

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Electoral boundary delimitation or the creation and realignment of electoral boundaries, establishes the electoral units used for representation. At its core, boundary delimitation creates the linkage between citizens and their elected representatives, establishing which representative voices the concerns and aspirations of citizens in representative bodies. This representation is linked to the fundamental principle, established in Zambia's Constitution and in international covenants, of one person, one vote, whereby all votes count equally and all voices are equally heard in councils and parliament. For the principle of one person, one vote to hold true, constituencies and other electoral boundaries must maintain roughly equal populations and best practice establishes a legal benchmark with a tolerable variation in population of 5-10% . As population trends shift over time, regular boundary delimitation focusing on population trends can address migration from one area to another and population growth, ensuring that a country's deliberative bodies accurately represent citizens. While other concerns may factor into boundary delimitation, such as ensuring that particular communities are within a single voting block to avoid diluting their voices across multiple constituencies, or using geographical features as natural boundaries, the fundamental concern for delimitation is one of equal representation and therefore population.

Following the constitutional reforms in late 2025, the Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ), per its mandate established in Article 229 of the Constitution, conducted a boundary delimitation exercise of constituencies in order to conform to the 70 constituency-based seats created by the reform. Zambia's previous boundary delimitation in 2019 did not ultimately delimit constituencies and the report on the exercise was never made public. From 6 to 26 February, the ECZ conducted district-level and then provincial-level delimitation sittings, followed by the release of the new constituencies on April 16.

The Christian Churches Monitoring Group (CCMG), conducted both in-person observation of the 116 district-level sittings and the 10 provincial-level sittings, as well as a voting power analysis of the constituencies before and after the 2026 delimitation. CCMG's observation of the sittings aimed to assess their accessibility to citizens seeking to make submissions, the facilitation of deliberations and sharing of information by the ECZ, while the voting power analysis helps to understand if equality of the vote is upheld by the resulting electoral boundaries or if some constituencies are under or overrepresented.

Key Findings

- The timing of the boundary delimitation process in Zambia ran counter to international standards and best practices regarding late electoral changes close to an election. Introducing significant alterations to constituencies just months before the campaign period may confuse voters, create challenges for finalizing the voters list and polling station list, and place strains on parties and aspirants to quickly shift campaign strategies and candidate recruitment. The compressed process was also initially plagued by a lack of clarity and information, including clear timelines and procedures.
- Initial analysis of the new constituencies by province, made available on April 16, 2026, demonstrate on-going and significant voting power disparity by province, undermining the key principle of one person, one vote, which should guide such an exercise. Additional information on the population of constituencies and their boundaries is needed from the ECZ for more complete analysis of the equality of the vote by constituency.
- The district sitting exercises demonstrated notable strengths in administration, technical capacity, and procedural compliance. The process was generally orderly and informative, with minimal incidents. However, in some instances, access to key documents was limited, public communication varied across districts, and not all consultation venues were equally accessible.
- The sitting exercise also highlighted areas where greater public engagement could have further strengthened trust and legitimacy. The absence of structured feedback mechanisms such as publicly available consolidated provincial reports or post-submission validation platforms made it more difficult for stakeholders to track how their inputs influenced final decisions.

Priority Recommendations

Overall, the 2026 delimitation process underscored the need to further strengthen legal and procedural safeguards that support transparency, participation, and accountability. Key recommendations for both the current and future processes include:

- Outlining each stage of the delimitation process in law such as timelines, data

collection, information sharing, boundary proposals, consultations, appeals and revisions, and final publication so that all stakeholders have a shared understanding of how decisions are made.

- To mitigate confusion and ensure stability in electoral planning, delimitation processes should be legally separated from imminent elections by adopting provisions that ensure boundary delimitation occurs on off-cycle years, and/or that any boundary changes effected within twelve months of an election apply only to future electoral cycles.
- Given ongoing challenges of voting power inequality across constituencies and in the absence of clear guidance in the legal framework, the ECZ should formalize and clearly communicate a national population quota (citizens-per-constituency ratio) as the central benchmark for delimitation. In addition the ECZ should clarify the level of deviation tolerance for constituencies from the population quota in line with international standards, i.e. 5%.
- Using the one person, one vote principle, the ECZ should revise current constituencies that appear significantly out of balance to promote a more fair and credible electoral map and public confidence in representative institutions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Boundary delimitation is the process of mapping and re-aligning electoral boundaries (constituencies and wards) for the administration of elections and the representation of citizens through their elected representatives. The delimitation of electoral boundaries is a key electoral process and should be guided by the fundamental principles of impartiality, equality, representativeness, non-discrimination and transparency. To this end, criteria and procedures used in delimitation should ensure the “one person, one vote,” or the principle of equal suffrage, which demands that all votes count equally, as guided by the Constitution and international covenants. At the constituency level, this means that the voices of all citizens of a constituency are represented by their member of parliament in the national assembly. To preserve the principle of one person, one vote, each member of parliament should represent a roughly equal number of citizens.

In Zambia, boundary delimitation is a legal provision in Article 58 (4) of the Constitution that provides that the Electoral Commission shall determine the names and boundaries of constituencies and wards. Further, Articles 59(a)-(e) and 229(2)(g) of the Constitution also provides that the Electoral Commission shall, in delimiting the boundaries of constituencies and wards consider historical context, population density and trends, communication and geography, ensure boundaries remain within districts, and aim for equal population distribution while ensuring fair representation for both urban and sparsely populated areas.

Principles of Boundary Delimitation and Equal Representation

Equal and universal suffrage, one of the most fundamental standards for democratic elections, is grounded in the condition that every vote has equal weight and that the electoral system allows for actual and equal representation. Practically speaking, this means equality of the vote relating to the proportion of voters to representatives. This principle is enshrined in international mechanisms, including the UN Declaration on Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), but also echoed in the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights and Zambia’s Constitution. Therefore, the boundary delimitation process should seek approximate population equality among constituencies or other electoral boundaries and be grounded in population data. This may be augmented by other considerations, as noted in the Constitution, such as historical, geographic, infrastructure, and urban and rural representation, but is typically controlled by a permissible population deviation among constituencies that is reasonable and clarified in the legal or administrative framework. Unfortunately, no such threshold has been legally established in Zambia despite the

recent Constitutional amendments and proposed changes to the Electoral Process Act (EPA), and previous recommendations from the CCMG Election Observation Report.

Like all electoral processes, boundary delimitation should be rooted in transparency, which means apportionment criteria should be publicly available and include details such as the number of residents, number of registered voters, or as well as any other criteria used and how it was integrated into ultimate delineations. Similarly such a process should be subject to independent scrutiny by civil society, candidates and political parties, or other groups. As a best practice, boundary delimitation should be based on total population not, for instance, registered voters or voting age population as elected officials are responsible for representing their entire constituency populations, including children and other unregistered voters.

Historical Background

Zambia has undertaken periodic boundary delimitation exercises as part of its broader efforts to strengthen democratic representation and respond to demographic, administrative, and political developments. These exercises have been guided by constitutional provisions and the need to ensure that electoral boundaries reflect population distribution, geographical considerations, and the principle of equal representation. In 1991, the number of constituencies was increased from 125 to 150 following the constitutional review undertaken during Zambia's transition to multi-party democracy. This reform aimed to realign electoral boundaries in response to population changes and to enhance inclusivity and representation within the National Assembly. The introduction of multi-party politics necessitated a more representative electoral framework, and delimitation played a central role in achieving this objective.

In 2016, delimitation was undertaken in the context of administrative reforms, particularly the creation of new districts. While the creation of new districts sought to enhance administrative efficiency and improve accessibility, it also led to overlapping constituencies. Consequently, the 2016 delimitation exercise led to a modest increase in the number of constituencies from 150 to 156 to align constituency boundaries with district boundaries. Despite these efforts, disparities in constituency populations have persisted over time, underscoring the continued need for comprehensive and regular delimitation exercises with clear requirements to uphold the constitutional principle of equal representation and ensure effective democratic governance.

In several parts of the country, uneven population distribution has resulted in constituencies with significantly higher numbers of citizens compared to others, thereby undermining the principle of equal representation. This means that some populations

are over-represented in the National Assembly, while others are under-represented. Delimitation, therefore, should rebalance representation using objective criteria such as total population size, geographic features, administrative boundaries, accessibility, and other relevant demographic considerations.

Context of the 2026 Boundary Delimitation Exercise

The 2026 boundary delimitation in Zambia represents a substantial electoral reform following the enactment of the Constitution of Zambia (Amendment) Act No. 13 of 2025, which significantly revised the representational framework by increasing the number of constituencies from 156 to 226, thus and mandating the establishment of 70 new constituencies based on the recommendations of the Mushabati-led Technical Committee on Constitutional Amendment (TCCA). Conducted in February and March 2026, the exercise involved one-day delimitation sittings in every district, followed by a one-day sitting in every province.

Articles 58 and 59 of the Constitution give the ECZ the authority to determine and periodically review electoral boundaries at intervals of not more than ten years. These provisions require that constituency boundaries be informed by factors such as population equality, geographical features, community interests, and administrative boundaries. As such, the law frames delimitation as both a constitutional obligation and a technical mechanism designed to promote equitable representation and uphold electoral integrity, though gaps such as the absence of an acceptable variance in population between constituencies and explicit publication procedures remain an area for reform.

The shortcomings of the 2026 delimitation exercise and CCMG's recommendations can be better understood in the context of the 2019 delimitation exercise, which exposed critical gaps in the legal framework governing boundary reviews. While the ECZ undertook delimitation in 2019 in line with constitutional provisions, the law did not clearly prescribe how the final delimitation report should be published, disseminated, or subjected to public scrutiny. This lack of procedural clarity limited transparency and public accountability, and the 2019 report was never made public, nor were constituencies delimited. The 2026 delimitation process, therefore, presented an opportunity to address these shortcomings by strengthening legal and administrative procedures for transparency and accountability in the creation of electoral boundaries, stronger guidance for equal representation, and more meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Importantly, the Electoral Reform Technical Committee (ERTC) report of June, 2025 recommended that delimitation outcomes should be formally published and widely disseminated to ensure transparency, legitimacy, and public confidence. The ERTC

emphasized that the ECZ should not only produce a comprehensive report but also make it accessible through official gazettes and public platforms, allowing for greater scrutiny and understanding of how boundaries are determined. The Committee further recommended the operationalization of Section 125 of the Electoral Process Act by developing regulations governing constituency delimitation. Anchoring the 2026 exercise within these recommendations is therefore critical to enhancing electoral integrity and aligning delimitation practices with principles of openness and accountability, as well as international standards.

Timing of Boundary Delimitation and Implications for the 2026 Elections

The 2026 delimitation exercise should be contextualized within the broader framework of electoral reform, particularly given its intersection with voter registration processes and its impact on political campaigns and party organizing. Initiating boundary delimitation proximate to a general election introduces considerable administrative and legal complexities. Adjustments to constituency boundaries necessitate corresponding updates to the allocation of voters across polling districts and constituencies, thereby increasing the risk of inaccuracies in the voter register. In Zambia, where the inspection and certification of the Register of Voters is occurring concurrently with the delimitation process, there is a risk of inconsistencies between revised voter data and newly established constituency boundaries. This situation could lead to voter confusion, errors within the register, and potential disenfranchisement, ultimately undermining public confidence in both the electoral process and the credibility of the ECZ.

The timing of boundary delimitation also significantly affects candidate strategy and electoral competitiveness. Candidates benefit from stable and predictable constituency lines, so that they are able to develop their support base and understand voters' concerns and priorities. Late adjustments to boundaries introduce uncertainty and complicate campaign planning. The creation of new constituencies may divide traditional support bases or combine areas with distinct political identities, requiring candidates to adapt strategies rapidly and parties to recruit new pools of aspirants. Such uncertainty may also foster opportunistic "constituency searching," increase the likelihood of electoral disputes, and disadvantage new entrants who may lack resources for swift adaptation. Comparative experience, notably Article 89(11) of Kenya's Constitution (2010), highlights the value of insulating elections from such disruptions by ensuring that boundary changes near an election take effect only in subsequent cycles.

II. METHODOLOGY

CCMG implemented a structured and systematic observation of the 2026 boundary delimitation exercise using a standardized Boundary Delimitation Observation (BDO) checklist. The checklist was designed to ensure consistency in data collection and reporting, while enabling CCMG to assess the transparency, inclusiveness, and procedural integrity of both the provincial and district boundary delimitation sittings conducted by the ECZ. CCMG complemented its observation with analysis of the resulting constituencies for voting power equality. As of publication, the ECZ has not yet provided a detailed breakdown of population per constituency, thus CCMG's analysis focuses on averages at the provincial level.

For the district boundary delimitation sittings, CCMG deployed 116 observers across all 116 districts (one observer per district) to observe the district-level consultations. All 116 observers successfully submitted their observation reports to the CCMG data center. The district-level observation was intended to capture how the delimitation process unfolded at the local level, where stakeholders directly engaged with proposals affecting constituencies, wards, and communities. For the provincial boundary delimitation sittings, CCMG deployed ten (10) observers, with one observer assigned to each of Zambia's ten provinces. Across both provincial and district sittings, observers monitored several critical aspects of the process. These included whether members of the public and stakeholders were permitted to observe the proceedings, whether the sittings were held according to the ECZ schedule, and whether the venues were appropriate and accessible, particularly for persons with disabilities. Observers also assessed the level and diversity of stakeholder participation, including the presence of ECZ officials, council and government officials, traditional leaders, political party representatives, civil society organisations, faith-based organisations, Members of Parliament, and the media.

In addition, observers evaluated the extent to which the ECZ provided relevant delimitation information, such as maps of existing boundaries, population statistics, the Boundary Delimitation report of 2019, the Electoral Reforms Technical Committee (ERTC) Report of 2025, and other supporting documents necessary for informed engagement. They further assessed whether stakeholders were given opportunities to make submissions, raise concerns, and provide recommendations both during and after the sittings. Finally, observers documented any disputes, tensions, incidents or irregularities that arose during the process.

CCMG's observation is also complemented by analysis of the pre-2026 constituency

boundaries and the new constituencies announced in April 2026. This analysis relied on population data from the 2022 census and looks at relative voting power by province by constituency across provinces, pending additional information from the ECZ on constituency boundaries and populations, as constituency deviations from population averages to determine the equality of the vote across the country. As more details of the new constituencies are made available, CCMG will provide more in-depth analysis on their distribution and impact.



III. DISTRICT DELIMITATION SITTINGS

3.1.1 Meeting Venue and Schedule

The district delimitation sittings adhered to established procedures. Most observed sittings were conducted according to the official schedule, reflecting adherence to planned timelines, and administrative preparedness. However, observers noted a lack of publicity regarding district sittings (such as radio notifications or flyers) in 9% of districts.

In terms of venue selection, 97% of sittings were held in public spaces. However, accessibility remained a key concern with 9% of observers reporting that their district sitting venue was not independently accessible to persons with disabilities. This was a slight improvement from the 2019 delimitation sittings exercise, which showed even higher barriers (31% of venues requiring the use of stairs). Despite these gains, persistent accessibility gaps indicate that the delimitation process was not fully inclusive across all districts.

3.1.2 Stakeholder Participation

Stakeholder participation was generally broad but uneven across different stakeholder groups. Institutional participation was near universal, with 100% attendance by government officials from the district administration and 100% representation from local government structures, reflecting strong institutional coordination and formal legitimacy of the process. The participation of Traditional leadership was reported at 96% and media participation at 97%, both were high, reinforcing public visibility of the process. Political engagement was also significant, with members of parliament attending 82% of sittings, indicating strong political interest in boundary outcomes. Political parties were also present at most sittings, though the ruling party was slightly more visible. Representatives from UPND were present in 98% of sittings, while other political parties were represented in 86% of sittings.

However, civil society and faith-based organisations were present in only 55% of sittings, reflecting relatively weak and inconsistent civic engagement. This represents a notable gap in independent oversight and citizen voice within the process, and reflects a reduction from the previous boundary delimitation exercise. When compared to the 2019 sittings, civic participation was significantly broader, with civil society engagement recorded at approximately 73% of sittings observed and political parties attending all sessions observed. Broad civic engagement in boundary delimitation is critical for independent scrutiny and public buy-in of the process.

3.1.3 Technical Preparedness and Information Sharing

The process demonstrated high levels of information sharing at the district level, although there was some inconsistency in certain background documentation. Nearly all sittings benefited from the provision of key technical materials, including boundary maps (98%), explanations of delimitation criteria (98%), population data (100%), and constituency population ratios (97%). In addition, 93% of sittings included discussions on the number of proposed constituencies. This enabled stakeholders to engage with empirical information during deliberations. However, only 12% of sittings provided access to previous delimitation reports, including the 2019 report, and only 16% made available relevant recommendations from the ERTC. This could limit stakeholders' understanding of the broader context of the delimitation exercise and opportunities for improvement.

3.1.4 Participation and Deliberative Engagement During Sittings

The sittings were generally open and participatory. Most observers (97%) confirmed the existence of formal mechanisms for stakeholders to submit concerns during sittings, and no cases were reported where stakeholders were prevented from making submissions. This indicates an open environment with no evidence of exclusion or suppression of participation.

In addition, 79% of sittings included explanations on how stakeholders could submit post-sitting concerns or recommendations, suggesting that follow-up engagement mechanisms were identified in most, but not all, districts and indicating some inconsistency or lack of clarity in post-consultation processes.

In terms of substantive engagement, discussions around new constituencies focused on population changes; geography and physical barriers; accessibility, distance and administrative efficiency; as well as district history and community ties. However, population-based reasoning in delimitation discussions seemed focused on population changes within each district and not necessarily constituency equitability across districts.

However, CCMG notes that the 2019 district sittings were typically longer, lasting up to four days per sitting, allowing for more extensive deliberation, stakeholder engagement, and contestation of proposals. By contrast, the 2026 sittings were generally limited to a single day, which may have constrained the depth of deliberation and reduced opportunities for comprehensive stakeholder input, particularly on complex or contested boundary issues.

The 2019 district sittings were deliberative and sometimes conflictual, with notable disagreements, walkouts, and dispute resolution interventions in several districts. The

2026 process, in contrast, was more orderly and peaceful, with fewer visible disputes but also less active debate. Observers only recorded two instances of disruptions or violence during the sittings, suggesting relative calm and tolerance in the process despite the politically sensitive nature of boundary delimitation.

However, CCMG notes that while the sittings provided a forum for submissions, the lack of release of key information - including the 2019 boundary delimitation report - and clear procedures on how population, geography and other considerations are weighted in the decision-making process, means that key aspects of the delimitation process lack transparency.



IV. PROVINCIAL BOUNDARY DELIMITATION SITTINGS

CCMG's observation of the provincial boundary delimitation sittings reflected that the sittings largely functioned as ceremonial platforms for the submission of district-level delimitation reports to the Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ), rather than as substantive forums for deliberation, validation, or decision-making. While the process facilitated the formal handover of reports compiled at the district level, it did not provide a structured opportunity for collective interrogation, refinement, or consensus-building on the proposed boundary adjustments.

From CCMG's assessment, the expectation of a delimitation process grounded in transparency, inclusivity, and public accountability is that, following the submission of district reports to the ECZ, a consolidated provincial report including key issues raised, stakeholder inputs, and any resolutions or divergences should be publicly shared. Such disclosure should be accompanied by a defined window for additional submissions, objections/appeals, or clarifications from stakeholders and the general public before the gazetting of new constituencies. The absence of this feedback loop limits opportunities for validation and corrective input, thereby weakening public confidence in the legitimacy of the final delimitation outcomes. Any process that concludes without structured stakeholder validation risks reducing delimitation to a procedural formality rather than a participatory democratic exercise.

This gap also highlights a broader concern regarding legal and procedural clarity in Zambia's delimitation framework. The current practice appears to lack explicit statutory provisions detailing how stakeholder submissions are to be consolidated, reviewed, published, and validated before final constituency boundaries are determined. This ambiguity creates room for inconsistent application of procedures and undermines uniform standards of participation and accountability across provinces. CCMG therefore underscores the need to strengthen the legal framework governing boundary delimitation, including clear provisions on public reporting, stakeholder validation mechanisms, and enforceable timelines for consultation.

V. INITIAL ANALYSIS OF ANNOUNCED CONSTITUENCIES

At the time of this report, the ECZ had only released topline information regarding the new constituencies for the 2026 elections. This analysis is based on these figures and population data from the 2022 census. As the ECZ has not released the composition of the new constituencies, i.e. their populations, the wards they contain and their geographical boundaries, it is not possible to conduct an analysis of voting power of individual constituencies. As the table below demonstrates, the newly proposed constituencies do not appear to closely adhere to the principles of equality of the vote for many provinces and leave some Zambians unfairly underrepresented.



Zambia

Total Population: **19,610,769**



Number of constituencies:

226



Population average per constituency:

86,773

Province	Province Total Population (2022 Census)	Number of Constituencies	Average Population per Constituency	Deviation from National Average (c)	Relative Voting Power
CENTRAL	2,252,483	23	97,934	-12.9%	0.89
COPPERBELT	2,757,539	29	95,088	-9.6%	0.91
EASTERN	2,454,788	29	84,648	2.4%	1.03
LUAPULA	1,514,011	20	75,701	12.8%	1.15
LUSAKA	3,079,964	18	171,109	-97.2%	0.51
MUCHINGA	918,296	14	65,593	24.4%	1.32
NORTHERN	1,618,412	19	85,180	1.8%	1.02
NORTH WESTERN	1,270,028	19	66,844	23.0%	1.30
SOUTHERN	2,381,728	29	82,129	5.4%	1.06
WESTERN	1,363,520	26	52,443	39.6%	1.65
TOTAL	19,610,769	226			

The deviation from the average population per constituency in four provinces (Lusaka, Muchinga, North Western, and Western) exceeds 20 percent, on the high-end of the threshold in international practice. Muchinga, North Western, and Western are considerably overrepresented compared to the other provinces, while voters in Lusaka are drastically

underrepresented, with constituencies deviating 97% from the average population-per-constituency. This is reflected in Lusaka voters' relative vote power, which is half of that of most of the other provinces. Relative voting power should be as close to 1 as possible (one person, one vote). This table, however, shows that several provinces have much stronger relative vote power, with voters in Western for instance having more than three times the voting power as those in Lusaka based on the new constituencies. Such disparities mean that voters in provinces with high relative vote power will be disproportionately represented in the National Assembly. In the absence of explicit guidance in the legal framework, there is no clearly defined or publicly communicated national population quota (i.e., a citizens-per-constituency ratio) serving as the central benchmark for delimitation. Furthermore, the acceptable level of deviation from such a quota is not clearly articulated, limiting transparency around how population equality is assessed and applied in practice, including in relation to international standards.

The 2026 boundary delimitation process was an opportunity to update electoral constituencies to ensure that representation remains fair, balanced, and reflective of population changes in our growing country, using data-driven criteria following the successful 2022 census. In this initial analysis it appears the exercise has fallen short of achieving these goals particularly in regards to voter equality.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented in this section are derived from the key findings of the 2026 boundary delimitation observation, which revealed both procedural strengths and critical gaps in the conduct of the exercise and resulting delimitation. While the process was largely transparent and informative, notable challenges were identified, including limited access to key reference documents, insufficient time for stakeholder consultation, uneven participation among stakeholders, accessibility barriers, and perceptions of predetermined outcomes. Additionally, CCMG's preliminary analysis of the available resulting data from the delimitation notes that significant inequalities in voting power. These issues affected the depth, inclusiveness and credibility of the delimitation process. This section focuses on providing practical, evidence-based recommendations to strengthen future delimitation exercises by promoting transparency, better information dissemination, enhancing inclusivity and accessibility, promoting balanced stakeholder participation, and reinforcing the use of objective criteria such as population quotas.

Lawmakers

- **Update the legal framework:**
 - **Protect elections from last minute boundary changes:** To help prevent confusion and ensure stability in electoral planning, delimitation processes should be legally separated from imminent elections by adopting provisions that ensure boundary delimitation occurs on off-cycle years, and/or that any boundary changes effected within twelve months of an election apply only to future electoral cycles.
 - **Use quotas and tolerable variances:** To address voting power inequalities, namely under and overrepresentation, the legal framework should be updated to establish a population quota per constituency and tolerable variance, in line with international standards.

Electoral Commission of Zambia (ECZ)

CCMG calls on the ECZ to release full and detailed information on the delimitation exercise, the deliberations, how stakeholder feedback was incorporated into decision-making, and how the final constituency boundaries were decided. CCMG notes that without providing constituency boundaries, including the allocation of wards and population into new and old constituencies, citizens and stakeholders are unable to comprehensively understand and assess the boundary delimitation exercise and prepare for the 2026 elections.

- **Develop regulations for boundary delimitation:** In compliance with Section 125 of the Electoral Process Act, the ECZ should develop regulations for delimitation. Such regulations should include delimitation procedures and processes, principles and factors for delimitation, consultation process and publication of the delimitation report.
- **Provide timely information to stakeholders:** The ECZ should ensure that all key information, including schedules, venues, and procedural guidelines, is disseminated to stakeholders in a timely, consistent, and comprehensive manner. In particular; CCMG urges the ECZ to provide advance notice of delimitation activities within a reasonable timeframe to enable adequate stakeholder preparation and participation, and ensure that all public notices include complete logistical details, including specific venues and timelines for sittings. Additionally, the ECZ should communicate any revisions to schedules promptly and through multiple accessible channels. Strengthening the timeliness and completeness of information dissemination will enhance transparency, facilitate meaningful stakeholder participation, and reinforce public confidence in the integrity of critical electoral processes.
- **Institutionalize the use of population quota analysis as a basis for constituency delimitation and define deviation thresholds:** Given ongoing challenges of voter inequality across constituencies, the ECZ should - in the absence of clear guidance in the legal framework - formalize and clearly communicate a national population quota (citizens-per-constituency ratio) as the central benchmark for delimitation. In addition, the ECZ should clarify the level of deviation tolerance from the population quota in line with international standards.
- **Revisit drastically unequal constituencies:** Using the one person, one vote principle, the ECZ should revise current constituencies that appear significantly out of balance to promote a more fair and credible electoral map and public confidence in their representative institutions.
- **Provide detailed and timely information to parties and voters:** Provide political parties and candidates with comprehensive information about the new boundaries immediately so they can align their campaign strategy. In addition, engage in widespread voter education and communication initiatives to enhance understanding among voters of the electoral boundary changes.
- **Guarantee full accessibility of venues to persons with disabilities:** The ECZ should

ensure that all future delimitation sittings, public engagements, and administration of electoral activities are held in venues that meet accessibility standards, including the provision of ramps, appropriate seating arrangements and accessible facilities. Where such venues are not readily available, temporary adjustments should be made.

- **Expand civic education on delimitation principles and electoral reforms:** The findings highlighted gaps in stakeholder understanding of the broader reform context, including the relationship between constitutional amendments and the constituency creation. The ECZ should therefore intensify civic education efforts, with a focus on explaining key concepts such as equal representation, population quotas, and the rationale for creating new constituencies. These efforts should be localized, translated into local languages, and disseminated through multiple platforms to ensure wide reach and comprehension.

Political Parties

- **Promote balanced and constructive participation in delimitation processes:** Political parties should ensure consistent and inclusive participation in delimitation sittings across all districts and provinces. Their engagement should be guided by national interest and the principles of fair representation using objective criteria, rather than partisan advantage. This would contribute to a more balanced and credible delimitation process.

Civil Society and Faith-Based Organisations

- **Enhance civic education and public engagement on delimitation:** CSOs and the Church should complement ECZ efforts by conducting community sensitization programs that explain the importance of boundary delimitation, the concept of equal representation, and the implications of constituency changes. This would help bridge information gaps and empower citizens to participate meaningfully in the process.



   — @CCMG Zambia

 <https://ccmgzambia.org>