflecting upon the findings. With such reflections this chapter answered the fourth research question on how participation and democracy was practiced in the displacement and resettlement process.

7.1 Reflections from resettlement policy framework

In implementing its project on Regional Communications Infrastructure Program (RCIP), the World Bank realized that there would be land acquisition, loss of access to economic assets and resources and ultimately compensation and resettlement of people. The World Bank resettlement framework made provisions in case this situation is inevitable so as to make sure both the displaced and the remaining residents benefit from the project.

The Policy framework provided that the project dealing with upgrading had to prepare a specific Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for impacted areas. From such a framework the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) in 2004, prepared a Resettlement Action Plan for the sixteen settlements which implemented the upgrading projects between 2006 and 2007. The Resettlement Action Plan
(RAP) with guidance from the framework established resettlement and compensation principles, organizations and design criteria to be applied in order to meet the needs of the people who were affected by the project. That was because the framework urged that the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) had to be made in such a way it reflected the standards of the concerned government’s own policy on resettlement and compensation with consideration with what was provided by the World Bank’s Operational Policies (OP 4.12).

The principles of the general framework which was also reflected in the Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program’s (CIUP) Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) included the following. First, involuntary resettlement should be avoided or minimized, by exploring all viable alternatives. If that is not possible then the resettlement and compensation should be conceived and executed in a sustainable way and give the displaced people opportunities to share the project benefits. Secondly, the displaced and compensated people have to be meaningful consulted and participated in planning and implementation of resettlement and compensation programs. Thirdly, the displaced people should be assisted in their efforts to improve their livelihoods and standards of living or at least to restore them in real terms to the situation before displacement. That was considered so as to enable the affected people share the objective of improving their living standard in the same way as those who remain in the project area. This policy framework is in line with elements advocated by the principles of justice theory and collaborative planning theories as they have been discussed in the following sections.

7.1.1 Sharing of benefits
Just like in Rawls’ first principle of justice which advocates on appropriate distribution of benefits as well as burdens within a society, the Resettlement Policy Framework made provisions to facilitate in achieving such a distribution. In the framework as well as in the Resettlement Action Plan, the affected residents were supposed to be compensated with the loss of their properties. The affected residents included both tenants and house owners. As it was explained in the findings, these provisions were not fully adhered to especially with tenants. Even though there were all possibilities for them to be compensated as well. The possibility came with the fact that there was a Resettlement Action Plan which was prepared with reflections from the Tanzania
Policy provisions on issues of compensation and land acquisition. In this policy, tenants were not entitled for compensation, but they were considered for such in the World Bank’ OP 4.12. In that case it was made possible for tenants to receive their compensation from their land owners.

### 7.1.2 Democracy and participatory consideration

As it is in Communicative and Collaborative Planning theory, the Resettlement Policy Framework urged for a meaningful and democratic participation of the community especially the affected ones. That was so emphasized in order to reduce the hardship which will be caused by the displacement and resettlement process. In such a situation participation which was required or urged was that which would influence the decisions and outcomes of the project. That is why the policy frameworks emphasized in it so as to reduce the impacts of affected residents. The policy framework stipulated the formulation of the Community Planning Teams (CPT) with gender and areas representations as it was explained in the focus group discussions with the Mtaa Leaders. This was a way of influencing the project through participatory approach and in a democratic manner. Also the CPTs had a responsibility of making sure that the displaced residents are meaningful consulted and participated so that they could make rational arguments in order to be able to benefit from the project. But it was realized in the findings that the CPT was not given enough power to practice its duties and obligation given. As it was explained in the focus group discussion in Mnazi Mmoja during the actual implementation the CPT members were reduced from twenty to only two. By doing that the CPT lost its real influence within the project and failed to exercise its power as an organ responsible to ensure that equal benefits and democratic considerations were adhered to.

### 7.1.3 Liberty

One of the concepts in the principles of Justice Theory is liberty whereby freedom or right to choose is advocated. It refers to the power to do as one pleases that is, the power of choice. According to the fieldwork findings it was claimed that all the house owners were at liberty to choose to let go their properties with the agreed amount of compensation. The findings also indicated that the house owners were consulted about the intention of total demolition and they were willing to allow such an act.
The findings give an indication that, some of the house owners thought the demolition was a good thing to them. That was because their houses were in poor conditions and these house owners had no means of renovating them. The problem came on the level of information that the house owners were provided with before being at liberty to let go their properties. It is advocated by the communicative and collaborative planning theory that the most appropriate and democratic means of decision making in planning and urban governance should be based on the premises of debate between all relevant stakeholders oriented towards agreement (Bond, 2011). In Manzese and Buguruni situation, the stakeholders that is house owners, tenants, local leaders and the Municipal and projects experts did not come into any kind of discussions, but rather informing house owners about the compensation of their affected properties. The information on compensation terms was even shallow that is, did not stipulate the level of compensation to be made. That is why after displacement and resettlement process the house owners were regretting and felt like they were carrying the entire burden for improving the living conditions of their community. If they had a chance in entering into a debate on knowing what they are really going to lose and what they will gain, then, their decision will have been more rational and democratic. With the absence of such a debate, the house owners felt that the project was unfair to them. Even though it was explained that the land owners were informed about the compensation rates and those who were not pleased with the amount were free to express their concerns. Still the dissatisfaction was based on not knowing what exactly the land owners were going to lose. The loss was on the property; location and the increased land value as well as improved social services and facilities. All these were not considered in the compensation.

7.1.4 The difference
According to Rawls, the focus of this concept of difference is concerned with the achievement of the greatest benefits to the least advantaged groups within a diverse society. The second principle of justice considered a proper act when person’s reactions to gain doesn’t affect others, since the principle for an individual is to advance as much as possible his own welfare and the principle for society is to advance as far as possible the welfare of the group (Rawls, 1999:20). Likewise in the Resettlement Policy Framework it was stipulated that resettlement and compensation should be conceived and executed in a sustainable ways in order to
enable the displaced people share the projects benefits. In the situation of Manzese and Buguruni settlements the welfare of the affected group of displaced residents was supposed to be shared or considered by the whole community. The unaffected people of Manzese and Buguruni societies were not facilitated or rather prepared to consider such a notion of sharing benefits and helping each other to reduce the burden of the loss. The least advantaged group, in this case the displaced residents after receiving their compensations were left to deal with their own issues of displacement and resettlement. This can be the result of lack of democracy and participatory approach whereby the whole community were not unified, in that case each group, the benefited and the affected ones considered one another benefiting more from the project.

Tenants were even worse than the house owners. One of the tenants made it clear during the interviews that the process of displacement and resettlement was not fair to tenants, since there was no any assistance during relocation and the amount of money they were compensated was not enough to at least enable them to achieve the same life standard as they had previously, leave alone making it better. That tenant had a feeling that there were no considerations to them being in a losing side of the community. As it was provided in the framework as well as advocated in the justice and communicative and collaborative theories; for such a society with social differences there should be a consideration in making the least or rather weak community members not to suffer but also share the benefit of the society.

7.2. The shortcoming of the process

From the discussions and reflections made on the guiding policy frameworks as well as the theories which were used in the analysis of the research, four shortcomings were identified while understanding the whole process of displacement and resettlement in relation to theories and policy frameworks. These shortcomings are assumed to be caused by the insufficient adherence of the policy provisions, and improper implementation of the participatory and democratic approaches as well as ignorance of both the community members and the project experts. It was also noted that the shortcoming of the project happened even while preparing the project for implementation as well as during the actual implementation.
7.2.1 Lack of democracy and real participation
There is an indication that there was no democracy and real participation during the process of displacement and resettlement. As it was provided by the World Bank policy framework, the community, especially the affected residents, should have participated in the planning and implementation of the resettlement process in such a way they could have influence the project decisions and outcomes. That was not the case in Buguruni and Manzese settlements, the participation was mostly on informing the community members about the project and its intentions. Even though that was the case, some of the residents such as tenants were completely not well informed about the process. But again, those who had a chance to be informed, in that case house owners were insufficiently informed and they had to make decisions basing on such insufficient information they had. The tenants had a different experience all together, as they were considered to be represented by their house owners. In that case, their house owners decided or agreed on tenants issues on their behalf.

7.2.2 Lack of power to exercise participation and democracy
This situation was felt within the Community Planning Team (CPT). The CPT was the organ formulated in order to exercise participation and democracy in the project. As it was stated in the focus group discussions the CPT had a role of linking the project and the community, as well as influencing the implementation to achieve the overall objective of the project. Since the number of its members was reduced day by day the CPT became incapable in exercising their power given by their respective zone to make sure that the implementations were going as planned and to the benefit of the whole community. But such a power was tempered with as the CPT lacked a chance to have debates as described by communicative and collaborative theory, which could have brought about rational arguments. Also the issue of lack of political will and enough resources needed for the implementation impaired the amount of democracy which was supposed to be adhered to in the implementation process. The lack of resources was used as an excuse in reducing the number of CPT members and therefore reduces their power in influencing the implementation process. As a result of that this research considers it as another shortcoming in the displacement and resettlement process within Manzese and Buguruni settlements.
7.2.3 Out-dated Resettlement Action Plan
The Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program prepared the resettlement action plan for sixteen settlements which implemented upgrading projects. This Action Plan was prepared in 2004 basing on the field work done in 2003 and valuation process done in May-July 2004, while the actual implementation started from 2006 to 2007 (RAP, 2004). The difference of two to three years is long enough to bring changes in the community and the economic values as well. This lapse of time between the preparation of the Action plan and its implementation can be the cause of dissatisfaction of the displaced residents as it was not possible for them to fulfil the objectives they had three years back. Also the mode on which the action plan was prepared indicates that participation was not considered much. This is due to the fact that, the valuation made was basing on the fieldworks done within the settlements. These fieldworks did not indicate how democracy and participation of the residents were achieved.

7.2.4 Lack of knowledge on more realistic levels of compensation
From the field finding and discussions on reflected framework and theories, it was noticed that the level of compensation was made on the value of the actual property which was affected. There were no considerations on the value of land in relations to its location or services provided. The Land Policy of 1997 and its Act of 1999 made provisions on recognizing the value of land with respect to the market economy. But compensations in Manzese and Buguruni settlements seemed not to consider that.

As a result of that, it was difficult for the displaced residents to access resettlement areas within settlements of equivalent status as their previous settlement since they were unable to afford the land market value of such areas. The affected house owners were not aware that the compensation they received was supposed to cover the loss of advantages related to the location and the improved services which were brought by the upgrading project.
As far as the theoretical and policy framework reflections made in order to understand the process of displacement and resettlement in Manzese and Buguruni settlements, it can be said that the provisions were idealistic and somehow difficult to be achieved in the real situation. As a result of that there were such shortcomings which were much felt by the affected group of tenants and house owners.
Chapter Eight
Implications and further research

From this research the process of displacement and resettlement of the displaced residents from upgraded settlements in Dar es Salaam city was analysed. The analysis identified the emerging patterns of issues and opportunities within the resettlement process from Manzese and Buguruni displaced residents. Also the research provided the discussions whereby shortcomings were identified while reflecting the process with the provisions from policies and theories reviewed. In this chapter the implications of the analysed process within the planning profession is provided it is as well conclude on the weaknesses of the project, the theories and framework which were used in the analysis of research finding. The research also suggests further research from the identified unanswered questions which came up from the discussions.

8.1 Summary in relation to research questions
The main question of this research was on how the displaced residents resettled from their previous settlement during the implementation of upgrading projects. It was seen that the ten displaced residents; four house owners and six tenants were displaced in order to give way for the provision of infrastructure such as access roads, public toilets, and storm water drainage within Manzese and Buguruni settlements. Since the number of respondents was very few, the findings of this research give an indicative picture of what is happening in such processes. These displaced residents used their own resources to resettle within, nearby, and far away from their previous settlements. Among the specific questions posed for this research was seeking to know where the displaced residents resettled. The research found out that the tenants were able to get resettlement rooms within their previous settlements. Some of them managed to resettle in the next house from their previous houses. The house owners did not have such an option of resettling within or even nearby their settlement. This was because they could not afford the expenses of acquiring a plot or a house within or nearby their settlements. It was therefore found out that tenants and house owners had different experiences in the displacement
and resettlement process. It was therefore indicated by this research that tenants and house owners have different characteristics within their settlements and consequently were supposed to be considered differently in the policy frameworks.

On answering the question on choices or alternatives of resettlement options, the research realized that being an informal settlement, located in a prime areas of the city, it was impossible to find an empty plot for new development. So for the house owners the only option they had was to resettle far away from their settlements, some went as far as 28, 25 and 20 kilometres away. Such distances give an indication of urban sprawl which is also a problem when it comes to service provisions and travel costs which are usually a challenge to low income people such as those living in informal settlements.

When enquiring on issues and opportunities faced by the displaced residents in their resettled areas, the research also gives an indication that; depending on the choice of resettlement options that the displaced residents had to take, there were issues and opportunities associated with such choices. These issues and opportunities were some individually felt and some were common within a group of displaced residents. For example, the group of house owners who were resettled outside their previous settlements, faced issues of inaccessibility to social services and basic infrastructures such as water and electricity supply, public transport, health facilities. Such issues occurred due to the fact that the resettled settlements were far away outside the city were infrastructure and services were not yet in place. The house owners also experienced to some extent and for a certain period of time marginalization, social disarticulation and family disintegration. Such experiences were for a short while to some of the displaced residents and for a longer period of time for others.

The tenants faced the issues of being temporarily homeless and also their families being disintegrated for a certain period of time. Like the house owners, some of the tenants suffered from the issues for a shorter and some for a longer period of time. These tenants did not face other issues such as that of loss of access to common resources, marginalization or social disarticulation since they remained within or
nearby their previous settlements. In that case they managed to maintain their social ties and access to common facilities.

When it comes to opportunities accrued, just like issues, depended on the resettlement option taken. There is an indication that house owners who resettled far away from their previous settlements had opportunities of acquiring more land than what they had in their previous plots. Such big lands gave them potential of expanding their houses and engaging in other activities like farming. In that case they had a chance of improving their livelihood options; expand human competence and improving their properties. Unlike tenants, with the fact that they remained in their settlements or moved in neighbouring ones, they only had an opportunity of improved social services which came with the implementation of the project and also improved rooms for rent. These opportunities came with the cost of increased rents compared to what they were paying before displacement that is before the upgrading project.

It can be concluded that the type of resettlement opted determined the issues and opportunities the displaced residents faced. Also the tenure status that is being a property owner or just a tenant also influenced the option of resettlement as well as the challenges which came with the displacement and resettlement process. It was observed in the reflections that there were a number of shortcomings in the process of displacement and resettlement experienced in Manzese and Buguruni settlements. These included lack of adequate resources which made the number of community planning team to be reduced during the actual implementation of the project. Also there was lack of proper representation of a certain group, the tenants within the society. The use of out-dated action plan was also among the shortcomings which resulted into bitter experiences to the displaced house owners. Failure to achieve the participation level which would have brought influence to the project was also among the shortcomings of the project as they were provided by theories and framework reflections on this research.
8.2 Implications to regularization process

The emphasis on conducting regularization process in a democratic and participatory manner was made in order to facilitate the achievement of the upgrading project’s objective easily and less costly. The objective was to improve the lives of the informal settlement dwellers without moving them away from their settlements. But this research gives an indication that the approach was not fulfilled but rather creates more hardship to those who made it possible for the project to be implemented. Though the findings of this research are from the few displaced residents, the policy on regularization can get an indication of what is worth to be considered when it comes to other similar process within Dar es Salaam city and minimize its emerging issues and shortcomings for better urban development strategies.

From the theoretical point of view, the planning process should have taken into consideration the freedom of speech and rational arguments by enabling all the residents of Manzese and Buguruni settlements to come together and discuss on how to influence the project for the benefit of all the residents. The discussions should have made it clear what is going to be gained and what is going to be lost and on whose expenses. Such a discussion or rather debate could have unified the community members both who were to be displaced and those who were to remain. That situation could have facilitated the possibility of sharing the burden of those who were to be displaced together with those who were to remain in a better settlement.

Knowing that tenants and house owner have different status within the community policy framework should have considered that rather than assuming the fact that they both share the common interest which in this research was to improve the living condition of their unplanned settlements. Such an assumption resulted into less consideration as the community regarded tenants to have less contribution into the development of the community due to their status of being temporary residents.
8.3 Further research

It was realized that there were important provisions from the World Bank Resettlement Policy Frameworks which was reflected on Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP) in guiding resettlement and compensation issues. These provisions were not adhered to and results into a number of shortcomings in the project. For the case of reviewed policies, it was found that they did not cover the issue of resettlement but on how to conduct regularization and compensations for affected property owners. This shows that there is a gap in policy provisions regarding the issue of resettlement of displaced residents from the CIUP upgrading projects. The same situation can be applicable to other big projects of that nature which displaced a large number of people. These projects are likely to be applying the same policy provisions and also suffer the issue of lack of resources and real participation. In that case increase the magnitude of resettlement challenges and chances for urban development strategies to fail.

With such a noted weakness or gap in the policy provision, it is recommended that, a further research has to be conducted for the purpose of looking upon legal framework on physical regularization process in Tanzania. Also further analysis of legal and policy implication for regularization and resettlement process is also needed. From the analysis of legal frameworks and physical planning process in Tanzania, it can be realized why there were no provisions for resettlements areas for the affected residents. Also why there were no other ideas of upgrading such as that of densification within the same settlement if provision of resettlement plots was not possible.

The unanswered questions also include why compensations were not considered as according to the policy provisions and regulations. There is also a need to enquire how livelihood and standard of living of the affected displaced residents was expected to improve. As such was the intention of the guiding regulations of the project. Also, some insights from the planning profession point of view as well as project set up is necessary in answering a number of concerns raised up from the displaced individual residents. For example, the status of land tenure of the displaced house owners within their new settlement areas, do they have more
secured tenure status or is it like that of their previous settlement. It is also important to known the status so as to be sure if the efforts of regularization are solving the problem of informal settlement or just shifting it from one place to others.

It could be important to the planning profession especially on the policy of regularization to avail on how the process of democracy and participation as it was suggested in the communicative and collaborative planning as well as that of justice theories, could have been achieve in such diverse settlements as that of Buguruni and Manzese. In that case, there is a need for further research to deal with legal and professional aspects on displacement and resettlement of displaced residents from upgraded settlements.

A need to understand the displacement and resettlement process which has taken place in urban renewal projects which are as well very common in developing cities such as the Dar es Salaam city. This kind of project usually displaces and resettles most of the residents if not all of them. Information obtained from such projects will complement the findings from this research and provide a useful knowledge in dealing with the proliferation of informal settlements. Such knowledge is necessary in order to make use of the indicative findings provided by this research into a more general and applicable knowledge into the planning profession.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Main steps for Qualitative research.

General research questions

Selecting relevant sites and subjects

Collection of relevant data

Interpretation of data

Collection of further data

Tighter specification of the research

Conceptual and theoretical work

Write up findings/conclusion

Source: Adopted from Bryman (2004:269)
Appendix 2: Plates showing the improved condition of upgraded settlements in Buguruni and Manzese.

Plate 1: Access road with flexible planning standards in Manzese

Plate 2: Improved infrastructure with improved developments
Plate 3: Access road with drainage channels in Manzese

Plate 4: Public water kiosk in Buguruni
Plate 5: Access road and drainage channel in Buguruni

Plate 6: Access road with drainage channel in Buguruni
Plate 7: Tarmac road in Buguruni

Plate 8: Improved access road within Buguruni-Mnyamani settlement
Appendix 3 Questionnaire for house owners

Resettling displaced residents from regularized settlements in Dar es Salaam City Tanzania: The case of Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP).

Open ended questionnaire for in depth interview with displaced house owners
  Name of the interviewer:……………………………….Date:……………………….
  Name of the interviewee:…………………………………………………………….
  Gender of the interviewee: M/F:…………., Age:……………,Tribe:……………

A: BEFORE THE DISPLACEMENT
  1. Where did you leave before you come to this place?: ……………………………
  2. For how long did you live there?:…………………………………………………
  3. How did you own your plot/house?................................................................
  4. Describe uses of your plot/house................................................................
  5. What was the size of your plot/house?..............................................................
  6. Describe its quality (plot/house):................................................................
  7. How many occupants did it have (tenants, family members, relatives, etc)?....
  8. In case of tenants, how many and how much did they pay for rent?..............
  9. What kind of social facilities/services did you have in your settlement?...........

10. Can you describe the availability these services and facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Type of facility/service</th>
<th>Level of service</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business/shopping center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Police post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What other social networks/groups did you have?........................................

.............................................................................................................
12. How did you benefit from those groups/networks?

13. What was your economic status (source of income)?

B: DURING DISPLACEMENT/RELOCATION PROCESS

14. How come that you moved?

15. Do you know that there were upgrading project in your settlement? How did you know about it?

16. Describe the process of property/land acquisition for project implementation...

17. Do you remember when you were displaced?

18. How long did it take for you to relocate?

19. Explain the process of displacement and relocation (how was it done, by who)...

20. Where you consulted (or give your opinion) on where you would like to relocate?

21. How much were you compensated?
22. Where you satisfied with the whole process of demolition, compensation and relocation?
Explain:..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
23. Where you given time and other assistance for relocation? ....................... 
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
24. Have you resume your normal life?...............................................................
25. How long did it take for you to be in this situation?................................. 
..................................................................................................................
26. How did you find/get a new place? ..............................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
27. If given a chance to suggest, explain how would you like the process of demolition 
and relocation to be done:..........................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
C: AFTER DISPLACEMENT/RELOCATION
28. Why did you move to this place?.................................................................
..................................................................................................................
29. Compared to your previous house/plot how do you rank your present house/plot is it 
better or worse? Explain:.................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
30. Did displacement cause any family disintegration, explain:..................... 
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
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31. How do you rank your life after displacement, have gained/lose in terms of property ownership (land, house ownership)? .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

32. What is your current economic status, employment/business opportunities? .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

33. Do you have a chance/opportunity of using your personal competence fully in your relocated area? .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

34. Compared to before displacement, how do access common properties/social facilities? .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

35. Was there any disruption of education services during and after resettlement? .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

36. How do you relate yourself with the current community? (Any social groups/networks) .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................

37. Compared your life before and after displacement, do you think the project was fair to you? (in terms of compensation, benefits from the project, etc.) .................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
                                                                 ..............................................................................................................................................................
38. Why did you settle here?

39. How long did it take you to resettle after displacement?

40. Did you receive any assistance from the project/community member?, explain

41. How do you associate/feel with the new community?

Thank you for your time!
Appendix 4 Questionnaire for tenants

Resettling displaced residents from regularized settlements in Dar es Salaam City, Tanzania: The case of Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP)

Open ended questionnaire for in depth interview with displaced tenants

Name of the interviewer:…………………………………Date:………………………
Name of the interviewee:……………………………………………………………………
Gender of the interviewee: M/F:……….., Age:………………,Tribe:…………………………

A: BEFORE DISPLACEMENT

1. Where did you come from? (place of origin)………………………………………………
2. Where did you live here in Dar es Salaam? ………………………………………
3. Why did you come to rent that settlement?............................................................
4. How long have you been in the settlement?............................................................
5. What was your source of income? ...........................................................................
6. Family status (married, kids):..............................................................................
7. What is the education profile of your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>House hold member</th>
<th>Level of education/skills</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How much was your rent?......................................................................................
9. What was the size and quality of your room(s)?...................................................
10. Where you accessible to any social services/facilities? Mention how accessible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Type of facility/service</th>
<th>Level of service</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business/shopping center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Police post</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Where you a member of any social groups/network?...........................................
12. How did you benefit from those groups?.........................................................

B: DURING DISPLACEMENT AND RELOCATION

13. Where you aware of upgrading project in your settlement?........How did you know?..............................................................................................................
14. As a tenant where you involved in such a project?..........................................
    If yes, how?........................................................................................................
15. How did participation towards displacement and relocation?


17. Did you received any assistance, if any describe it?

18. Did displacement cause any family disarticulation? If yes, how?

C: AFTER DISPLACEMENT/RELOCATION

19. How did you move to this place/house?

20. What is the quality of the house/room that you are renting now?

21. How much are you paying now?

22. Why did you choose to rent here?

23. What is your current economic status (business, employment)

24. Compared to your former settlement what can you say about, availability of customers or distance to your employment area

25. What is your opinion on current availability of basic services (transport, business/employment proximity or availability, school, hospital and other social amenities)

26. Compared the former and the present settlement what can be missed or what has been gained in terms of resources, proximity to basic facilities?

27. As a tenant do you think the process displacement and relocation was fair to you? Explain

28. What is your opinion on the whole process of displacement and relocation?

Thank you for your time!
Appendix 5 Questionnaire for focus group discussions

Resettling displaced residents from regularized settlements in Dar es Salaam City Tanzania: The case of Community Infrastructure Upgrading Program (CIUP).

Checklist questions for Focus Group Discussions with Mtaa Leaders and Community planning team members

1. Can you recall when was the CIUP project stared in your settlement and how was it introduced?
2. How did you, as a leaders and committee members knew about it?
3. How did you inform the rest of the community and what was the reaction from them?
4. How was the procedure of demolition, please explain?
5. As an Mtaa leader and committee members what were your roles in the process of demolition?
6. When did resettlement took place in your settlement?
7. How was displacement and resettlement process conducted within your settlement?
8. As an Mtaa leader or committee members, what was your role in the displacement and resettlement process?
9. Was there freedom of speech and rational arguments during the process of displacement and finding options for resettlement?
10. Was democracy and participatory development considered when it comes to displacement and resettlement of the displaced residents?

Thank you very much for your cooperation!
Appendix 6: Participants of focus group discussions in Manzese, Mnazi Mmoja

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JINA</th>
<th>CHEO</th>
<th>MWIKII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ELIAMRISI KUNAI</td>
<td>2. OMARI OMARI</td>
<td>3. MUSSA MMANNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. AYU MKASI</td>
<td>5. HALIMA MGRADA</td>
<td>6. MARIA MARUNDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FARKA ABDALLAH</td>
<td>8. RUKA A CHAULA</td>
<td>9. GETRODA NASOLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. SAMUEL MASWA</td>
<td>RECORDER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Participants of focus group discussion in Buguruni, Mnyamani

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabir Sanoe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paidha Mlwizi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katibu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majumuna Mzellele</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abude Bawazir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muwana Hamis Chumu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retema Omari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musyafa Habulanika</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juma Mbaruku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramadhani Wa2ir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>