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Abstract

An account on the exact description on how votes are translated into seats during the 2009 European Parliament elections is presented. A complete list of weblinks to the national electoral provisions of the 27 Member States, and to the official election results is included. The electoral provisions are subject to principles common to all Member States laid down in the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002. We scrutinize conformance with regard to Articles 1–3, that is (1) the seat apportionment procedure (three different divisor methods, quota methods with ten different quotas and two different largest remainder variants, and single transferable vote systems with random and fractional transfer), (2) the concept of regional representation (establishment of constituencies, subdivisions into districts, and electoral alliances), and (3) electoral thresholds (relative to valid votes, relative to votes cast, and implicit thresholds). It turns out that Bulgaria and Lithuania impose thresholds higher than five percent of votes cast, and that the Italian provisions include self-contradictory clauses with respect to the regional subdivision.
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Introduction

In the 27 Member States the electoral procedures differ considerably. Thus our title uses the plural form, elections, when referring to how the European Parliament is elected. In view of the non-existence of a European electoral authority it is a challenging project to assemble the election results for the 27 Member States. For instance, the total number of EU citizens that had the franchise to vote is not given by any official EU board. Summing up the electorates of the 27 Member States, we find that 384 928 081 EU citizens had the right to vote. This made the European Parliament elections of 4–7 June 2009 the largest transnational elections in history.

Our research aim is to document the 27 seat apportionment procedures. The precise vote counts, rather than shares of votes, are recorded in order to reconstruct the European-wide election results. Moreover, we elaborate the articles pertinent to the seat apportionment procedures in the 27 national electoral provisions. A complete list of weblinks of the election results and the national provisions is contained in the bibliography. The identification of the 27 electoral procedures gives rise to check whether and how the principles common to all Member States, as laid down in the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002, are fulfilled.

While Member States publicize the national election results in their traditional ways, we introduce a scheme to unify the calculations and to ease comparisons between the different seat apportionment procedures. We add information on the affiliation of national parties to Political Groups in the European Parliament. The election results, seat apportionment procedures, and links to pertinent articles in the electoral provisions are also provided in our public domain Java program BAZI—Calculation of Allocations by Apportionment Methods in the Internet, available at http://www.uni-augsburg.de/bazi.


In the political sciences, measures such as effective thresholds, effective magnitudes, and effective numbers of parties play a prominent role (Taagepera and Shugart, 1989; Gallagher and Mitchell, 2008). These measures are not considered in the present paper, as they do not intervene in the actual seat apportionment calculation. The Parliament’s role and functioning, neither considered in this work, are described from various viewpoints in such works as (Lenz, 1995; Hovehne, 1999; Axt, 2006; Wuest and Stoever, 2006; Wessels, 2008). For the debate on the Union’s democratic deficit, see such papers as (Millar, 1990; Reif and Schmitt, 1997; Nohlen, 2004; Farrell and Scully, 2007; Toplak, 2007).

During our study we met with some difficulties, of which the major were the following.

- Identification of national electoral provisions in the Internet is by no means an easy task. Some Member States seem to provide legal information only in their mother tongues.
- Tracing the election results in the Internet was not trivial either. In fact, sometimes it remains unclear which authority publicizes the election results, see (Wall, Ellis, Ayoub, Dundas, Rukambe and Staino, 2006).
- The Italian link broke after some months, the files having been moved to the election archive of the Ministry of the Interior. We remark that those data feature vote counts for the five districts not summing up to the total given.
- The official Cypriot link broke, too, and thereafter failed us permanently.
- The French provisions stipulate that the threshold refers to voix exprimées, which we would translate into votes cast. However, the threshold is calculated relative to valid votes.
Throughout the paper titles of laws and treaties are printed in small capitals. Quotes from official documents appear in italics, as do terminological conventions. Independent candidates are taken to be candidates with no party affiliation, as in Romania, Estonia, and the United Kingdom. In contrast, nominees are candidates who also run for a party, as in the STV systems in Malta, Ireland, and the UK-constituency of Northern Ireland.

Table 1: Member State indices for the 2009 elections. 736 seats are allotted in the Accession Treaty of Bulgaria and Romania. Four States establish constituencies. Thresholds refer to valid votes or to votes cast, or emerge implicitly. Six Member States use two-step systems to handle regional subdivisions and electoral alliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Const.</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Two-step systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT Austria</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4% of valid v.</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE Belgium</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG Bulgaria</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>implicitd</td>
<td>HaQgrR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY Cyprus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6% of valid v.</td>
<td>HQ3grR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ Czech Republic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE Germany</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.</td>
<td>DivStd</td>
<td>16 districts, DivStd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK Denmark</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td>3 alliances, DivDwn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Estonia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL Greece</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3% of valid v.</td>
<td>HQ3-ELb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES Spain</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI Finland</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td>1 alliance, pluralityc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR France</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5% of valid v.d</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Hungary</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE Ireland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>STVran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Italy</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4% of valid v.c</td>
<td>HQ1grR</td>
<td>5 districts, HQ1grR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT Lithuania</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hybridf</td>
<td>HQ2gR2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU Luxembourg</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwnf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV Latvia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of v. cast</td>
<td>DivStd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT Malta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>STVran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL Netherlands</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td>3 alliances, HaQgrR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL Poland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td>13 districts, HaQgrR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Portugal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO Romania</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.h</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Sweden</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4% of valid v.</td>
<td>Div0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI Slovenia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%c</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK Slovak Republic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5% of valid v.</td>
<td>DG3grR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK United Kingdom</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>DivDwnj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Based on HQ4 (equivalent to 5.8 percent of votes cast).
b) A hybrid residual apportionment involving DQ4, see Subsection “Survey of the 27 Member States”.
c) On the basis of personal votes.
d) Per constituency.
e) Minority parties possibly exempted from the threshold.
f) Five percent of votes cast, and full-seat restricted greatest remainder variant (equivalent to 6.7 percent of votes cast).
g) Six votes per ballot.
h) Separate threshold for independent candidates based on HQ4 (equivalent to 2.9 percent of votes cast).
i) Unclear, refers to votes in the whole country.
j) Except for STVira in Northern Ireland.

We conclude the Introduction with a brief overview. In Section “EU documents and national electoral provisions” we describe that the European legislation on the electoral procedure comes in two parts. Firstly, EU primary law and accession treaties determine the composition of the European Parliament, thus prescribing the number of representatives to be elected in each Member State. Secondly, the national electoral provisions must conform to common principles laid down in the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002.
In Section “Pertinent articles of the European Electoral Act 2002” we turn to the common principles that are particularly pertinent to the seat apportionment procedures, of which there are three. The first principle deals with electoral thresholds. Art. 3 allows the introduction of thresholds that may not exceed 5 per cent of votes cast. Most thresholds are calculated relative to valid votes, others relative to votes cast, and in some cases they emerge implicitly within the apportionment calculation. Thresholds in Bulgaria and Lithuania appear to violate Art. 3, both exceeding 5 percent of votes cast, see Subsection “Electoral thresholds, and effective votes (Art. 3)”.

The second principle, in Art. 2, deals with regional representation within a Member State. This may be achieved in two ways. The first permits a Member State to establish constituencies for which the number of seats is pre-specified a priori. Then seats are apportioned separately within each constituency, see Subsection “Single electoral area, and the establishment of constituencies (Art. 2)”. Another way is for a Member State to subdivide its electoral area in a different manner. Here we speak of a subdivision of the electoral area into electoral districts. The number of seats allocated to each district is decided upon a posteriori, depending on the vote counts. The Italian provisions appear to be self-contradictory in pre-specifying a priori seat numbers to the districts which do not conform with the actual seat numbers (Pennisi, Ricca and Simeone, 2009). It transpires that electoral alliances among several parties are methodologically related to the handling of electoral districts. Therefore both concepts are explained side by side, see Subsection “Subdivision into electoral districts, and electoral alliances (Art. 2)”.

The third principle, in Art. 3, demands for proportional representation. We found eleven different seat apportionment procedures. We use the term apportionment method to refer to a succinct electoral calculation, while the term system may reach beyond, see Subsection “Proportional representation, and seat apportionment procedures (Art. 1)”.

Section “Translation of votes into seats: Methods and systems” is dedicated to the details of proportional seat apportionment calculations. The procedures used are either divisor methods, quota methods, or single transferable vote (STV) systems. Divisor methods are traditionally defined by divisor sequences, thoroughly analyzed in (Balinski and Young, 2001). In our opinion the characterization by rounding rules and divisors is more perspicuous. The divisor D can be interpreted as an electoral key which enables a single-stage verifiability of the final seat numbers, see Subsection “Divisor methods of apportionment”. Quota methods are characterized by a certain quota and a certain residual fit. We found ten different quotas and two different residual apportionments, see Subsection “Quota methods of apportionment”. Describing single transferable vote systems we distinguish whether votes are transferred by an element of randomness or at fractional weight, see Subsection “Single transferable vote systems”.

Section “Apportionment procedures used in the 2009 elections” is the core section. In Subsection “Format of tables, and Political Groups in the European Parliament” we explain our unified scheme for the seat apportionment procedures, and give European-wide election results with respect to Political Groups in the European Parliament. In Subsection “Survey of the 27 Member States” we document the 27 ways of translating votes into seats.

Section “Conclusion” concludes with a general outlook, in particular with regard to enhance the degree of uniformity of the electoral procedures.

**EU documents and national electoral provisions**

The composition of the European Parliament, that is, the allotment of seats among its Member States, has been changed again and again. The Committee on Constitutional Affairs of the European Parliament continues to deal with the topic (Europarl(2009a)). National seat allotments are not determined by a mathematical formula, but emerge from negotiations. The June 2009 composition relied on the Act Concerning the Conditions of Accession of the Republic of
Bulgaria and Romania and the adjustments to the treaties on which the European Union is founded (Eur-lex, 2005). Art. 9(1) stipulates that the number of Members of the European Parliament shall not exceed 736, and Art. 9(2) prescribes the seat contingent of each Member State. Due to the Lisbon Treaty (Eur-lex, 2009) the total number of representatives will be raised to 751 by the end of the year 2010. In the course of this paper we restrict our attention to the 736 seats at stake during the elections in June 2009.

European legislation on the apportionment of seats among registered parties and independent candidates originates from the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (Eur-lex, 1951). By Art. 21(1), in force for almost twenty years, representatives were designated by the respective Parliaments, while Art. 21(3) called for proposals for a uniform electoral procedure.

In 1976 the then European Communities agreed on the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, hereafter referred to as European Electoral Act (Eur-lex, 1976). Art. 7(2) enunciated that the electoral procedure shall be governed in each Member State by its national provisions. On this basis the first European Parliament elections were held in 1979.

The mandate to draw up proposals for a uniform procedure was moderated with the 1999 Amsterdam Treaty (Eur-lex(1999), and found its way in way into the Lisbon Treaty. Art. 223(1) (ex Art. 21(3) in (Eur-lex, 1951) calls for a uniform electoral procedure or [for] elections in accordance with principles common to all Member States. The 2002 Amendments of the European Electoral Act (Eur-lex, 2002) specify these common principles. The renumbered version of this Act is annexed to the recent draft report of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (Duff, 2010).

As for the seat apportionment procedures, the national electoral provisions must be based on proportional representation (Art. 1(1)). Furthermore, Member States may establish constituencies …or subdivide its electoral area in a different manner (Art. 2), and electoral thresholds not exceeding 5 per cent of votes cast may be included (Art. 3).

European Electoral Act 2002, Art. 1(1). In each Member State, members of the European Parliament shall be elected on the basis of proportional representation, using the list system or the single transferable vote.

European Electoral Act 2002, Art. 2. In accordance with its specific national situation, each Member State may establish constituencies for elections to the European Parliament or subdivide its electoral area in a different manner, without generally affecting the proportional nature of the voting system.

European Electoral Act 2002, Art. 3. Member States may set a minimum threshold for the allocation of seats. At national level this threshold may not exceed 5 percent of votes cast.

Details on the national electoral provisions confronted us with three essential difficulties. The first is to get hold of the 27 texts of law. Seventeen Member States entertain specific laws for the European Parliament elections: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Greece, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, and United Kingdom. On the other hand Spain, Finland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, and Sweden subsume the European electoral provisions into their national electoral laws. As a last group Cyprus, Ireland, Malta, Portugal, and Slovenia possess laws on the European Parliament elections which, however, contain cross-references to national electoral acts, in particular when it comes to the details of the seat apportionment procedures. There is a document of the scientific service of the European Parliament with weblinks for the national electoral provisions which, unfortunately, the author points out to be incomplete, see (Lehmann, 2009). A complete list of weblinks is appended to this paper.
The second difficulty arises from the 23 official EU languages. To the best of our knowledge Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Germany, Spain, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, and Portugal do not provide English translations of their national electoral provisions. The help of native speakers turns out to be indispensable, as we gratefully acknowledge.

The third difficulty lies in the wording of some of the sections in the provisions. In Slovenia, it is not clear to us whether the threshold is calculated relative to valid votes, or relative to votes cast. In the Slovak Republic, the notion of quotients being rounded off means standard rounding, as pointed out to us by the former head of the Slovak Statistical Office. The Greek provisions are hard to find and difficult to understand, due to antiquated language, as our Greek correspondent assured us comfortingly.

Pertinent articles of the European Electoral Act 2002

The common principles of the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002 leave a wide margin of appreciation for the seat apportionment procedures. In order to work out how the Member States make use of this margin, we discuss the articles quoted above in reverse order, first Art. 3, then Art. 2, and finally Art. 1.

Electoral thresholds, and effective votes (Art. 3)

The well-known electoral principle one person, one vote demands that all votes shall be treated equally. Yet, the imbalance in the number of representatives elected in the Member States entails that voters from smaller Member States have more power than voters from larger Member States. Even within a Member State one vote is not always equal to the other. We distinguish between valid votes and invalid votes. The definitions differ among Member States. For example, blank votes are valid in Spain, but invalid in Germany. In France there is a discussion whether valid votes should comprise blank votes.

Due to electoral thresholds, as permitted by Art. 3, votes cast for parties or independent candidates with too small a support are discarded. We say that the retained votes are effective, while the discarded votes are ineffective. In the absence of any electoral threshold, all valid votes become effective.

For 25 Member States, the effective votes provide the sole basis for the seat apportionment calculation. In Greece and Cyprus, ineffective votes do play a role though parties still must pass the threshold before they can be apportioned a seat. In the 2009 elections the effective votes total is 148,271,668, while 12,086,125 votes are discarded because of being ineffective.

Ten Member States have no threshold: Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Portugal, and Spain.

Thresholds relative to valid votes are applied in Cyprus (1.8 percent), Austria, France, Italy, and Sweden (4 percent), Czech Republic, Hungary, Germany, Poland, and Slovak Republic (5 percent). Thresholds relative to votes cast are applied in Latvia and Lithuania (5 percent). In Slovenia it is not clear to us whether the four percent threshold is calculated relative to votes cast or relative to valid votes.

The remaining four thresholds are of a rather peculiar type, explained thoroughly in Subsection “Survey of the 27 Member States”. In Italy, there is a four percent threshold relative to valid votes, except for parties of ethnic minorities. In Romania, the electoral provisions distinguish between a five percent threshold relative to valid votes for registered parties, and a lower threshold for independent candidates.

In Bulgaria and Lithuania the 2009 thresholds exceed five percent of votes cast, and thus violate Art. 3. In Bulgaria an implicit threshold amounts to 5.8 percent relative to votes cast. If the threshold had been at five percent relative to votes cast, one additional party would
have been apportioned a seat. In Lithuania, the five percent threshold relative to votes cast is accompanied by an implicit threshold that emerges from the apportionment method. It results in a 6.7 percent threshold relative to votes cast. Luckily, each party passes either both thresholds, or neither.

**Single electoral area, and the establishment of constituencies (Art. 2)**

With a view toward Art. 2 of the European Electoral Act 2002, four Member States choose to establish constituencies… without affecting the proportional nature of the voting system. Prior to the election, the available seats are allotted among several constituencies. After the election, the seat apportionment calculations are carried out separately for each constituency. Belgium establishes three constituencies, France eight, Ireland four, and United Kingdom twelve. In the remaining 23 Member States the seat apportionment is carried out across the whole electoral area.

Altogether the 2009 elections give rise to 50 seat apportionment calculations, 23 single electoral areas, plus 3 constituencies in Belgium, 8 in France, 4 in Ireland, and 12 in the United Kingdom.

**Subdivision into electoral districts, and electoral alliances (Art. 2)**

Art. 2 of the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002 also permits the subdivision of the electoral area in a different manner. Subdivisions of the whole electoral area into several electoral districts occur in Germany, Italy, and Poland. The number of representatives elected per district are determined dynamically, by the election results. Thus proportionality among parties is achieved across the entire electoral area. A two-step system is implemented to carry out the seat apportionment.

The first step is the super-apportionment, allocating all available seats among parties according to their nationwide vote totals. The second step consists of one sub-apportionments per party to apportion the nationwide party seats among the districts.

The concept of a subdivision into several districts is closely related to the formation of electoral alliances (also known as list apparentements). Electoral alliances were formed in Denmark, Finland, and the Netherlands. They also call for a two-step system. The super-apportionment allocates the available seats among alliances and stand-alone parties. Subsequently, a sub-apportionment calculation is conducted for each alliance to allocate its seats among the members.

In Denmark, Finland, Germany, and Italy the methods for the super-apportionment and the sub-apportionments are alike. The Italian provisions also pre-specify a priori seat numbers to the districts. However, these numbers are not realized. In the Netherlands and Poland, the methods for the super-apportionment and the sub-apportionments differ.

**Proportional representation, and seat apportionment procedures (Art. 1)**

Art. 1 of the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002 obliges the Member States to built their national electoral provisions on the basis of proportional representation. Proportionality can be achieved by means of apportionment methods for list systems such as divisor methods (also known as highest average formulas), and quota methods (also known as greatest remainder formulas). Single transferable vote systems (STV), explicitly mentioned in Art. 1, are also feasible. Details of these seat apportionment procedures are given in the following section.
Table 2: Seat apportionment procedures used in the 2009 elections. Divisor methods make use of a (flexible) divisor and a (fixed) rounding rule. Quota methods employ a (fixed) quota and a (flexible) residual fit. Single transferable vote systems are characterized by the transfer apportionment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisor methods (highest average formulas)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td>Divisor method with rounding down (Jefferson, D'Hondt, Hagenbach-Bischoff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DivStd</td>
<td>Divisor method with standard rounding (Webster, Sainte-Lagué)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div0.7</td>
<td>Divisor method with modified standard rounding (Scandinavian method)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quota methods (greatest remainders formulas)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HaQgrR</td>
<td>Hare quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ1gR2</td>
<td>Hare quota variant 1 with residual fit by greatest remainders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ3gR2</td>
<td>Hare quota variant 2 with full-seat restricted residual apportionment gR2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ3rR</td>
<td>Hare quota variant 3 with residual fit by greatest remainders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ3-EL</td>
<td>Hare quota variant 3 with Greek residual fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ3gR</td>
<td>Drop quota variant 3 with residual fit by greatest remainders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single transferable vote (STV) systems</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STVfra</td>
<td>Drop quota, and fractional transfer apportionment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STVran</td>
<td>Drop quota, and random transfer apportionment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Translation of votes into seats: Methods and systems

Divisor methods of apportionment

Divisor methods follow the motto Divide and round. Let \( h \) be the given house size, the number of representatives to be elected in a certain Member State or in a certain constituency. The effective votes are denoted by \( v_j \) where \( j \) designates a party or an independent candidate. Firstly, we divide the effective votes \( v_j \) by a feasible divisor \( D \). Secondly, the resulting fractional quotients \( v_j/D \) are rounded by a pre-specified rounding rule to obtain an integer seat number. The divisor \( D \) is determined so as to allocate exactly \( h \) seats. Different rounding rules generate different divisor methods. The 2009 European Parliament elections employ three rounding rules: rounding down, standard rounding, and modified standard rounding.

Rounding down, \( [\cdot] \). A positive number is rounded down to its integer part. Example: \( [3.45] = 3 \), or \( [6.87] = 6 \). The divisor method with rounding down (DivDwn) is often named after Jefferson, D'Hondt, or Hagenbach-Bischoff.

Standard rounding, \( \langle \cdot \rangle \). A positive number is rounded to the integer nearest to it. Example: \( \langle 3.45 \rangle = 3 \), or \( \langle 6.87 \rangle = 7 \). The divisor method with standard rounding (DivStd) is often named after Webster, or Sainte-Lagué.

Modified standard rounding. Same as standard rounding, except that a number below 0.7 is rounded down to 0, and a number between 0.7 and 1 is rounded up to 1. The divisor method with modified standard rounding (Div0.7) is also referred to as the Scandinavian method.

The divisor \( D \) may be interpreted as an electoral key. It provides a single-stage access to the final seat number of each party, given by the rounded quotient of votes divided by the divisor \( D \). Therefore we always display a divisor \( D \), so that the method is captured by the phrase: Each \( D \) votes yield about one seat. In contrast, verifying the results with highest averages involves the time-consuming computation of all the averages.

A feasible divisor \( D \), that is a divisor that results in the allocation of exactly \( h \) seats, may be determined as follows. For every participant \( j \), the votes \( v_j \) are divided by signposts peculiar to the rounding rule specified, say \( s(1), s(2), s(3) \), etc. The resulting quotients \( v_j/s(1), v_j/s(2) \),
\( v_j / s(3) \), etc., are taken to signify some sort of averages. They are ordered in decreasing size. Now seats are handed out, one by one until all seats are gone, to the participants with the highest averages. The last highest average used, and the first highest average not used define the divisor interval. Finally an arbitrary number may be picked from the divisor interval to be used as a divisor \( D \).

The signposts \( s(1), s(2), s(3) \), etc. are determined by the rounding rule specified. Rounding down comes with the sequence 1, 2, 3, etc. or, equivalently, with 2, 4, 6, etc. For this reason the method is also known as the even-number method. Standard rounding uses the signposts 0.5, 1.5, 2.5, etc. or, equivalently, 1, 3, 5, etc. This is why the method is also termed the odd-number method. Modified standard rounding uses the signposts 0.7, 1.5, 2.5, etc. or, equivalently, 1.4, 3.5, etc.

In the 2009 European Parliament elections, 16 Member States applied the divisor method with rounding down: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, and United Kingdom (except for the constituency of Northern Ireland). Germany and Latvia used the divisor method with standard rounding, and Sweden the divisor method with modified standard rounding.

**Quota methods of apportionment**

Quota methods are a family of apportionment methods that follow the motto *Divide and sort*. The apportionment method is split into a main apportionment that is based on a pre-specified quota \( Q \), and a residual apportionment. The seats apportioned in the main apportionment practically always fail to exhaust the house size \( h \), leaving some \( r \) seats to be taken care of in the residual apportionment.

**Main apportionment.** Determine the quota \( Q \), and divide it into the effective votes \( v_j \) of participant \( j \). The integer part of the resulting quotient, \( \lfloor v_j / Q \rfloor \), signifies the number of seats apportioned in the main apportionment.

**Residual apportionment.** The \( r \) residual seats are apportioned according to the remainders \( v_j / Q - \lfloor v_j / Q \rfloor \), the quotient’s fractional parts. A prescription is specified to sort the participants, and to allocate the remaining \( r \) seats in the sequence of this sorting.

The 2009 European Parliament elections used the generic Hare quota HaQ, its three variants HQ1, HQ2, HQ3, and the Droop quota variants DQ3 and DQ4. The quotas are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quota</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HaQ</td>
<td>( \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ1</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h} \right\rfloor )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ2</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{valid votes}}{h} \right\rfloor )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ3</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{valid votes}}{h} \right\rfloor ) (for thresholds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ4</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{valid votes}}{h} \right\rfloor )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h + 1} \right\rfloor + 1 ); (in STV systems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ1</td>
<td>( \max \left{ \left\lfloor \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h + 1} \right\rfloor , 1 \right} ); (not in EP 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ2</td>
<td>( \left\lfloor \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h + 1} \right\rfloor ); (not in EP 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ3</td>
<td>( \left\langle \frac{\text{effective votes}}{h + 1} \right\rangle )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ4</td>
<td>( \max \left{ \left\lfloor \frac{\text{unused voting power}}{r + 1} \right\rfloor , 1 \right} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The generic Hare quota HaQ is the quotient of the effective vote total divided by the number of seats to be allocated. It is applied in Bulgaria, Netherlands (super- and sub-apportionments), and Poland (only sub-apportionments). The variant HQ1 is applied in Italy (super- and sub-apportionments). The variant HQ2 is applied in Lithuania. In Greece, the main apportionment uses the variant HQ3. The variant HQ4 is applied in Bulgaria for the electoral threshold pertaining to parties, and in Romania for the electoral threshold pertaining to independent candidates.

Of the Droop quota family, variant DQ3 is applied in the Slovak Republic, and variant DQ4 is applied in Greece in the course of the first part of the residual apportionment.

The fashion which remainders to consider for the allocation of the $r$ residual seats, depends on the prescription specified. In the 2009 elections the residual fit by greatest remainders (grR) and its variants gr2 and -EL are employed. The variants are defined as follows:

- grR All remainders are sorted by decreasing size,
- gr1 The $r$ residual seats are given to the strongest party (not applied in EP 2009),
- gr2 Remainders are sorted by decreasing size only of parties with $Q$ votes or more, also referred to as full-seated residual apportionment,
- -EL Remainders are sorted by decreasing size, of certain parties only, see details for Hellenic Republic in Subsection “Survey of the 27 Member States”.

The residual fit by greatest remainders (grR) is applied in Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy (super- and sub-apportionments), and Slovak Republic. Variant gr1 is not employed in the 2009 elections. Variant gr2 is used in Lithuania, and variant -EL is used in Greece.

**Single transferable vote systems**

Single transferable vote systems obey the motto *Count and transfer*. Voters mark a preference order of individual nominees on their ballot sheets. The apportionment procedure comes in two parts. The main apportionment procedure checks whether the vote count reaches the Droop quota $DrQ$. The second part takes the form of a transfer apportionment, evaluating the voters’ preferences.

**Main apportionment.** Determine the Droop quota $DrQ$. Nominees whose votes reach the quota $DrQ$ are awarded a seat.

**Transfer apportionment.** If a nominee’s votes exceed the quota $DrQ$ the surplus votes are transferred to other nominees according to the voters’ preferences, with the larger surpluses transferred first. If no further nominees reach $DrQ$ votes, the nominee with the fewest votes is eliminated and her votes are transferred.

The seats apportioned in the main apportionment stay far below $h$, leaving $r$ residual seats. The voters’ transfer ranking indicates to whom votes are to be transferred, if the nominee of their first, or subsequent, choice has already reached the quota $Q$. The same applies if the nominee has obtained too few votes and has thus been eliminated.

There are two ways to conduct the transfer. The first way is to consider all ballot sheets and calculate fractional weightings to affect the transfer. The second way incorporates an element of randomness to decide which ballot sheets are to be transferred.

- STVfra All ballot sheets are transferred, with fractional weightings.
- STVran The ballot sheets of a nominee that has reached the quota or the ballot sheets of a nominee that has been eliminated, are sorted into sub-parcels with respect to the nominee next in the transfer ranking. In proportion to the sub-parcel’s size, the ballot sheets that happen to be on top of each parcel are transferred to the next nominee.
In the 2009 European Elections, Northern Ireland uses the fractional part variant (STVfra), while Ireland and Malta apply the random transfer apportionment (STVran).

### Apportionment procedures used in the 2009 elections

#### Format of tables, and Political Groups in the European Parliament

Member States are sorted by their two-letter codes as given by the European Union’s inter-institutional style guide (Publications, 2009).

The first columns of our tables show names of registered parties, independent candidates and nominees. In order to adjoin a European dimension and to substitute for the non-visible European party system, these names are listed together with the Political Group in the European Parliament they are affiliated to (Schleicher, 2011). Their acronyms and sizes (in number of seats) are taken from the Parliament’s website on the election results (Europarl, 2009b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European People’s Party</th>
<th>EPP 265</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats</td>
<td>S&amp;D 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe</td>
<td>ALDE 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Greens / European Free Alliance</td>
<td>GREENS/EFA 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Conservatives and Reformists</td>
<td>ECR 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European United Left / Nordic Green Left</td>
<td>GUE/NGL 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe of Freedom and Democracy</td>
<td>EFD 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-attached members of the European Parliament</td>
<td>NA 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td><strong>730</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second columns of our tables give votes that enter into the apportionment calculation. Generally, these are the effective votes, excepts for Cyprus and Greece where ineffective votes are needed to compute the quota HQ3. This restriction reduces the number of parties. In the Czech Republic, for instance, twenty-nine parties are discarded as they have not passed the electoral threshold.

The third columns display quotients. In the case of divisor methods, these are the quotients of effective votes divided by the divisor $D$ displayed in the bottom line of each table. For example, in Austria the ÖVP-quotient is $858921/140000 = 6.14$. In case of quota methods, the third column displays quotients of effective votes divided by the quota $Q$ displayed in the bottom line of each table. For example, in Bulgaria the İEP6-quotient is $627693/128619 = 4.880$.

The fourth columns display final seat numbers. For divisor methods, the quotients in the third column are rounded according to the applicable rounding rule to obtain the seat numbers. For quota methods, the remainders that result in an additional seat during the residual apportionment are printed in bold-face type.

In case a Member State establishes several constituencies, the pertinent tables are displayed one after the other. For two-step systems, the vote counts that are subjected to a sub-apportionment calculation are printed in italic type, together with the corresponding divisor or quota.

STV systems are more difficult to monitor. For this reason we include first preferential votes only, and indicate whether a nominee is awarded a seat or not. It so happens that the final seat apportionments go along with the first preferential vote counts in all cases except two. In the Irish constituency of *Dublin* one of the elected nominees (Joe Higgins, 50 510 votes) has fewer first preferential votes than a non-elected nominee (Eoin Ryan Jnr, 55 346 votes). In Malta David Casa is elected with 6 539 first preferential votes, while three nominees with more first preferential votes (Joseph Cuschieri 19 672, Marlene Mizzi 17 724, Baldacchino Abela 12 309) are not elected.
Survey of the 27 Member States

AT – Republic of Austria

Austria allocates its 17 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a four percent threshold relative to valid votes. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

There are 2,864,621 valid votes. Four percent thereof is 114,584.8. Six parties have at least 114,585 votes, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 39,594 ineffective votes, cast for another two parties. From the divisor interval [136,009; 142,252] we use divisor 140,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009AT</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVP: EPP</td>
<td>858,921</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO: S&amp;D</td>
<td>680,041</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin: NA</td>
<td>506,092</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPO: NA</td>
<td>364,207</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRÜNE: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>284,505</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZÖ: NA</td>
<td>131,261</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>2,825,027</td>
<td>[140,000]</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE – Kingdom of Belgium

Belgium allocates its 22 seats in three constituencies. There is no electoral threshold. The national electoral provisions allot 13 seats to the Nederlands kiescollege, 8 seats to the College électoral français, and 1 seat to the Deutschsprachiges Wahlkollegium. All constituencies use the divisor method with rounding down, DivDwn.

(1) The Nederlands kiescollege has divisor interval [237,031; 269,696], we use divisor 250,000.
(2) The College électoral français has divisor interval [213,364; 238,315], we use divisor 230,000.
(3) The Deutschsprachiges Wahlkollegium has divisor interval [7,878; 12,475], we use divisor 10,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009BE</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Nederlands kiescollege</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD &amp; V: EPP</td>
<td>948,123</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Vld: ALDE</td>
<td>837,884</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlaams Belang: NA</td>
<td>647,170</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp.a: S&amp;D</td>
<td>539,393</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-VA: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>402,545</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROEN! GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>322,149</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lijst Dedecker: ECR</td>
<td>296,699</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PVDA+: NA</td>
<td>40,057</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>26,541</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP: NA</td>
<td>8,985</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP: NA</td>
<td>6,398</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>4,075,944</td>
<td>[250,000]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) College électoral français</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS: S&amp;D</td>
<td>714,947</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR: ALDE</td>
<td>640,092</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOLO: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>562,081</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDH: EPP</td>
<td>327,824</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN: NA</td>
<td>87,706</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLONIE D'ABORD: NA</td>
<td>37,505</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.W.F.: NA</td>
<td>30,488</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTB+: NA</td>
<td>28,483</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCR-PSL: NA</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP D'ORAZIO: NA</td>
<td>7,626</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC-GE: NA</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS: NA</td>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>2,457,178</td>
<td>[230,000]</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BG – Republic of Bulgaria

Bulgaria allocates its 17 seats across the whole electoral area. The implicit electoral threshold is determined by variant 4 of the Hare quota, \( HQ4 = \left\lfloor \frac{\text{valid votes}}{h} \right\rfloor \). The Hare quota \( HaQ \) with residual fit by greatest remainders is used, \( HaQgrR \).

There are 2,576,434 valid votes. The threshold is \( HQ4 = \left\lfloor \frac{2,576,434}{17} \right\rfloor = 151,555 \). Six parties pass the threshold and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 389,911 ineffective votes, cast for another six parties. The quota happens to be an integer, \( HaQ = 2,186,523/17 = 128,619 \).

However, the threshold of 151,555 votes amounts to 5.8 percent of the 2,601,677 votes cast, in violation of Art. 3 of the European Electoral Act as amended in 2002. If the threshold were five percent relative to votes cast, that is 130,084 votes, the 146,984 votes for ПП “ЛИДЕР” would have been retained, and the party would have been apportioned a seat (at the expense of НДСВ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009BG</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HaQgrR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ГЕРБ/EPP</td>
<td>627,693</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>КОАЛИЦИЯ ЗА БЪЛГАРИЯ:S&amp;D</td>
<td>476,618</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ДПС/АЛЕДЕ</td>
<td>364,197</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>АТАКА:NA</td>
<td>308,052</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>НДСВ/АЛЕДЕ</td>
<td>205,146</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>СИЯНТА КОАЛИЦИЯ:EPP</td>
<td>204,817</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum (Quota)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,186,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>[128,619]</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CY – Republic of Cyprus

Cyprus allocates its 6 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a 1.8 percent threshold relative to valid votes. Variant 3 of the Hare quota with residual fit by greatest remainders is used, \( HQ3grR \).

There are 306,325 valid votes. The threshold amounts to \( \left\lfloor \frac{5,513.85}{6} \right\rfloor = 5,514 \). Five parties pass the threshold and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 9,770 ineffective votes, cast for another eight parties. The quota is \( HQ3 = \left\lfloor \frac{306,325}{6} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{51,054.17}{6} \right\rfloor = 51,054 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009CY</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HQ3grR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISY: EPP</td>
<td>109,209</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKEL: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>106,922</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIKO: S&amp;D</td>
<td>37,625</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEK: S&amp;D</td>
<td>30,169</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVROKO: ALDE</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineffective votes</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,770</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum (Quota)</strong></td>
<td><strong>306,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>[51,054]</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CZ – Czech Republic

The Czech Republic allocates its 22 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to valid votes. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.
There are 2,358,934 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 117,946.7. Four parties have at least 177,947 votes, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 573,828 ineffective votes, cast for another twenty-nine parties. From the divisor interval [74,194.6; 75,447.4] we use divisor 75,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009CZ</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivStd</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Občanská demokratická strana: ECR</td>
<td>741,946</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Česká str. sociálně demokrat.: S &amp; D</td>
<td>528,132</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komunistická str. Čech a Moravy: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>334,577</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Křesť. demokr. str.: EPP</td>
<td>180,451</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divider]</td>
<td>1,785,106</td>
<td></td>
<td>[75,000]</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DE – Federal Republic of Germany

Germany allocates its 99 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to valid votes. The Christlich Demokratische Union (CDU) presented fifteen district lists for a sub-apportionment. The divisor method with standard rounding is used throughout, DivStd.

There are 26,333,444 valid votes nationwide. Five percent thereof is 1,316,672.2. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 2,840,893 ineffective votes, cast for another twenty-six parties. The super-apportionment has divisor interval [233,954; 236,630], we use divisor 235,000. In the CDU sub-apportionment, the divisor interval is [238,752; 246,111], we use divisor 240,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009DE</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivStd</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivStd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDU: EPP [Divider]</td>
<td>807,391</td>
<td>34.35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>[240,000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nordrhein-Westfalen</td>
<td>209,1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Baden-Württemberg</td>
<td>147,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Niedersachsen</td>
<td>962,510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Rheinland-Pfalz</td>
<td>660,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hessen</td>
<td>596,878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sachsen</td>
<td>567,231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Schleswig-Holstein</td>
<td>308,368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Thüringen</td>
<td>304,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sachsen-Anhalt</td>
<td>213,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Berlin</td>
<td>208,395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Mecklenburg-Vorpommern</td>
<td>201,447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sachsen</td>
<td>162,696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Brandenburg</td>
<td>140,616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hamburg</td>
<td>128,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bremen</td>
<td>45,886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD: S &amp; D</td>
<td>547,566</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grüne: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>319,509</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP: ALDE</td>
<td>288,084</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linke: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>156,929</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU: EPP</td>
<td>189,762</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DK – Kingdom of Denmark

Denmark allocates its 13 seats across the whole electoral area, without an electoral threshold. There are three electoral alliances. The super-apportionment and the three sub-apportionments use the divisor method with rounding down, DivDwn.

The divisor interval for the super-apportionment turns out to be [157,008; 162,522], we use divisor 160,000. In the sub-apportionments, Alliance 1 has divisor interval [123,868; 125,859], we use divisor 125,000. Alliance 2 has interval [148,600; 158,013], we use 150,000. Alliance 3 has interval [84,277.5; 168,555], we use 100,000.
EE – Republic of Estonia

Estonia allocates its 6 seats across the whole electoral area. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

The divisor interval turns out to be [34,502; 34,508], we use divisor 34,505. The independent candidate Indrek Tarand drew 102,460 votes. Had he handed in a list, he would have been assigned two seats. But he did not, so his votes gave him just a single seat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009K</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 1 [Division]</td>
<td>975,136</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[125,000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Socialdemokratiet: S &amp; D</td>
<td>503,439</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Socialistisk Folkeparti: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>371,603</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Radikale Venstre: NA</td>
<td>100,094</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 2 [Division]</td>
<td>785,036</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[150,000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Venstre: ALDE</td>
<td>474,041</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Konservative Folkeparti: EPP</td>
<td>297,199</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Liberal Alliance: NA</td>
<td>13,796</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansk Folkeparti: EFD</td>
<td>357,942</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 3 [Division]</td>
<td>224,014</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>[100,000]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Folkebevægelsen mod EU: GIJE/NGL</td>
<td>168,555</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*JuniBevægelsen: NA</td>
<td>55,459</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,342,128</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EL – Hellenic Republic

Greece allocates its 22 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a three percent threshold relative to valid votes. The apportionment calculations combine the Hare quota variant HQ3 with a rather unique split residual apportionment, which we abbreviate by HQ3-EL where EL is short for Greece.

For a party j, let v_j designate its votes, and x_j its number of seats apportioned in the main apportionment. The residual apportionment has an initial part, and a terminal part. The initial residual apportionment relies on the unused voting power UVP_j = v_j - x_j \cdot HQ3, that is, the number of votes beyond those already having been awarded their HQ3 share. The unused voting power UVP_j is divided by the Droop quota variant DQ4 and rounded down, to obtain an initial integer increment y_j. The terminal residual apportionment only admits parties not having received a seat in the initial residual apportionment (that is, y_j = 0), and uses the greatest remainder variant -EL to obtain terminal integer increments z_j.

There are 5127 537 valid votes. Three percent thereof is 153,826.1. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 377,997 ineffective votes, cast for another
twenty-one parties. The main apportionment uses quota HQ3 = \[\left\lfloor \frac{5127537}{22} \right\rfloor = 233069\]. The initial part of the residual apportionment uses DQ4 = \[\left\lfloor \frac{(\text{total UVP})}{(4+1)} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{932295}{5} \right\rfloor = 186459\].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>UVP</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HQ3-EL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps SoK: S&amp;D</td>
<td>1787982</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14430</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND: EPP</td>
<td>1655722</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24239</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.K.E.: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>428282</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195213</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La.O.S.: EFD</td>
<td>366637</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133568</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy.Riz.A: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>240930</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7861</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>178887</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>178887</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective votes</td>
<td>377997</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>377997</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES – Kingdom of Spain

Spain allocates its 50 seats across the whole electoral area. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

The divisor interval is [279 172; 290 010], we use divisor 280 000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP : EPP</td>
<td>6670377</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE: S&amp;D</td>
<td>6141784</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEU: ALDE</td>
<td>808246</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU-ICV-EUIA-BA: GUE/NGL, GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>588248</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPyD: NA</td>
<td>451866</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edp-V: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>394938</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: NA</td>
<td>178121</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV-GVE: NA</td>
<td>89147</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACMA: NA</td>
<td>41913</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUMA+ J: NA</td>
<td>24507</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertas: NA</td>
<td>22903</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IZAN-RG: NA</td>
<td>19735</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES: NA</td>
<td>19583</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPE: NA</td>
<td>15221</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA: NA</td>
<td>13993</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSI: NA</td>
<td>12344</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFyV: NA</td>
<td>10456</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS: NA</td>
<td>10144</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE de las JONS: NA</td>
<td>10301</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN: NA</td>
<td>9950</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF: NA</td>
<td>9721</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN: NA</td>
<td>7970</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC: NA</td>
<td>7547</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH: NA</td>
<td>7009</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV: NA</td>
<td>6072</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSR: NA</td>
<td>6009</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAln: NA</td>
<td>5877</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL: NA</td>
<td>5733</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA: NA</td>
<td>5165</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremadura Unida: NA</td>
<td>5007</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPAL: NA</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCE: NA</td>
<td>3483</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA: NA</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA: NA</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL: NA</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>15615296</td>
<td>[280000]</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FI – Republic of Finland

Finland allocates its 13 seats across the whole electoral area, without an electoral threshold. There is one electoral alliance. The super-apportionment uses the divisor method with rounding down, DivDwn. In the sub-apportionment, seats are apportioned according to personal votes cast for the candidates.
The super-apportionment has divisor interval [98,690; 101,453], we use divisor 100,000. In the sub-apportionment of **Alliance 1 (Perussuomalaiset + Kristillisdemokraatit)** seats are apportioned to the candidates with the most votes. The two strongest candidates of Perussuomalaiset receive 130,715 and 9,374 votes, the strongest candidate of the Kristillisdemokraatit has 53,803 votes. Therefore both parties are apportioned one seat each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009F1</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kansallinen Kokoomus: EPP</td>
<td>386,416</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Keskusta: ALDE</td>
<td>316,798</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosialidemokraatitinen: S &amp; D</td>
<td>292,051</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 1</td>
<td>232,388</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Perussuomalaiset: EFD</em></td>
<td>162,930</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kristillisdemokraatiet: EPP</em></td>
<td>69,458</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vihreä liitto: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>206,439</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruotsalainen kansanpuolue: ALDE</td>
<td>101,453</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasemmistoliitto: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>98,690</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liisa Suljakoski: NA</td>
<td>8,463</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kommunistinen: NA</td>
<td>8,089</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köyhien Asiat: NA</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilmenäisyyspuolue: NA</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Työvapheenpuolue: STP: NA</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Senioripuolue: NA</td>
<td>2,974</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum (Divisor)</strong></td>
<td>1,664,631</td>
<td>[160,000]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FR – French Republic**

France allocates its 72 seats in eight constituencies. The national electoral provisions allot the seats as follows: **Nord-Ouest 10, Ouest 9, Est 9, Sud-Ouest 10, Sud-Est 13, Massif-Central/Centre 5, Ile-de-France 13, and Outre-Mer 3**. There is a threshold of five percent relative to valid votes (**voix exprimées**) calculated separately within each constituency. In all instances the divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

The divisors show that, in the seven mainland constituencies, representation is roughly in proportion to population. The smaller divisor in Outre-Mer leads to an over-representation of the non-European territories.

1. In the **Nord-Ouest** constituency, there are 2,484,140 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 124,207. Seven parties pass the threshold and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 350,201 ineffective votes, cast for another eleven parties. The divisor interval is [150,290; 150,389], we use 150,300.

2. In the **Ouest** constituency, there are 2,506,694 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 125,334.7. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 376,505 ineffective votes, cast for another fourteen parties. The divisor interval is [170,208; 208,724], we use divisor 200,000.

3. In the **Est** constituency, there are 2,174,901 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 108,745.1. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 361,599 ineffective votes, cast for 13 parties. The divisor interval is [155,310; 158,754], we use divisor 157,000.

4. In the **Sud-Ouest** constituency, there are 2,625,075 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 131,253.8. Seven parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 295,418 ineffective votes, cast for another seventeen parties. The divisor interval is [155,806; 176,475], we use divisor 170,000.

5. In the **Sud-Est** constituency, there are 2,939,639 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 146,982.0. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 473,988 ineffective votes, cast for another fifteen parties. The divisor interval is [143,760; 172,511], we use divisor 160,000.

6. In the **Massif-Central/Centre** constituency, there are 1,342,249 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 67,112.5. Seven parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves
179,110 ineffective votes, cast for another thirteen parties. The divisor interval is [119,403; 127,544], we use divisor 120,000.

(7) In the Ille-de-France constituency, there are 2,798,120 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 139,906. Five parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 59,147 ineffective votes, cast for another twenty-two parties. The divisor interval is [138,029; 145,922], we use divisor 140,000.

(8) In the Outre-Mer constituency, there are 347,796 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 17,389.8. Five parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 12,101 ineffective votes, cast for another six parties. The divisor interval is [56,502; 70,514], we use divisor 60,000. Furthermore, the constituency consists of three sections (Atlantique, océan Indien, Pacifique). Parties must include at least one candidate from each section. The seat(s) allocated to the strongest party is (are) allocated to the section(s) where the percentage of votes is highest. The seat allocated to the second strongest party is allocated to one of the remaining sections. In case the third strongest party is allocated a seat, it is allocated to the remaining section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009FR</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Nord-Ouest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>601,556</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>449,533</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>300,579</td>
<td>1.9999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFN: NA</td>
<td>253,009</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>215,482</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOP: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>169,813</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXG: NA</td>
<td>143,967</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,133,939</td>
<td>[150,300]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Ouest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>680,829</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>433,309</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>417,449</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDVD: EFD</td>
<td>257,437</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>212,524</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXG: NA</td>
<td>128,641</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,130,189</td>
<td>[200,000]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Est</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>635,016</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>374,971</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>310,620</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>205,256</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFN: NA</td>
<td>164,672</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXG: NA</td>
<td>122,767</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>1,813,302</td>
<td>[157,000]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Sud-Ouest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>705,900</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>465,076</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>415,457</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>225,917</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOP: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>214,079</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFN: NA</td>
<td>155,806</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXG: NA</td>
<td>147,422</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,329,857</td>
<td>[170,000]</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Sud-Est</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>862,556</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>537,151</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>426,043</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFN: NA</td>
<td>249,695</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>216,630</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOP: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>173,576</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,465,651</td>
<td>[160,000]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HU – Republic of Hungary

Hungary allocates its 22 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to valid votes. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

There are 2,896,179 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 144,808.95. Hence the threshold requires at least 144,809 votes, or more than 144,808 votes which is the number quoted by the electoral office website. Four parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 179,297 ineffective votes, cast for another four parties. The divisor interval is [108,821; 116,593], we use divisor 110,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009FR (continued)</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Massif-Central/Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMAJ: EPP</td>
<td>382,632</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOC: S &amp; D</td>
<td>238,806</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEC: GREENS/EF A</td>
<td>182,311</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCMD: ALDE</td>
<td>109,369</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCOP: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>108,194</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXG: NA</td>
<td>73,162</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPN: NA</td>
<td>68,665</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>1,163,139</td>
<td>[120,000]</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (7) Ile-de-France    |       |          |        |
| LMAJ: EPP            | 828,172 | 5.92     | 5      |
| LVEC: GREENS/EF A    | 583,690 | 4.17     | 4      |
| LSOC: S & D          | 379,908 | 2.71     | 2      |
| LCMD: ALDE           | 238,341 | 1.70     | 1      |
| LCOP: GUE/NGL        | 176,862 | 1.26     | 1      |
| Sum [Divisor]        | 2,206,973 | [140,000] | 13     |

| (8) Outre-Mer        |       |          |        |
| LMAJ: EPP            | 103,247 | 1.72     | 1      |
| LDVD: GUE/NGL        | 73,110  | 1.22     | 1      |
| LSOC: S & D          | 70,514  | 1.18     | 1      |
| LVEC: GREENS/EF A    | 56,502  | 0.94     | 0      |
| LCMD: ALDE           | 32,322  | 0.54     | 0      |
| Sum [Divisor]        | 335,695 | [80,000]  | 3      |

IE – Ireland

Ireland allocates its 12 seats in four constituencies. Proportionally to population, the national provisions allot three seats each to the four constituencies Dublin, East, North-West, and South. The single transferable vote (STV) system with random vote transfer is used throughout, STVran.

The Droop quotas DrQ are \[\frac{406,630}{(3 + 1)} + 1 = 101,658\] for the constituency of Dublin, \[\frac{429,249}{(3 + 1)} + 1 = 107,313\] for East, \[\frac{495,307}{(3 + 1)} + 1 = 123,827\] for North-West, and \[\frac{498,127}{(3 + 1)} + 1 = 124,532\] for South.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009HU</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIDESZ. EPP</td>
<td>1,632,309</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSZP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>503,140</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBBIK: NA</td>
<td>427,773</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDF: ECR</td>
<td>153,660</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>2,716,882</td>
<td>[110,000]</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Dublin
Gay Mitchell  Fine Gael: EPP          96 715  1
Páraísa de Rossa  Labour: S&D        83 471  1
Eoin Ryan Jnr  Fianna Fáil: ALDE   55 346  0
Joe Higgins  Socialist: GUE/NGL        50 510  1
Mary Lou McDonald  Sinn Féin: GUE/NGL  47 928  0
Deirdre de Burca  Green/Conhaontas Glas: GREENS/EFA  19 086  0
Eithin Byrne  Fianna Fáil: ALDE    18 958  0
Patricia McKenna  Independent: NA     17 521  0
Caroline Simons  Libertas: EFD        13 514  0
Emmanuel Sweeney  Independent: NA     3 583  0
Sum [Quota] [101 658]  408 630  3

(2) East
Mairead McGuinness  Fine Gael: EPP       110 366  1
Liam Aylward  Fianna Fáil: ALDE         74 666  1
Nessa Childers  Labour: S&D             78 338  1
John Paul Phelan  Fine Gael: EPP        61 851  0
Kathleen Funchion  Sinn Féin: GUE/NGL  26 987  0
Thomas Byrne  Fianna Fáil: ALDE         31 112  0
Tomas Sharkey  Sinn Féin: GUE/NGL       20 932  0
Ray O’Malley  Libertas: EFD             18 557  0
Paddy Garvey  Independent: NA           2 934  0
Jim Tallon  Independent: NA             2 412  0
Micheal E Grealy  Independent: NA       1 514  0
Sum [Quota] [107 313]  429 249  3

(3) North-West
Marian Harkin  Independent: ALDE        84 813  1
Pat Gallagher  Fianna Fáil: ALDE        82 643  1
Jim Higgins  Fine Gael: EPP             80 093  1
Declan Ganley  Libertas: EFD            67 638  0
Pádraig MacLochlainn  Sinn Féin: GUE/NGL  45 515  0
Paschal Mooney  Fianna Fáil: ALDE       42 985  0
Joe O’Reilly  Fine Gael: EPP            37 564  0
Susan O’Keeffe  Labour: S&D             28 708  0
Michael McNamara  Independent: NA       12 744  0
Fiachra O Luain  Independent: NA        6 510  0
John Higgins  Independent: NA           3 030  0
Noel McCullagh  Independent: NA         1 940  0
Tom R King  Independent: NA             1 124  0
Sum [Quota] [123 827]  485 307  3

(4) South
Brian Crowley  Fianna Fáil: ALDE        118 258  1
Sean Kelly  Fine Gael: EPP              92 579  1
Alan Kelly  Labour: S&D                  64 152  1
Kathy Sinnott  Independent: NA           58 485  0
Toireasa Ferris  Sinn Féin: GUE/NGL    64 671  0
Colm Burke  Fine Gael: EPP               53 721  0
Ned O’Keeffe  Fianna Fáil: ALDE          16 596  0
Dan Boyle  Green/Conhaontas Glas: GREENS/EFA  15 499  0
Alexander Stafford  Independent: NA     11 692  0
Maurice Sexton  Independent: NA         2 474  0
Sum [Quota] [124 532]  498 127  3

IT – Italian Republic

Italy allocates its 72 seats across the whole electoral area, subdivided into five electoral districts. There is a four percent threshold relative to valid votes. All apportionment calculations use the Hare quota variant HQQ with residual fit by greatest remainders, HQ1grR.

Minority parties may register an electoral alliance with parties that campaign in all districts. In 2009, the Südtiroler Völkspartei (SVP) is allied with the Partito democratico, the Vallee d’Aoste with Il Popolo della liberta, and Autonomie liberté et démocratie with Di Pietro Italia dei Valori. A minority party is guaranteed
a seat provided its top candidate wins at least 50,000 votes. In 2009 this clause applies to Herbert Dorfmann (SVP) only, with 84,361 of the 142,996 votes cast for the SVP.

The valid votes of the five districts total 30,615,364. The website of the Ministry of the Interior quotes 30,623,840 valid votes. Four percent of 30,615,364 is 1,224,614.5. Five parties pass the threshold. Together with the three allied minority parties, eight parties participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 4,049,147 ineffective votes, cast for another eight parties.

The HQ1 quota for the super-apportionment is \[26,566,217/72\] = 368,975. The HQ1 quotas for the sub-apportionments are \[10,828,525/29\] = 373,397 for Il Popolo della liberta, \[8,140,766/22\] = 370,034 for Partito democratico, \[3,125,418/9\] = 347,268 for Lega Nord, \[2,476,695/7\] = 353,813 for Di Pietro Italia dei Valori, and \[1,994,813/5\] = 398,962 for Unione di Centro.

There is a severe bug in the Italian electoral provisions (Pennisi, Ricca and Simeone, 2006). Art. 2 of the Italian electoral provisions assigns a fixed number of seats to each district, based on the 2001 population census: Nord-Ocidentale 19, Nord-Orientale 13, Italia Centrale 14, Italia Meridionale 18, Italia Insulare 8. These numbers are not realized, but sum up to: Nord-Ocidentale 21, Nord Orientale 15, Italia Centrale 15, Italia Meridionale 15, Italia Insulare 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009R</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HQ1grR</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HQ1grR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il Popolo della liberta: EPP [Quota]</td>
<td>10,828,525</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>373,397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Ocidentale+Valle d’Aoste</td>
<td>2,933,126</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Meridionale</td>
<td>2,869,765</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Centrale</td>
<td>2,344,066</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Orientale</td>
<td>1,777,869</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Insulare</td>
<td>901,459</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partito democratico: S&amp;D [Quota]</td>
<td>8,140,766</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>370,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Centrale</td>
<td>2,030,062</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Ocidentale</td>
<td>2,002,790</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Orientale+SVP: EPP</td>
<td>1,915,846</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Meridionale</td>
<td>1,575,928</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Insulare</td>
<td>616,140</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lega Nord: EFD [Quota]</td>
<td>3,125,418</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>347,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Ocidentale</td>
<td>1,684,842</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Orientale</td>
<td>1,204,785</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Centrale</td>
<td>186,988</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Meridionale</td>
<td>39,521</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Insulare</td>
<td>9,282</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Meridionale</td>
<td>688,368</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Ocidentale+Aut. lib. et démo.</td>
<td>663,495</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Centrale</td>
<td>483,471</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Orientale</td>
<td>454,801</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Insulare</td>
<td>186,560</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unione di Centro: EPP [Quota]</td>
<td>1,994,813</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>398,962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Meridionale</td>
<td>582,421</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Ocidentale</td>
<td>460,487</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nord-Orientale</td>
<td>353,714</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Centrale</td>
<td>341,612</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Italia Insulare</td>
<td>256,579</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum [Quota]**

30,615,364

| [368,975] | 72 |

**LT – Republic of Lithuania**

Lithuania allocates its 12 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to votes cast. The Hare quota variant HQ2 together with the full-seat restricted residual apportionment gr2 is used, HQ2gr2.

The number of votes cast is 564,803, with 550,017 valid votes. Five percent of the votes cast is 28,240.2. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 97,514 ineffective votes, cast for another nine parties. The HQ2 quota is \[452,503/12\] = 37,709.
The electoral provisions include a clause that, if necessary, the threshold is lowered such that at least 60 percent of valid votes are effective. In 2009 the clause does not apply as 452,503 equals 82.3 percent.

No party passing the threshold is affected by the full-seat restriction in the residual apportionment. Otherwise a violation of Art. 3, European Electoral Act as amended in 2002, would have emerged. The full-seat restriction implies a threshold of HQ2 = 37709 votes, that is, 6.7 percent of the 564,803 votes cast.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009LT</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HQ2gR2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tevynės sąjunga – Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai: EPP</td>
<td>147,756</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lietuvos socialdemokratų partija: S &amp; D</td>
<td>102,347</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partija TVarka ir teisingumas: EFD</td>
<td>67,237</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darbo partija: ALDE</td>
<td>48,368</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lietuvos lenkų rinkimu akcija: ECR</td>
<td>46,293</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lietuvos Respublikos liberalų sąjūdis: ALDE</td>
<td>40,502</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Quota]</strong></td>
<td><strong>452,503</strong></td>
<td><strong>37709</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LU – Grand Duchy of Luxembourg**

Luxembourg allocates its 6 seats across the whole electoral area. Voters have up to six votes that can be distributed across party lines, with a maximum of two votes for any candidate. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

There are 1,121,305 valid votes on 198,364 valid ballot sheets. On the average, about 5.7 votes are expressed on each ballot sheet. The divisor interval is [109,266; 117,074], we use divisor 110,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009LU</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSV-Chrëschtlesch Sozial Vollekspartei: EPP</td>
<td>351,223</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSAP-D’SÖZIALISTEN: S &amp; D</td>
<td>218,532</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP: ALDE</td>
<td>209,123</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēi grëng: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>188,637</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR-Alternativ Demokratesch Reformpartei: NA</td>
<td>82,719</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lënëk: NA</td>
<td>38,289</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPL-d’KOMMUNISTEN: NA</td>
<td>17,299</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIERGERLESCHT: NA</td>
<td>15,483</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,121,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>[110,000]</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LV – Republic of Latvia**

Latvia allocates its 8 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to votes cast. The divisor method with standard rounding is used, DivStd.

The number of votes cast is 791,597, with 777,084 valid votes. Five percent of the votes cast is 39,579.9. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 182,144 ineffective votes, cast for another eleven parties. The divisor interval is [77,014.8; 103,262], we use divisor 100,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009LV</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivStd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pārējā savienība: EPP</td>
<td>192,537</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskanas Centrs: S &amp; D, GUE/NGL</td>
<td>154,894</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par oliveka tiesībām vienota Latvijā: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>76,436</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partija LPP/LC: ALDE</td>
<td>59,326</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apvienība Tēvzemē un Brivibai/LNNK: ECR</td>
<td>58,991</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaunais laiks: EPP</td>
<td>52,751</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td><strong>594,935</strong></td>
<td><strong>[100,000]</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MT – Republic of Malta

Malta allocates its 5 seats across the whole electoral area. The single transferable vote (STV) system with random vote transfer is used, STVran.

The Droop quota is $248\,169 / (5 + 1) + 1 = 41\,362$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009MT</th>
<th>1st Pref</th>
<th>STVran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simon Busuttil</td>
<td>Partit Nazzjonalist: EPP</td>
<td>68,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Grech</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>27,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Scicluna</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>24,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cuschieri</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>19,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlene Mizzi</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>17,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Montalti Attard</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>12,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldacchino Abela</td>
<td>Partit Laburista: S&amp;D</td>
<td>12,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casa</td>
<td>Partit Nazzjonalist: EPP</td>
<td>6,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 further nominees</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum (Quota)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>41,362</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NL – Kingdom of the Netherlands

The Netherlands allocate their 25 seats across the whole electoral area, without an electoral threshold. There are three electoral alliances. The main apportionment uses the divisor method with rounding down, DivDwn. The three sub-apportionments apply the Hare quota HaQ with residual fit by greatest remainders, HaQqrR.

The super-apportionment has divisor interval $[157\,735; 158\,785]$, we use divisor 158\,000. The Hare quotas for the sub-apportionments are $1\,223\,773 / 7 = 174\,824.7$ for Alliance 1, $1\,034\,065 / 6 = 172\,344.2$ for Alliance 2, and $952\,711 / 6 = 158\,785.2$ for Alliance 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009NL</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>HaQqrR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 1 [Quota]</td>
<td>1,223,773</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$[174,824.7]$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; CDA: EPP</td>
<td>913,233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ ChristenUnie-SGP: ECR, EFD</td>
<td>310,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 2 [Quota]</td>
<td>1,034,065</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$[172,344.2]$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; VVD: ALDE</td>
<td>518,643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ D66: ALDE</td>
<td>515,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance 3 [Quota]</td>
<td>952,711</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$[158,785.2]$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; PvdA: S&amp;D</td>
<td>548,691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ GroenLinks: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>404,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partij voor de Vrijheid: NA</td>
<td>772,746</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialistische Partij: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>323,269</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partij voor de Dieren: NA</td>
<td>157,735</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKP: NA</td>
<td>21,448</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewEuropeans: NA</td>
<td>19,840</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libertas: EFD</td>
<td>14,612</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberaal Democraties Partij: NA</td>
<td>10,757</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Groenen: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>8,517</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidara: NA</td>
<td>7,533</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa Voordelig! &amp; Duurzaam: NA</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partij voor Europees Politiek: NA</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum (Divisor)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,553,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>[158,000]</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PL – Republic of Poland

Poland allocates its 50 seats across the whole electoral area, subdivided into thirteen districts. There is a five percent threshold relative to valid votes. The super-apportionment uses the divisor method with rounding down, DivDwn. The four sub-apportionments apply the Hare quota HaQ with residual fit by greatest remainders, HaQqrR.

There are 7\,364\,763 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 368\,238.2. Four parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 650\,393 ineffective votes, cast for another
eight parties. The super-apportionment has divisor interval \([129,037; 129,823]\), we use divisor 129,400. In the sub-apportionments, the HaQ quotas are \(2,371,852/25 = 930,741.4\) for Platforma Obywatelska RP, \(2017,607/15 = 134,507.1\) for Prawo i Sprawiedliwość, \(908,765/7 = 129,823.6\) for Wyborczy Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej - Unia Pracy, and \(516,146/3 = 172,048.7\) for Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platforma Obywatelska RP: EPP [Quota]</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Div/Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katowice, okr. 11</td>
<td>523,602</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 1, okr. 4</td>
<td>434,421</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków, okr. 10</td>
<td>347,617</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań, okr. 7</td>
<td>289,442</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk, okr. 1</td>
<td>285,268</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź, okr. 6</td>
<td>204,798</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski, okr. 13</td>
<td>203,038</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz, okr. 2</td>
<td>162,556</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn, okr. 3</td>
<td>159,943</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 2, okr. 5</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin, okr. 8</td>
<td>112,221</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów, okr. 9</td>
<td>107,092</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prawo i Sprawiedliwość: ECR [Quota]</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Div/Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kraków, okr. 10</td>
<td>383,631</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice, okr. 11</td>
<td>207,429</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 1, okr. 4</td>
<td>196,720</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław, okr. 12</td>
<td>163,197</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów, okr. 9</td>
<td>153,661</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin, okr. 8</td>
<td>136,986</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź, okr. 6</td>
<td>134,947</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 2, okr. 5</td>
<td>129,165</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn, okr. 3</td>
<td>121,921</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań, okr. 7</td>
<td>121,216</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk, okr. 1</td>
<td>105,946</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski, okr. 13</td>
<td>89,605</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz, okr. 2</td>
<td>73,183</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wyborczy Sojusz Lewicy Dem.: S&amp;D [Quota]</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Div/Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Katowice, okr. 11</td>
<td>117,884</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków, okr. 10</td>
<td>95,277</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań, okr. 7</td>
<td>94,180</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław, okr. 12</td>
<td>93,172</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski, okr. 13</td>
<td>89,471</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 1, okr. 4</td>
<td>84,740</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz, okr. 2</td>
<td>79,400</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź, okr. 6</td>
<td>62,923</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn, okr. 3</td>
<td>59,194</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk, okr. 1</td>
<td>50,427</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 2, okr. 5</td>
<td>30,225</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów, okr. 9</td>
<td>27,147</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin, okr. 8</td>
<td>24,725</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe: EPP [Quota]</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Div/Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 2, okr. 5</td>
<td>72,551</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraków, okr. 10</td>
<td>60,846</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poznań, okr. 7</td>
<td>52,716</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin, okr. 8</td>
<td>51,954</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rzeszów, okr. 9</td>
<td>45,685</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrocław, okr. 12</td>
<td>41,975</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bydgoszcz, okr. 2</td>
<td>38,092</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olsztyn, okr. 3</td>
<td>38,012</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Łódź, okr. 6</td>
<td>32,390</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katowice, okr. 11</td>
<td>23,566</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warszawa 1, okr. 4</td>
<td>22,899</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorzów Wielkopolski, okr. 13</td>
<td>22,290</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdańsk, okr. 1</td>
<td>13,170</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum [Quotient] 6 714 370 [129 400] 50
PT – Portuguese Republic

Portugal allocates its 22 seats across the whole electoral area. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

The divisor interval is [126 569; 127 337], we use divisor 127 000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009PT</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPD/PSD: EPP</td>
<td>1 129 243</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS: S&amp;D</td>
<td>946 475</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.E.: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>382 011</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP–PEV: GUE/NGL</td>
<td>379 707</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDS–PP: EPP</td>
<td>298 057</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP: NA</td>
<td>52 828</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTP/MRPP: NA</td>
<td>43 141</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPT: NA</td>
<td>23 415</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMS: NA</td>
<td>21 636</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.H.: NA</td>
<td>16 980</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM: NA</td>
<td>13 794</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.N.R.: NA</td>
<td>13 039</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POUS: NA</td>
<td>5 101</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>3 325 427</td>
<td>[127 000]</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RO – Romania

Romania allocates its 33 seats across the whole electoral area. There are two electoral thresholds. One threshold applies to parties, and is five percent of valid votes. The other, implicit threshold applies to independent candidates, and is determined by variant 4 of the Hare quota, HQ4 = [ valid votes / h ]. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

There are 4 840 033 valid votes. The five percent party threshold is 242 001.7, and the implicit independent candidate threshold is ⌈ 4 840 033 / 33 ⌉ = ⌈ 146 667.7 ⌉ = 146 668. Five parties and one independent candidate pass the thresholds, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 139 728 ineffective votes, cast for another four parties and five independent candidates. The divisor interval is [130 728; 136 747], we use divisor 134 000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009RO</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alianța Politică PSD+PC: S&amp;D</td>
<td>1 504 218</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partidul Democrat Liberal: EPP</td>
<td>1 438 000</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partidul Național Liberal: ALDE</td>
<td>702 974</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniunea Democrată a Maghiarilor din România: EPP</td>
<td>431 739</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partidul România Mare: NA</td>
<td>419 094</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Băsescu: EPP</td>
<td>204 280</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>4 700 305</td>
<td>[134 000]</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SE – Kingdom of Sweden

Sweden allocates its 18 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a four percent threshold relative to valid votes. The divisor method with modified standard rounding is used, Div0.7.

There are 3 168 546 valid votes. Four percent thereof is 126 741.8. Eight parties pass the threshold and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 292 172 ineffective votes, cast for another six parties. The divisor interval is [150 610; 170 488], we use divisor 160 000. Since all quotients stay above 0.7, the modification is not called upon.
### SI – Republic of Slovenia

Slovenia allocates its 7 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a four percent electoral threshold, but it is not clear to us whether the percentage refers to votes cast, or to valid votes. For the 2009 election both thresholds leave 45,894 ineffective votes, cast for another six parties. The divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

The divisor interval is [41,187.7; 42,703.5], we use divisor 42,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009SI</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slovenska demokratska stranka-sds: EPP</td>
<td>123,563</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialni demokrati: S &amp; D</td>
<td>85,407</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova slovenija-krščanska ljudska stranka: EPP</td>
<td>76,866</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS Liberaldemokracija Slovenije: ALDE</td>
<td>53,212</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZARES-nova politika: ALDE</td>
<td>45,238</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSUS-demokratčna stranka upokojencev slovenije: NA</td>
<td>33,292</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>417,578</td>
<td>(42,000)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SK – Slovak Republic

The Slovak Republic allocates its 13 seats across the whole electoral area. There is a five percent threshold relative to valid votes. The apportionment method uses the Droop quota variant D3Q with residual fit by greatest remainders, DQ3grR.

There are 826,782 valid votes. Five percent thereof is 41,339.1. Six parties pass the threshold, and participate in the apportionment calculation. This leaves 117,778 ineffective votes, cast for another eleven parties. The quota is DQ3 = \( \left( 709,004 / (13 + 1) \right) = 50,643 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP2009SK</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DQ3grR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMER-sociálna demokracia: S &amp; D</td>
<td>264,722</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slov. demokr. a kresťanská unia-Demokr. strana: EPP</td>
<td>140,428</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strana maďarskej koalície-Magyar Koalicíó Pártja: EPP</td>
<td>93,750</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kresťanskodemokratické hnutie: EPP</td>
<td>89,905</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ľudová strana-Hnutie za demokratické Slovensko: ALDE</td>
<td>74,241</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenská národná strana: EFD</td>
<td>45,960</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Quota]</strong></td>
<td>709,004</td>
<td>[50,643]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UK – United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The United Kingdom allocates its 72 seats in 12 constituencies. There is no electoral threshold. The British electoral provisions allot seats to constituencies in proportion to population. In eleven constituencies the divisor method with rounding down is used, DivDwn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Divisor interval Divisor</th>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Divisor interval Divisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Eastern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>[141,016; 156,960]</td>
<td>(7) South West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[144,179; 156,247]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East Midlands</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[123,425; 151,428]</td>
<td>(8) West Midlands</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[132,283; 150,235]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) London</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[124,197; 159,679]</td>
<td>(9) Yorkshire/Humber</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[115,005; 120,139]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>[90,700; 103,644]</td>
<td>(10) Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>[107,003; 114,926]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) North West</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>[130,870; 132,094]</td>
<td>(11) Wales</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[73,082; 87,585]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) South East</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>[162,458; 165,170]</td>
<td>(12) Northern Ireland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>STVfra, see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2009UK</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Quotient</td>
<td>DivGwn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Eastern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>500331</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>313921</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>221235</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>167833</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>141016</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>97013</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKF: NA</td>
<td>38185</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>32211</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>24646</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>13939</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>13599</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC: NA</td>
<td>13201</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>9940</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent: NA</td>
<td>9916</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>6354</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>1603340</td>
<td>190000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) East Midlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>370275</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>206945</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>201984</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>151428</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>106319</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>28498</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>17907</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>13590</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>11375</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>83939</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKF: NA</td>
<td>20561</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>7882</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>7362</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>1228065</td>
<td>140000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>479037</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>372590</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>240156</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>190589</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>188440</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>86420</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>51336</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Jananaygam: NA</td>
<td>50014</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>24477</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>17758</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>15306</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>8444</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>7284</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP: NA</td>
<td>4050</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Cheung: NA</td>
<td>4918</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes2Europe: NA</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohale Rahman: NA</td>
<td>3248</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Alcantara: NA</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haroon Saaid: NA</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum [Divisor]</td>
<td>1751026</td>
<td>140000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP2009UK (continued)</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Quotient</td>
<td>DivDwn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(4) North East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>147,338</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>116,911</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>103,644</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>90,700</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>52,700</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green: GREENS/EFA</strong></td>
<td>34,081</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>13,007</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>10,238</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>8,066</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>589,862</td>
<td>[100 000]</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(5) North West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>423,174</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>336,831</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>261,740</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>235,639</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>132,094</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green: GREENS/EFA</strong></td>
<td>127,133</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>40,027</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>26,224</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>25,999</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>23,580</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>8,783</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Aplin: NA</td>
<td>3,621</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>1,651,825</td>
<td>[131 000]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(6) South East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>812,288</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>440,002</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>330,340</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green: GREENS/EFA</strong></td>
<td>271,506</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>192,592</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>101,769</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>52,526</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>35,712</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>21,455</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>16,767</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>15,484</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKF: NA</td>
<td>15,261</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>14,172</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNVJE: NA</td>
<td>9,534</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA: NA</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>2,334,858</td>
<td>[164 000]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(7) South West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>468,742</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>341,845</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>266,253</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green: GREENS/EFA</strong></td>
<td>144,179</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S &amp; D</td>
<td>118,716</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>60,889</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP: NA</td>
<td>37,785</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>25,313</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>21,329</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Kernow/Cornwall: NA</td>
<td>14,922</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>10,033</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>9,741</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie O.Hopkins: NA</td>
<td>8,971</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>7,292</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPFTP: NA</td>
<td>7,151</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAI D: NA</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum [Divisor]</strong></td>
<td>1,549,708</td>
<td>[150 000]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(8) West Midlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>396.847</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>300.471</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S&amp;D</td>
<td>240.201</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>170.246</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>121.967</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>32.455</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>187.84</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>134.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>14.724</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>88.244</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>8.721</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>6.961</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum [Divisor] 1413036 [140000] 6

(9) Yorkshire and Humber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR, NA</td>
<td>299.802</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S&amp;D</td>
<td>230.009</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>213.750</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>120.139</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>161.552</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>104.456</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP: NA</td>
<td>31.287</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>19.380</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>16.742</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>15.614</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>7.181</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD: NA</td>
<td>6.268</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum [Divisor] 1226180 [120000] 6

(10) Scotland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNP: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>321.007</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S&amp;D</td>
<td>229.853</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>185.794</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>127.038</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>80.442</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>27.174</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>57.788</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>22.135</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>16.738</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSP: NA</td>
<td>10.404</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Robertson: NA</td>
<td>10.189</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>9.693</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>6.257</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum [Divisor] 1104512 [110000] 6

(11) Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Quotient</th>
<th>DivDwn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP: ECR</td>
<td>145.193</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP: S&amp;D</td>
<td>138.852</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>126.702</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKIP: EFD</td>
<td>87.585</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD: ALDE</td>
<td>73.082</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP: NA</td>
<td>37.114</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPPCL: NA</td>
<td>13.037</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green: GREENS/EFA</td>
<td>38.160</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLP: NA</td>
<td>12.402</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No2EU: NA</td>
<td>8.600</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JT: NA</td>
<td>3.793</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum [Divisor] 684520 [80000] 4

(12) The Northern Ireland constituency apportions its 3 seats using the single transferable vote (STV) system with fractional vote transfer, STVfra. The Droop quota DrQ is \[\frac{484572/(3 + 1)}{1} = 121144\].
Conclusion

Since 1951, there has been a perennial call for a uniform electoral procedure for the European parliamen-
tary body. The present paper records the 2009 elections, and shows that the 27 Member States follow
eleven distinct ways to translate votes into seats. There are even more differences within the electoral
procedures, such as the handling of electoral thresholds, constituencies, districts, electoral alliances, and
the like.

Our account of the status quo hopefully offers a helpful starting point to further move towards
a uniform electoral procedure. In our companion paper (Oelbermann and Pukelsheim, 2010), we rely
on the present aggregate data to propose ten steps in this direction.

Bibliography

Books and Articles


Member States. London.


am Main.

Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C, Brussels. [on-line].


Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte, B17, pp. 29–37. [on-line]. [cit. 2010-11-09] Available at
http://archiv.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/
volltextserver/frontdoor.php?source_opus=4696.


**European Documents**


**National Electoral Provisions and Election Results**


[HU] (Hungary) Art. 8 (2), Act CXIII of 2003 with regards to the election of the MPs for the European Parliament (excerpt). Available at


