



ODD NUMBERS?

Derek Matyszak, Senior Researcher
11 June 2013

Introduction

In a report¹ on the polling figures for the March 16th Referendum of 2013 on a new constitution for Zimbabwe, the Election Support Centre (a Harare based NGO) states that “*the flurry of votes has left more answers than questions (sic) with various suggestions being made to explain the rise in the voter turnout*”. Both ZANU PF and MDC-T sought to interpret increased numbers at the poll, (relative to the 2008 elections and all previous polls) as a sign of support for their parties’ policies and claimed extreme satisfaction with the results.

However, a closer look at the numbers should cause some disquiet for those who hope that the general election of 2013 will meet democratic standards. The numbers which emerge from the Referendum show that, despite the claimed surfeit of answers over questions, the question marks pertaining to the state of the Voters Roll² remain. In fact, the need for urgent attention to this element of the electoral process is underscored. Furthermore, comparing the numbers on the voters roll with those of the Referendum and Census also somewhat undermines any confidence one might place in data presented there.

Methodology

This brief report uses numbers from the recently released preliminary report of the 2012 Census and compares these numbers with the figures on the Voters Roll and the official results of the Referendum.

In compiling these figures, difficulties exist in obtaining accurate and essential information, for current purposes, in respect of each of the three core components – the Census³, the Voters Roll and the Referendum.

¹ “Miracle Votes” An Analysis of the March 2013 Referendum Available at http://www.google.com/search?q=%22miracle+votes%22&hl=en&sourceid=gd&rlz=1Q1GGLD_enBR487BR487

² Zimbabwe has no national voters roll, but rather a separate roll for each of the 210 constituencies. The term voters roll is used here, however, to refer to all 210 rolls for the sake of convenience.

³ The changes in the demographic profile of Zimbabwe from the three censi, 1992 to 2012, are given in Appendix 1.

The Census figures are problematic due to the fact that only preliminary results for the 2012 Census have been released, and these results do not reveal any age demographic, the statistic of prime importance here, and which would make it possible to estimate the eligible voter population (i.e. adults or persons above the age of 18); the Voters Roll is problematic as a source as the only official “electronic” version of the roll available at the time of writing, one released prior to the March 2008 election, does not include the over 300 000 voters added to the roll after its release; and the official results for the Referendum are problematic as they have only been broken down to constituency level, rather than polling station level, as is required for proper psephological analysis.

These difficulties have been approached in the following way.

The gap in the 2012 Census data pertaining to age demographics has been filled by looking at other reports issued by Zimstat, the body under whose auspices the Censi are conducted. As is the convention with censi, the age bands given in the 2002 Census and other reports do not divide at a point which separates adults from minors, there being an overlap in the band of those aged 15 – 19. However, applying an accepted demographological formula, a study⁴ of the 2002 Census showed an adult population of 6 070 537, or approximately 52% of the population. The 2012 Census put the inter-censal growth rate at a low 1.1%, based solely on fertility and mortality rates, ignoring any migration from the country. Thus, a 2011 report⁵ produced in collaboration with Zimstat, the body responsible for the country’s censi, stated the adult population of Zimbabwe to be slightly reduced from that of the 2002 Census at 5,983,253, probably on account of migration.⁶ A second report,⁷ also by Zimstat, issued in the same month, and using a population of 11,930,038, estimated by extrapolation, suggests the adult population to be slightly higher at 6,151,127 people or 51.56% of the total population.⁸

On the basis of the foregoing, it seems reasonable to assume an adult population of no more than 52% of the current population of 12,973,808; that is, 6,746 380 people. If, however, the adult population is taken to be the roughly six million claimed by the 2011 reports, the adult population constitutes 46.25% of the total. If the adult population is in fact a lower percentage than 52%, as is likely⁹, the findings here are exacerbated, if higher mitigated. In what follows, it should be borne in mind that it is not necessary to be on the voters’ roll in order to vote in a referendum. It is merely necessary to prove an entitlement to be registered as a voter.¹⁰ Censi statistics are thus of prime importance, rather than voter registration statistics, when considering the Referendum.

The addition of 300,000 plus voters to the roll after the release of a digital¹¹ version of the 2008 roll has been catered for by utilising figures from an unofficially obtained,¹² but almost assuredly

⁴ *Report on the Age Distribution of Zimbabwe’s Population* Ms. F Matarise UZ October 2003.

⁵ *Finscope Consumer Survey Zimbabwe 2011* Finamark Trust, Zimstat, Government of Zimbabwe, 17.05.12.

⁶ First at p10 and then throughout. The source of this statistic appears to have been extrapolated from the 2002 census. The estimated total population of Zimbabwe is not given.

⁷ *2011 Labour Force Survey* Zimstat 05.2012.

⁸ At p36. If the estimated adult population of the first report is applied, the percentage is just over 50%.

⁹ This is most likely to be the case as many of these adults do not meet other voting criteria such as citizenship. Furthermore, the 52% is also likely to be overstated. With a growth rate of 1.1% the population could not have increased by roughly 900 000 in two years.

¹⁰ Section 6 of the Referendums Act [Chapter 02:10].

¹¹ The roll was in fact released in TIFF format, essentially digital photographs requiring optical character recognition software to convert it to a format allowing analysis.

¹² The unofficial version was not obtained by RAU which was merely supplied with data from the electronic version.

accurate, version of the roll as at October, 2010. The addition of voters to the roll after this date (as is presumably the case) would exacerbate the findings here. Removal of persons from the roll (see below) only apparently took place to any significant extent after the 2012 Census. The findings when taking these removals into account are also given here.

The Zimbabwe Electoral Commission has been approached with a written request for detailed polling information pertaining to the Referendum. This request has not elicited any response. As a result this report confines itself to such conclusions as may be made by examining the data at constituency level.

The Voters Roll

In June 2011 the ZANU PF controlled Herald reported that:

The Registrar-General told journalists yesterday that no country in the world had a voters' roll that was as 100 percent perfect as Zimbabwe's (sic).¹³

An electronic audit of the voters' roll, as it was shortly before this statement (October 2010), showed that 41,119 persons of a total of 5,867,643 were on the roll with ages recorded as being over 100. At the same press briefing the Registrar-General, Tobaiwa Mudede, claimed:

"You don't want these people to attain 100 years, you don't want them to be alive? The law does not say once one attains 100 years he/she should be removed.

Those in opposition to ZANU PF have frequently claimed that the voters' roll is deliberately inflated as a means of facilitating electoral fraud, while ZANU PF has claimed that the roll is accurate. The voters roll is patently inaccurate. Mudede's comments thus did nothing to remove perceptions of his partisanship. It would been more appropriate had he asserted that everything possible was being done to improve the roll.

The number of registered voters has increased steadily since the formation of the MDC, the start of Zimbabwe's economic and political crisis and increased interest in Zimbabwe's politics. This is notwithstanding the large number of people who have left Zimbabwe as economic refugees in this period, and the slow population growth estimated, as indicated above, to be 1.1%. In March, 2002 there were 5,229,538 registered voters, in March 2008 5,727,902 and the figures from the October 2010 roll used here, show 5,867,642 registered voters.

The number on the roll at the time of writing is 5,702,821 and increasing steadily with an ongoing voter registration exercise ahead of elections.¹⁴ Comparing this with the estimated adult population deduced from the 2012 Census, this gives a mathematically possible, but practically dubious, voter registration rate of 87%. Perhaps due to the exposure of a manifestly false registration rate on account of the Census statistics, a report appeared in the ZANU PF controlled Sunday Mail, four months after the release of the preliminary census results (on 14th April 2013), stating that:

¹³ *Voters Roll Clean: Registrar-General* The Herald 18.06.11.

¹⁴ Zimbabwe's new constitution provides for an intensive registration period for 30 days before elections (paragraph 6(3) Part 3 of the Sixth Schedule) in addition to the registration process which commenced on the 29th April, 2013.

“345 400 names of deceased people have been struck off the national voters’ roll in the last five months”.

Avoiding quotation marks, and thus raising the possibility that this was merely the Sunday Mail’s interpretation of a statement by the ZEC chair, Justice Rita Makarau, the report claimed “[Justice Makarau] said contrary to claims by some political parties that the roll was full of dead people, the voters’ register was being updated constantly.” This was followed by a report in the Herald two weeks later (on Friday 3rd May 2013) that:

The Registrar-General’s Office had scrapped almost one million names of deceased people from the voters’ roll as of Wednesday this week, putting to rest claims by MDC formations and some NGOs that the roll was full of dead people.

In the same report, the Registrar-General of voters was quoted as stating:

“Deceased voters from 1985 to 2010 stand at 692 422 while deceased voters from 2010 to date are at 277 198 which gives us a total of 969 620 deceased voters.”

If these numbers are correct, it reflects a sudden enthusiasm for removing the deceased from the roll, with the rate after 2010, 3.33 times greater than 2010. Furthermore, six days later a second report claimed: “Justice Makarau said at least 278 432 names of deceased people had been struck off the voters roll from 2010 to Monday this week” Thus revealing that 1,234 people had been removed in the space of three days.

Any confidence that the citation of these precise figures in the reports is evidence of a greater commitment to compiling an accurate voter’s roll, is eroded by the fact that a comparison of the numbers in the May reports in the Herald with those in the April report in the Sunday Mail, shows an increase of about 67 000 voters between the first and second report, i.e. a decrease in the number of deceased person removed.

The rapid removal of deceased persons from the voters’ roll since the release of the 2012 Census Report raises several questions.

If it is possible to remove these dead voters from the roll at this rate, why it may be asked, was this exercise not undertaken earlier and at least prior to the 2008 election? Secondly, it seems that, contrary to Mudede’s averments in this regard, age has been used as the criterion for determining whether the voter is dead and thus should be removed from the roll. While this might seem a sensible approach, it is not provided for by the law. The Electoral Act¹⁵ does not allow the removal of a voter merely on the presumption that the voter is deceased or even, oddly, if a constituency registrar is in possession of a death certificate pertaining to a registered voter. In all instances, where a voter is to be removed from the voters roll, the Act requires notice to be sent to the registered voter, allowing an appeal to be made against removal. It is only after such notice has been given, and no appeal against removal is lodged, that the voter may be removed.¹⁶ Given the number of voters that have been removed in such a short space of time, it is unlikely that these procedures have been followed.

¹⁵ Chapter 02:13.

¹⁶ See section 33 of the Electoral Act [Chapter 02:13].

Notwithstanding the hasty removal of names from the voters roll following the Census, the Census exposes an impossible registration rate of over 100% in 49 constituencies (or 64 before the removal took place) if the removals are spread evenly over the 210 constituencies. Furthermore, if the adult population is taken to be approximately 6,000,000 as suggested by other Zimstat's reports (or 46.25% of the total population as opposed to the 52% used in Appendix 2), the number of constituencies with a voter registration rate of over 100% rises to 114, or 97 after the removal has taken place¹⁷. The only way to avoid the conclusion the voters' roll contains numerous entries which should not be there, is to make the unlikely assumption that the 278,432 voters removed from the roll all come from the constituencies which present over registration. Even so, such constituencies would still reflect a suspiciously high percentage registration rate of about 85% each.

Perhaps the most notable instance of "over-registration" is Mbare in Harare Metropolitan Province. If one assumes an adult population of 52% the voter registration rate is 161% (or 154% if the removals are taken into consideration).¹⁸ In Epworth, however, where many of the socio-economic conditions are similar to those in Mbare, the registration rate is a very low 37% (or 35%¹⁹ after the removals). Bearing in mind that there is no reason to exclude from Epworth the factors which cause over-registration, the actual registration rate in Epworth is extremely low as even the 37% must be considered to include entries which should not be part of the roll.

No clear pattern of political bias is immediately apparent, but some interesting findings emerge on closer analysis (see below). For example, while the three Matabeleland provinces, which are generally strongholds of the MDC formations, may be said to show a rough leaning towards over-registration, Harare Province (which is also an MDC stronghold) has a significantly lower registration than other provinces at 70, as can be seen from Table 1 below.

Table 1: Percentage of registered voters per Province

Province	Percentage of registered voters
Bulawayo	93%
Harare	70%
Manicaland	84%
Mashonaland Central	84%
Mashonaland East	94%
Mashonaland West	81%
Matabeleland North	93%
Matabeleland South	99%
Midlands	93%

The lower registration for Harare may be explained partly by the higher presence of persons in the province deemed to be aliens by the Registrar-General, particularly in the case of Epworth with a singularly low registration rate, and partly by the possibility that death notices are more regularly and

¹⁷ Here see Appendix 2, which shows the actual data relating to the number of constituencies in which there are larger numbers of voters than the 2012 census population, calculated at the more conservative rate of 52% adults in the total population. See also Appendix 3, showing a map of the registered voters per constituency.

¹⁸ Rising to 181% and 174% using an adult population of 46.25%.

¹⁹ Rising to 41% and 39% using an adult population of 46.25%.

efficiently sent to the Registrar-General in Harare than in more remote districts. This latter explanation would assume that the Registrar-General of Births and Deaths (who is also the Registrar-General of voters (and Registrar-General of citizenship) acts upon such death notices to remove the erstwhile voters from the roll – a suggestion met with considerable scepticism in many quarters, and especially in the light of the rapid removal of the deceased from the roll since the publication of the census.

Similar remarks may be made when one compares the adult population per province against the number of directly elected seats in the House of Assembly.²⁰ It requires significantly more people to constitute a constituency in Harare Province than any other province. There are 16% more adults on average in each Harare constituency, than the average number of adults in the constituencies in the Mashonaland Provinces (see Table 1). This suggests a gerrymandering against the MDC-T stronghold of Harare Province. Yet the Bulawayo provinces, also strongholds of the MDC formations, require 12% *less* adults than the Mashonaland provinces to comprise a constituency.

Table 2: Number of voters per constituency according to delimitation criteria

Constituency	Adult Population	Seats	Average
Harare	1091063	29	37623
Mash Central	587313	18	32629
Mash East	695,271	23	30229
Mash West	753968	22	34271
Bulawayo	340951	12	28413
Manicaland	912600	26	35100
Masvingo	773034	26	29732
Mat North	386813	13	29755
Mat South	356224	13	27402
Midlands	843688	28	30132
Totals	6740925	210	

Thus, while no coherent pattern of specific political manipulation of the roll emerges from these figures, it is clear that there remain are many entries on the roll which ought to have been removed on account of the death of the erstwhile voter. The fact that many of these entries were removed after the Census of 2012 in order to give the roll a modicum of plausibility, suggests that the voters' roll has been, and is, inflated for reasons other than bureaucratic difficulties.

Obviously the numbers here showing that the roll remains inflated with the names of the deceased will increase as more people are added to the roll ahead of the 2013 elections. Furthermore, as the consideration of the Referendum figures immediately below indicates, there are also numerous persons who should be entered on the voters roll who are not. If these people were on the roll, as they ought to be, the figures showing the extent to which the roll is inflated would likewise increase.

²⁰ Under the new constitution the House will be called the National Assembly.

Referendum numbers.

Despite an extensive²¹ (and expensive²²) show of soliciting input from the country's citizenry, the draft constitution put to the public in the Referendum of 16th March 2013 was clearly a document negotiated and agreed by the three main political parties in Zimbabwe, ZANU PF, the MDC-T, and the MDC. All three main political parties thus called for a "yes" vote, though the reasons given as to why the populace should endorse the document differed.²³ Once the draft had been completed, very little time was allowed for the document to be studied by voters and only limited printed copies of the draft, in any language, were distributed. There was insufficient time for any person or group to mount a campaign for a "no" vote, or for the public to be appraised of any reasons why the draft should be rejected. Only three weeks were allowed "*to disseminate, publicise and educate the nation on the contents of a voluminous and intricate legal document*".²⁴ For these reasons it was widely assumed that the poll would be marked by widespread apathy.²⁵ In the event some 3 316 082 people voted,²⁶ a record number of voters for any poll in Zimbabwe.

However, it is this very statistic which is unsettling rather than a cause for the celebration of the success of the democratic process in Zimbabwe. The large turnout in an essentially uncontested poll suggests that Zimbabweans are politicised, like to cast their ballots and have their "voice" heard, and will fulfil their civic duty of voting when free to do so. The unfortunate corollary of this explanation of the high turnout in the Referendum is that a lower numerical turnout in previous polls indicates that the electorate has not cast its ballot freely and fairly in these polls and that the electoral process is flawed. The constraints placed upon the voting population when the poll is contested are thus highlighted. Furthermore, the removal of these constraints for the Referendum is likely to be a temporary phenomenon and one which will not carry over into the general election, constitutionally mandated before 29th October, 2013.

Claims of the high voter turnout itself need to be moderated. While the turnout was high in numerical terms, as a percentage of the eligible voter population in a Referendum,²⁷ it is not dramatically so, at 49.2%. A claim that this is nonetheless higher than the turnout, in percentage terms, of 42.7%²⁸ in the March 2008 general election does not bear scrutiny. This is because the denominator used to determine that percentage, the number of registered voters, is clearly hugely inflated as indicated above, thus bringing down the real percentage vote. A more realistic voter registration rate of 65% yields a turnout of 58% in the highly contested March 2008 poll. Given the interest in this poll, 58% is quite low, suggesting that the actual registration rate of the adult population should be even lower or that those registered face considerable constraints when voting

²¹ 1.1 million people participated in the outreach programme – see *The Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee (Copac)* February 2013 p21 and *Close to 2 Million People Participated in Outreach Program* <http://www.swradioafrica.com> 14.04.10.

²² At a cost of nearly \$51 million – see *The Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee (Copac)* February 2013 p53.

²³ Parties use Referendum to Push Election Agenda *The Standard* 18.03.13.

²⁴ See ZLHR Pre-Referendum Statement 15.03.13.

²⁵ *Referendum Fails to Excite Zimbabweans* <http://www.swradioafrica.com/> 07.03.13.

²⁶ Government Notice 201A of 2012.

²⁷ It is not necessary to be registered as a voter to cast a ballot in a Referendum, but merely to show that one is entitled to be so registered.

²⁸ *Report on the 2008 General Elections* Zimbabwe Electoral Commission 04.02.09.

in a contested poll. If 70% of registered voters went to the poll in March 2008, a not unreasonable hypothesis, this would assume a registration rate of only 53% of the adult population.²⁹

Once again, the instance of Epworth is most illustrative of problems with the voters' roll. Epworth has an estimated adult population of more than 84,000, three times the number of adults in some other constituencies in Harare Province. 25,320 more people voted in the Referendum than voted in the March 2008 elections. Unlike a national election, there is no requirement that votes are cast at specific ward based polling stations. However, there does not appear to be any reason why voters would commute to a polling station in Epworth to cast a vote. The implication is thus that at least 25,320 people in Epworth, nearly an entire constituency, meet the requirements for eligibility to vote, but are not on the voters' roll. And this is merely the number who turned up to vote in a virtually uncontested poll, suggesting that the number of people eligible to vote, but not on the roll is in fact much higher. This is corroborated by the extremely low voter registration rate in the constituency, discussed above. In contrast, in Mbare the turnout for the Referendum was 163% of the adult population, as opposed to 48% in the March poll. The high turnout here, unlike that in Epworth, is most easily explained by the fact that Mbare is a transport and commercial hub, and many commuters may have chosen to cast their vote in Mbare. This assumption is supported by the fact the other transport and commercial hubs also recorded high turnouts. Harare Central, for example, recorded a poll well above average at 70%, as did Bulawayo Central and Mutare Central (at 65% and 74% respectively).³⁰

The ZANU PF controlled Herald has maintained that the highest turnout for the Referendum was in ZANU PF strongholds, and that this is indicative of strong support for that party countrywide, which will transpose into victory in the 2013 elections. The claim is based on contrived and convoluted interpretations and misquotes of the ERC article referred to at the outset of this paper and public statements made by National Constitutional Assembly leader, Professor Lovemore Madhuku.³¹ The democratic pressure group, Sokwanele, to whom the Herald wrongly attributed authorship of the ERC Report, has effectively demolished any argument that the ERC report can be interpreted in this manner.³²

It is also difficult to discern any reason as to why a high turnout in the Referendum in ZANU PF strongholds should be indicative of a ZANU PF victory in the impending election. It seems that to make this claim, one would have to assert that the new constitution favours ZANU PF and thus the "yes" vote is a vote for ZANU PF and its policies. But given that the MDC formations likewise campaigned for a "yes" vote, this assertion cannot stand.

In numerical terms the largest turnout was in Harare Province, as is to be expected having the largest adult population of all the provinces (1,091,063) only nearly matched by Manicaland (912,600). However, in percentage terms, a greater percentage of the adult population turned out to vote in the three Mashonaland Provinces, ZANU PF strongholds, than in any other province. Furthermore, there is a direct correlation between the extent of ZANU PF support in each province

²⁹ Assuming the adult population to be 52% of the whole.

³⁰ The high turn was not, however, replicated in some of the other urban hubs, with Masvingo Urban at 47% and Gweru Urban at 50%.

³¹ *Zimbabwe: Sokwanele Predicts Zanu-PF Victory in Harmonised Polls* The Herald 03.04.13

³² *Response to The Herald's Article Titled 'Sokwanele Predicts Zanu-PF Victory in Harmonised Polls'* Sokwanele 4.04.13.

and the voter turnout. Thus, in Mashonaland Central, where ZANU PF won by an average of 4 590 votes in March 2008, the turnout was greater than 55% in 66% of the seats; in Mashonaland East, where ZANU PF won by an average of 2 743 votes, the turnout was greater than 55% in 60% of the seats; and, in Mashonaland West, where ZANU PF support is the weakest of the three provinces, with an average margin of 1 800 votes, the turnout was greater than 55% is only 18% of the seats. There is thus a clear correlation between the turnout and ZANU PF support in these areas. But the most likely reason for this, as suggested by Sokwanele,³³ is the degree of political control exerted by ZANU PF in these areas, and thus the ability to coerce voters to the polling station. Areas notorious for high levels of political violence³⁴ recorded some of the highest turnouts in the Referendum. These areas include Muramba-Pfungwe (81%), Mudzi West (74%), Shamva South (69%), and Uzumba (69%). It is likely that this coercive control will translate into votes for ZANU PF during the elections, but this has been the case in previous elections and the Referendum merely signals that ZANU PF's control in these constituencies has not eased to any extent.

The higher than expected voter turnout in the Referendum, led many to believe that the figures had been manipulated upwards. This belief was fuelled to a large part by the noticeable lack of voters queuing at the polling stations as is the norm during elections, anecdotal evidence of a low turnout, and a statement by the chair of the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission, Rita Makarau, that the turnout had been in the region of 2 million, shortly before the results were announced showing that 3,316,082 had voted.

Conclusions

Although there was general acceptance of the results by all three main political parties, MDC-T Secretary-General Tendai Biti, claimed that the results had been “tweaked” by 10% - 15%.³⁵ The basis for this allegation seemed to rest upon the fact that the voter turnout in some constituencies was higher than the adult population there as recorded by the Census. However, only Mbare recorded a voter turnout greater than the adult population at 164%, and this, as suggested above, is mostly due to its situation as a transport hub. Biti is unlikely to have had the figures presented here, which took some time to compile, at his disposal and thus be aware of the adult population in each constituency. His allegation in this regard appears to be mere speculation. Others postulated that the vote had been inflated as ZANU PF was “testing its rigging machinery”.³⁶ Some credence was given to this suggestion in a report which alleged that Referendum observers had been barred from counting centres and prevented from seeing the results.³⁷ This proposition of “test rigging” is somewhat unlikely. It is improbable that ZANU PF would risk exposing an intended rigging mechanism, and being exposed as perpetrating electoral fraud, simply as a test. With most parties

³³ See Sokwanele Response, footnote immediately above.

³⁴ See *Mapping Terror In Zimbabwe: Political Violence and Elections 2008* available at <http://www.sokwanele.com/map/electionviolence>

³⁵ *Referendum Figures Manipulated – Biti* The Independent 28.04.13 and see the ERC Report p12.

³⁶ *Vote Rigging Fears in Chimanimani* <http://www.swradioafrica.com/> 03.04.13. and ERC Report p12.

³⁷ *Referendum Observers Barred from Counting Centres* <http://www.swradioafrica.com/> 20.03.13, though the report refers to this happening at only one counting centre.

concurring on the desired outcome, the level of vigilance against rigging would have been too low to render the test effective or of any value in any event.

The ERC suggested several reasons for the higher than expected voter turnout. The more salient of these are:

- Relaxed voting requirements: national IDs in the absence of a voter's roll which enabled a number of unregistered, but ineligible voters to cast their votes.
- The Voting procedure was less complex as compared to an actual election, exemplified by the average three minutes that voters took to complete voting, hence the short voting queues.
- The relatively prevailing peaceful political engagements could have revitalized confidence in the electoral processes.³⁸

These factors are more likely explanations than the claims of rigging, which are not borne out by the numbers presented here, though the investigation has been limited by the failure to release results at lower than constituency level. They do, however, support the view that the Referendum has exposed a variety of defects in Zimbabwe's electoral machinery. The Referendum statistics, when set against the voter turnout in March 2008, the Census of 2012 and the 2010 voters' roll clearly show that there are many people who are not on the voters roll, who not only ought to be, but would want to be. It is also readily apparent that there are entries on the roll which ought not to be there. In sum, this means that the number of real and eligible voters on the roll is extremely low, thus explaining the seemingly low turnout in the March 2008 election.

Compilation of an accurate voters' roll is one of the initial steps in the electoral cycle and essential for a credible election. As the 2013 election draws nearer and Zimbabwe is put to the test as to whether it is able to hold a free and fair election, the country is at risk of failing at the first hurdle.

³⁸ See the ERC Report at p10.

Appendix 1

Province	1992 census	2002 census	2012 census
BULAWAYO	620936	676650	655675
HARARE	1478840	1896134	2098199
MANICALAND	1537636	1568930	1755000
MASH CENTRAL	857318	995427	1139940
MASH EAST	1033336	1127413	1337059
MASH WEST	1116928	1224670	1449938
MASVINGO	1221845	1320438	1486604
MAT NORTH	640957	704948	743871
MAT SOUTH	591747	653054	685046
MIDLANDS	1302214	1463993	1622476
Total	10401757	11631657	12973808

Appendix 2

PROVINCE	CONSTITUENCY	TOTAL POPULATION 2012 CENSUS	ADULT POPULATION [52%]	REGISTERED VOTERS	% OF POPULATION REGISTERED AS VOTERS
Bulawayo	Makokoba	42,170	21,743	27,359	125.8%
Bulawayo	Magwegwe	41,690	21,495	25,990	120.9%
Bulawayo	Pelandaba/Mpopoma	47,599	24,542	28,156	114.7%
Bulawayo	Lobengula	47,262	24,368	27,143	111.4%
Bulawayo	Bulawayo South	41,877	21,592	23,556	109.1%
Bulawayo	Emakhandeni Entumbane	48,685	25,102	27,194	108.3%
Bulawayo	Bulawayo Central	58,839	30,337	28,642	94.4%
Bulawayo	Nkulumane	57,976	29,892	27,138	90.8%
Bulawayo	Bulawayo East	55,032	28,374	24,588	86.7%
Bulawayo	Pumula	69,368	35,766	25,685	71.8%
Bulawayo	Nketa	70,030	36,107	25,768	71.4%
Bulawayo	Luveve	75,147	38,746	25,226	65.1%
Total		655,675	338,066	316,445	93.6%
Harare	Mbare	37,213	19,187	31,190	162.6%
Harare	Southerton	43,951	22,661	22,475	99.2%
Harare	Sunningdale	44,255	22,818	22,427	98.3%
Harare	Highfield West	50,014	25,787	25,334	98.2%
Harare	Mufakose	42,035	21,673	21,215	97.9%
Harare	Highfield East	59,666	30,764	29,638	96.3%
Harare	Kambuzuma	43,008	22,175	21,192	95.6%
Harare	Glenview NoNorth	53,268	27,465	25,160	91.6%
Harare	Zengeza East	64,756	33,388	29,661	88.8%
Harare	Harare Central	57,812	29,808	26,097	87.6%
Harare	Mabvuku Tafara	68,374	35,254	30,746	87.2%
Harare	Glenview South	60,610	31,251	27,061	86.6%
Harare	Zengeza West	66,566	34,321	28,386	82.7%
Harare	Chitungwiza NorthNorth	64,092	33,046	27,192	82.3%
Harare	Mount Pleasant	53,890	27,786	22,768	81.9%
Harare	Glen Nrah	59,551	30,704	21,792	71.0%
Harare	St Mary's	77,540	39,980	27,691	69.3%
Harare	Warren Park	87,768	45,253	31,156	68.8%
Harare	Chitungwiza South	81,518	42,031	28,887	68.7%
Harare	Kuwadzana East	70,508	36,354	23,949	65.9%
Harare	Harare NorthNorth	77,987	40,210	26,236	65.2%
Harare	Harare East	77,080	39,742	25,755	64.8%
Harare	Dzivarasekwa	69,230	35,695	22,718	63.6%
Harare	Hatfield	100,673	51,907	29,115	56.1%
Harare	Harare West	101,154	52,155	27,429	52.6%
Harare	Budiriro	120,198	61,974	31,187	50.3%
Harare	Kuwadzana	90,522	46,673	23,337	50.0%
Harare	Harare South	113,120	58,325	24,759	42.5%
Harare	Epworth	161,840	83,445	30,755	36.9%
Total		2,098,199	1,081,831	765,308	70.7%
Manicaland	Mutare Central	40,581	20,924	26,919	128.7%
Manicaland	Makoni West	46,960	24,213	26,329	108.7%
Manicaland	Buhera NorthNorth	48,652	25,085	27,217	108.5%
Manicaland	Nyanga NorthNorth	60,979	31,441	31,839	101.3%

Manicaland	Chimanimani West	55,731	28,735	28,091	97.8%
Manicaland	Makoni NorthNorth	55,978	28,862	27,937	96.8%
Manicaland	Buhera West	61,815	31,872	30,705	96.3%
Manicaland	Buhera Central	66,797	34,441	32,851	95.4%
Manicaland	Mutasa Central	60,882	31,391	29,773	94.8%
Manicaland	Nyanga South	64,709	33,364	31,587	94.7%
Manicaland	Makoni South	68,747	35,446	32,899	92.8%
Manicaland	Chipinge West	55,001	28,359	25,870	91.2%
Manicaland	Musikavanhu	60,459	31,173	27,554	88.4%
Manicaland	Chipinge East	59,702	30,782	27,030	87.8%
Manicaland	Mutasa NorthNorth	76,429	39,407	33,571	85.2%
Manicaland	Buhera South	69,198	35,678	29,594	82.9%
Manicaland	Mutare South	78,814	40,636	33,476	82.4%
Manicaland	Makoni Central	62,492	32,221	26,525	82.3%
Manicaland	Chipinge South	79,960	41,227	33,640	81.6%
Manicaland	Headlands	69,830	36,004	28,144	78.2%
Manicaland	Chimanimani East	78,079	40,258	30,471	75.7%
Manicaland	Mutare NorthNorth	87,727	45,232	32,597	72.1%
Manicaland	Mutasa South	75,015	38,678	27,085	70.0%
Manicaland	Chipinge Central	71,345	36,785	25,583	69.5%
Manicaland	Mutare West	94,026	48,480	32,408	66.8%
Manicaland	Dangamvura Chikanga	105,092	54,185	29,896	55.2%
Total		1,755,000	904,878	769,591	85.0%
Mashonaland_Central	Mount Darwin NoNorth	52,342	26,988	31,057	115.1%
Mashonaland_Central	Rushinga	58,257	30,037	33,847	112.7%
Mashonaland_Central	Mount Dawin East	57,549	29,672	31,303	105.5%
Mashonaland_Central	Shamva NorthNorth	54,336	28,016	28,797	102.8%
Mashonaland_Central	Guruve NorthNorth	63,098	32,533	32,052	98.5%
Mashonaland_Central	Mount Darwin West	59,576	30,717	29,951	97.5%
Mashonaland_Central	Mazowe Central	54,326	28,010	26,955	96.2%
Mashonaland_Central	Mazowe NorthNorth	49,762	25,657	24,109	94.0%
Mashonaland_Central	Guruve South	66,840	34,463	30,916	89.7%
Mashonaland_Central	Muzarabani NorthNorth	58,732	30,282	26,673	88.1%
Mashonaland_Central	Mbire	75,437	38,895	33,107	85.1%
Mashonaland_Central	Mount Darwin South	55,014	28,365	23,581	83.1%
Mashonaland_Central	Bindura South	71,653	36,944	30,511	82.6%
Mashonaland_Central	Muzarabani South	61,996	31,965	25,442	79.6%
Mashonaland_Central	Shamva South	65,194	33,614	26,643	79.3%
Mashonaland_Central	Mazowe South	65,340	33,689	26,686	79.2%
Mashonaland_Central	Mazowe West	63,457	32,718	23,793	72.7%
Mashonaland_Central	Bindura NorthNorth	107031	49,502	33,907	58.2%
Total		1,129,449	582,344	519,330	89.2%
Mashonaland_East	Mudzi West	36,710	18,928	25,831	136.5%
Mashonaland_East	Chikomba East	32,773	16,898	22,677	134.2%
Mashonaland_East	Chikomba Central	38,315	19,755	25,988	131.6%
Mashonaland_East	Wedza South	34,188	17,627	22,903	129.9%
Mashonaland_East	Mudzi North	49,203	25,369	31,621	124.6%
Mashonaland_East	Mutoko East	41,669	21,485	26,728	124.4%
Mashonaland_East	Mutoko North	48,450	24,981	31,041	124.3%
Mashonaland_East	Marondera West	43,804	22,585	25,422	112.6%
Mashonaland_East	Maramba Pfungwe	53,653	27,663	30,981	112.0%
Mashonaland_East	Uzumba	58,497	30,161	32,912	109.1%
Mashonaland_East	Mudzi South	46,704	24,081	25,400	105.5%
Mashonaland_East	Chikomba West	65,145	33,589	33,049	98.4%
Mashonaland_East	Wedza North	48,011	24,754	23,898	96.5%

Mashonaland_East	Mutoko South	55,557	28,645	27,502	96.0%
Mashonaland_East	Murewa North	63,396	32,687	30,212	92.4%
Mashonaland_East	Murewa West	68,132	35,129	32,167	91.6%
Mashonaland_East	Marondera Central	62,120	32,029	28,253	88.2%
Mashonaland_East	Murewa South	63,557	32,770	28,319	86.4%
Mashonaland_East	Marondera East	60,897	31,398	27,054	86.2%
Mashonaland_East	Goromonzi North	69,820	35,999	29,787	82.7%
Mashonaland_East	Seke	86,066	44,376	29,528	66.5%
Mashonaland_East	Goromonzi West	85,731	44,203	29,031	65.7%
Mashonaland_East	Goromonzi South	124,661	64,275	31,261	48.6%
Total		1,337,059	689,388	651,565	94.5%
Mashonaland_West	Zvimba West	42,863	22,100	26,526	120.0%
Mashonaland_West	Mhondoro Mubaira	49,733	25,642	30,352	118.4%
Mashonaland_West	Sanyati	46,060	23,749	23,274	98.0%
Mashonaland_West	Chegututu East	66,091	34,077	32,546	95.5%
Mashonaland_West	Magunje	56,621	29,194	27,426	93.9%
Mashonaland_West	Mhondoro Ngezi	56,630	29,198	26,653	91.3%
Mashonaland_West	Kariba	68,162	35,144	31,065	88.4%
Mashonaland_West	Hurungwe West	63,958	32,977	27,191	82.5%
Mashonaland_West	Kadoma Central	66,650	34,365	28,026	81.6%
Mashonaland_West	Makonde	71,399	36,813	29,923	81.3%
Mashonaland_West	Zvimba South	64,699	33,359	26,956	80.8%
Mashonaland_West	Chegututu West	66,256	34,162	26,910	78.8%
Mashonaland_West	Zvimba East	68,409	35,272	27,293	77.4%
Mashonaland_West	Hurungwe Central	65,539	33,792	26,058	77.1%
Mashonaland_West	Mhangura	77,420	39,918	30,209	75.7%
Mashonaland_West	Zvimba North	69,518	35,843	26,920	75.1%
Mashonaland_West	Hurungwe North	68,169	35,148	25,688	73.1%
Mashonaland_West	Chinhoyi	79,368	40,922	28,721	70.2%
Mashonaland_West	Muzvezve	70,890	36,551	25,530	69.8%
Mashonaland_West	Orton	75,198	38,772	26,924	69.4%
Mashonaland_West	Chakari	67,160	34,628	23,935	69.1%
Mashonaland_West	Hurungwe East	89,145	45,963	30,470	66.3%
Total		1,449,938	747,588	608,596	81.4%
Masvingo	Gutu South	41,431	21,362	26,717	125.1%
Masvingo	Bikita South	47,648	24,567	30,633	124.7%
Masvingo	Zaka East	36,495	18,817	23,318	123.9%
Masvingo	Gutu North	34,369	17,721	21,876	123.4%
Masvingo	Zaka West	36,812	18,980	22,916	120.7%
Masvingo	Chivi North	45,891	23,661	27,904	117.9%
Masvingo	Gutu East	42,228	21,773	25,273	116.1%
Masvingo	Gutu Central	42,950	22,145	25,547	115.4%
Masvingo	Gutu West	42,555	21,941	25,294	115.3%
Masvingo	Bikita West	56,500	29,131	31,354	107.6%
Masvingo	Zaka Central	52,990	27,322	29,227	107.0%
Masvingo	Zaka North	54,809	28,260	30,116	106.6%
Masvingo	Chiredzi East	50,352	25,961	27,495	105.9%
Masvingo	Chivi Central	59,423	30,638	31,952	104.3%
Masvingo	Chiredzi South	51,042	26,317	27,188	103.3%
Masvingo	Bikita East	57,555	29,675	30,149	101.6%
Masvingo	Masvingo South	54,155	27,922	27,717	99.3%
Masvingo	Chivi South	66,552	34,314	33,863	98.7%
Masvingo	Masvingo Central	52,602	27,122	25,960	95.7%
Masvingo	Masvingo West	47,558	24,521	22,513	91.8%
Masvingo	Mwenezi East	72,176	37,214	31,794	85.4%

Masvingo	Mwenezi West	88,498	45,630	37,320	81.8%
Masvingo	Masvingo North	57,417	29,604	23,782	80.3%
Masvingo	Chiredzi West	86,389	44,542	33,537	75.3%
Masvingo	Masvingo Urban	88,554	45,658	33,439	73.2%
Masvingo	Chiredzi North	119,653	61,693	38,228	62.0%
Total		1,486,604	766,493	745,112	97.2%
Matabeleland_North	Hwange East	40,765	21,018	22,953	109.2%
Matabeleland_North	Tsholotsho North	51,456	26,531	27,709	104.4%
Matabeleland_North	Lupane West	43,982	22,677	22,495	99.2%
Matabeleland_North	Nkayi North	52,713	27,179	26,293	96.7%
Matabeleland_North	Nkayi South	56,658	29,213	28,193	96.5%
Matabeleland_North	Hwange Central	46,057	23,747	22,838	96.2%
Matabeleland_North	Binga North	66,855	34,470	33,088	96.0%
Matabeleland_North	Tsholotsho South	62,439	32,194	30,525	94.8%
Matabeleland_North	Hwange West	52,356	26,995	25,290	93.7%
Matabeleland_North	Lupane East	54,882	28,297	25,292	89.4%
Matabeleland_North	Umguzi	74,662	38,496	33,569	87.2%
Matabeleland_North	Bubi	75,044	38,693	32,767	84.7%
Matabeleland_North	Binga South	66,002	34,031	28,582	84.0%
Total		743,871	383,540	359,594	93.8%
Matabeleland_South	Bulilima East	53,934	27,808	36,140	130.0%
Matabeleland_South	Insiza South	41,827	21,566	25,607	118.7%
Matabeleland_South	Gwanda South	39,503	20,368	23,933	117.5%
Matabeleland_South	Mangwe	60,240	31,060	33,991	109.4%
Matabeleland_South	Beitbridge West	40,744	21,008	22,938	109.2%
Matabeleland_South	Umzingwane	60,221	31,050	33,523	108.0%
Matabeleland_South	Gwanda North	41,096	21,189	22,543	106.4%
Matabeleland_South	Matobo South	44,489	22,939	23,179	101.0%
Matabeleland_South	Bulilima West	55,248	28,486	28,458	99.9%
Matabeleland_South	Matobo North	51,791	26,703	23,010	86.2%
Matabeleland_South	Gwanda Central	56,178	28,965	24,187	83.5%
Matabeleland_South	Insiza North	57,966	29,887	23,879	79.9%
Matabeleland_South	Beitbridge East	81,809	42,181	29,509	70.0%
Total		685,046	353,210	350,897	99.3%
Midlands	Zvishavane Runde	43,818	22,593	29,669	131.3%
Midlands	Chirumanzu	41,827	21,566	26,726	123.9%
Midlands	Mberengwa West	37,188	19,174	22,830	119.1%
Midlands	Mberengwa South	49,564	25,555	28,857	112.9%
Midlands	Mberengwa East	39,862	20,553	22,355	108.8%
Midlands	Kwekwe Central	43,276	22,313	23,480	105.2%
Midlands	Shurugwi South	43,409	22,382	23,033	102.9%
Midlands	Vungu	51,671	26,642	27,165	102.0%
Midlands	Gokwe Gumunyu	46,189	23,815	24,265	101.9%
Midlands	Gokwe Nembudziya	55,552	28,643	29,129	101.7%
Midlands	Gweru Urban	56,048	28,898	29,051	100.5%
Midlands	Gokwe Sengwa	52,887	27,269	25,945	95.1%
Midlands	Zhombe	65,584	33,815	32,140	95.0%
Midlands	Mkoba	66,346	34,208	31,568	92.3%
Midlands	Mberengwa North	59,550	30,704	28,170	91.7%
Midlands	Silobela	61,978	31,956	29,245	91.5%
Midlands	Gokwe Kana	63,310	32,643	29,784	91.2%
Midlands	Redcliff	64,661	33,339	29,412	88.2%
Midlands	Zvishavane Ngezi	66,366	34,218	29,704	86.8%
Midlands	Gokwe Mapfungautsi	72,621	37,443	32,253	86.1%
Midlands	Gokwe Chireya	67,075	34,584	29,232	84.5%

Midlands	Mbizo	57,179	29,481	24,765	84.0%
Midlands	Gokwe Sesame	79,953	41,224	34,279	83.2%
Midlands	Shurugwi North	61,695	31,810	26,357	82.9%
Midlands	Chirumanzu Zibagwe	58,796	30,315	24,815	81.9%
Midlands	Chiwandura	77,296	39,854	32,102	80.5%
Midlands	Gokwe	62,615	32,284	24,840	76.9%
Midlands	Gokwe Kabuyuni	76,160	39,268	30,033	76.5%
Total		1,622,476	836,549	781,204	93.4%
Grand		12,963,317	6,683,886	5,867,642	87.8%

