

# European Elections 2014: From Voters to Representatives, in Twenty-eight Ways

Kai-Friederike Oelbermann\* (Kai-Friederike.Oelbermann@ovgu.de)

Friedrich Pukelsheim † (Pukelsheim@math.uni-augsburg.de)

## Abstract

The 2014 European Parliament elections are analyzed with regard to how votes are cast, how the votes cast are converted into seats, and how the seats are filled with candidates. The ballot structure and vote pattern, the apportionment of seats among parties, and the assignment of seats to candidates are described, specifically for each Member State.

## Keywords

European Electoral Act 2002, European Parliament elections 2014, ballot structure, candidate votes, electoral thresholds, list votes, preference votes, seat allocation between Member States, seat apportionment among parties, seat assignment to candidates, vote pattern

---

\*Institut für Mathematische Optimierung, Otto von Guericke Universität Magdeburg, Deutschland.

†Institut für Mathematik, Universität Augsburg, Deutschland.

## Introduction

The 2014 elections to the European Parliament (EP) took place on the four days between Thursday, 22 May 2014, and Sunday, 25 May 2014. The dimensions of these elections are unique. They extend over twenty-eight Member States of the European Union, and address an electorate of more than half a billion Union citizens. There are many aspects and diverse approaches how to analyze the elections, see for instance Kaeding and Switek (2015).

This paper focuses on the procedural details how Union citizens cast their votes, and how these votes eventually mandate a select group of 751 men and women, out of several thousands candidates, to serve as a Member of the European Parliament (MEP) in the EP's eighth legislative period. A similar overview for the 2009 European elections was assembled by Oelbermann, Palomares and Pukelsheim (2010). The present paper goes a step further, by describing the ballot structures and vote patterns used, and by reporting the starting position on the party list of every candidate who finished as a MEP.

European elections are governed by the European Electoral Act 2002, and by supplementary provisions decreed within each of the Union's twenty-eight Member States. This extensive framework is compiled in detail and with many links to domestic legal acts by Lehmann (2014). The present paper serves a complementary function, by supplementing Lehmann's "pre-electoral summary of provisions" with a "post-electoral summary of results".

Of course the paper must set itself limits how far it carries the aspired summary of results. It does *not* examine the way in which domestic parties recruit their candidates who then stand in the elections. Nor does it include any comparative analyses how voters react to the distinct ballot structures and vote patterns of the Member States. That vote patterns may have a decisive influence on the electoral outcome is vividly demonstrated by the field experiment of Laslier et al. (2015).

The paper is organized as follows. The section "Seat allocation between Member States" briefly recalls how the 751 EP seats are allocated between the Member States for the 2014 elections. The section "Ballot structure and vote pattern" proposes a common terminology for the design of ballots and voting procedures actually used in the Member States in 2014. The section "Seat apportionment among parties" recalls the seat apportionment methods that are employed in the process of converting the number of votes cast in favor of a party into the number of seats awarded to this party. The section "Seat assignment to candidates" discusses the influence of preference votes and candidates votes when it comes to assign a party's seats to its candidates. The core of the paper is the section "The 2014 European elections, by Member States" whose twenty-eight subsections report the detailed 2014 results, Member State by Member State. The paper finishes with the section "Conclusions".

Several external weblinks<sup>1</sup> are particularly useful for this paper. The paper sorts the twenty-eight Member States by their two-letter codes, as given in Section 7.1.1<sup>2</sup> of the Union's Interinstitutional style guide. This sorting is language independent, and differs from the Union's protocol order.

As a companion product to this paper, a gallery of the 2014 ballot papers used in the Member States is exhibited at the site <http://www.uni-augsburg.de/bazi/EP2014Ballots.html>. The Java program BAZI-Calculations of Allocations by Apportionment Methods in the Internet, available at <http://www.uni-augsburg.de/bazi>, is a public tool that aids to carry out the unavoidable calculations needed to produce the paper's tables.

In the tables, domestic parties are abbreviated by the party tabs<sup>3</sup> that are used on the EP's Internet site. The site includes an expansion of the tabs into the full names of the domestic parties. The present paper emphasizes the European outlook, by associating every domestic party with the Political Group in the EP which the party joined upon inauguration of the 2014 EP.

---

<sup>1</sup>See <http://www.elections2014.eu>.

<sup>2</sup>See <http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-370100.htm>.

<sup>3</sup>See <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/seats-member-state-absolut.html>.

Table 1: European elections 2014

	Member State	Seats 2014	Ballot structure	Vote pattern	Electoral threshold	Apportionment method
AT	Austria	18	sheet	LV1	4% of valid v.	DivDwn
BE	Belgium*3	21	sheet	LVm	–	DivDwn
BG	Bulgaria	17	sheet	LV1	5.6% of v. cast	HaQgrR
CY	Cyprus	6	sheet	2CV	1.8% of valid v.	HQ3grR
CZ	Czech Republic	21	papers	LV2	5% of valid v.	DivDwn
DE	Germany/16	96	sheet	LV0	–	DivStd
DK	Denmark+2	13	sheet	1CV	–	DivDwn
EE	Estonia	6	sheet	1CV	–	DivDwn
EL	Greece	21	papers	4CV	3% of valid v.	HQ3-EL
ES	Spain	54	papers	LV0	–	DivDwn
FI	Finland	13	sheet	1CV	–	DivDwn
FR	France*8	74	papers	LV0	5% of valid v.	DivDwn
HR	Croatia	11	sheet	LV1	5% of v. cast	DivDwn
HU	Hungary	21	sheet	LV0	5% of valid v.	DivDwn
IE	Ireland*3	11	sheet	STV	–	STVran
IT	Italy/5	73	sheet	3CV	4% of valid v.	HQ1grR
LT	Lithuania	11	sheet	5CV	5% of v. cast	HQ2grR
LU	Luxembourg	6	sheet	6CV	–	DivDwn
LV	Latvia	8	papers	mCV	5% of v. cast	DivStd
MT	Malta	6	sheet	STV	–	STVran
NL	Netherlands+2	26	sheet	LV1	3.8% of v. cast	DivDwn,HaQgrR
PL	Poland/13	51	booklet	1CV	5% of valid v.	DivDwn,HaQgrR
PT	Portugal	21	sheet	LV0	–	DivDwn
RO	Romania	32	booklet	LV0	5% of valid v.	DivDwn
SE	Sweden	20	papers	LV1	4% of valid v.	Div0.7
SI	Slovenia	8	sheet	LV1	4% of v. cast	DivDwn
SK	Slovakia	13	papers	LV2	5% of valid v.	DQ3grR
UK	United Kingdom*12	73	sheet	LV0, STV	–	DivDwn,STVfra

Member States are ordered by their two-letter codes. The notation “Belgium\*3” indicates that Belgium establishes three districts for separate evaluation. So do France (8 districts), Ireland (3), and the United Kingdom (12). “Germany/16” means that Germany is subdivided into 16 districts possibly entailing one or more sub-apportionments. Similar subdivisions exist in Italy (5) and Poland (13). “Denmark+2” says that Denmark features two list alliances, as the Netherlands do. The acronyms for the vote patterns and apportionment methods are explained in the main text.

## Seat allocation between Member States

European elections decide on who will serve as a MEP in the next legislative period. The 2014 EP comprises 751 seats. Naturally the allotment of these 751 seats to the candidates of the political parties in the twenty-eight Member States of the European Union is a multi-step process. In order to adapt the terminology to the steps involved we find it instructive to distinguish between:

- the allocation of seats between Member States;
- the apportionment of seats among parties;
- the assignment of seats to candidates.

The allocation of the 751 seats between the twenty-eight Member States for the 2014 EP is settled in Council decision 2013/312/EU (Eur-lex 2013). The 2014 seat contingents are shown in Table 1.

The 2014 seat allocation results from intricate negotiations within the EP, and between the EP and the European Council. The EP would like to relinquish negotiated solutions that are characterized by political bartering. Parliament intends to adopt a seat allocation method that is *objective, fair, durable and transparent* (Eur-lex 2013). A proposal in this direction is an allocation method called *Cambridge Compromise*, see Grimmett et al. (2011). It transpired that the Cambridge Compromise deviates from the status quo to an extent which many MEPs find politically unacceptable. However, the Cambridge Compromise allows a restrained version. The “limited loss variant” Pukelsheim (2014: 173) guarantees that Member States give up at most two of their status quo seats. Whether Parliament succeeds in adopting an objective and fair allocation formula, of one sort or other, remains to be seen.

The seats that are allocated to a Member State are apportioned among the parties on the basis of the votes cast by the domestic electorate. Before reviewing the relevant seat apportionment methods, we describe the ballot structures and vote patterns that are specified in the Member States’ domestic provisions for the election of the EP.

## Ballot structure and vote pattern

Ballots used during European Parliament elections often resemble the ballots used in domestic elections. Consequently ballot structures differ visibly across the Union. Some are colored, include emblems of the competing parties and exhibit voting instructions. Others merely present the parties’ tabs and a box to be crossed. Ballots may include names and portraits of the parties’ nominees, and headlines printed in several languages. A comprehensive gallery of the ballots used in the 2014 elections is provided in the Internet at <http://www.uni-augsburg.de/bazi/EP2014Ballots.html>. Figures and provide examples of this selection. We propose to distinguish between:

- a single ballot sheet;
- several ballot papers, one for every party;
- a booklet of ballots.

A ballot sheet might include merely a box to write-in the serial number of the preferred candidates. Or it lists all parties that run for office. Sometimes even the parties’ nominees are presented, sometimes not. Ballot papers are loose slips of paper, one for every party. In case ballot papers are bound together we call it a booklet of ballots. Table 1 specifies the ballot structure for all Member States.

The classification of ballot structure is merely physical and only mildly correlates with the “vote pattern”, that is the number and kind of votes each voter is entitled to. Of course, vote patterns vary across the Union. As a matter of fact, the electoral principle ‘One person, ONE vote’ does not hold



Figure 1: European elections 2014, ballot structure and vote pattern. Austrian voters mark their preferred party and write down the name or rank number of one candidate on a single ballot sheet (left). Estonian voters fill in the number of their preferred candidate on a single ballot sheet. This vote is evaluated for both the party and the candidate (middle). In Latvia each party has its own ballot paper. The voter chooses one ballot paper and may give preferential votes and penalizing votes to any of the list’s candidates (right).



Figure 2: European elections 2014, ballot structure and vote pattern. Lithuania hands out a single ballot sheet. Each voter has one list vote. Up to five preference votes can be given by inserting the serial numbers of the preferred candidates into the boxes in the bottom line (left). In Romania voters stamp into the booklet of ballots next to a party’s symbol. No preference vote is granted (middle). A Czech voter receives several ballot papers and an envelope. She chooses one ballot and may indicate two preferred candidates (right).

verbatim for European elections. In most Member States voters may cast several votes. We distinguish between votes that are cast for political parties, “list votes”, and votes cast for the parties’ individual nominees, “preference votes”. List votes determine the number of seats for each party. Preference votes influence how party seats are eventually filled by persons.

To be precise the colloquial phrase ‘voting for a party’ usually means that the voter casts a vote for a party list, rather than for a party. A party list is a list of candidates. Gallagher and Mitchell (2008: 43) classify three different types of party lists:

- closed party lists;
- flexible party lists;
- open party list.

In a “closed list” system voters have a single list vote. For instance, in Romania voters stamp next to a party’s symbol (see Figure ). The seats of a party are filled in the order of the candidates’ ranking. Hence if a party is apportioned six seats, these are assigned to the first six nominees. Table 1 uses the acronym “LV0” indicating that voters have one list vote and zero preference votes.

“Flexible lists” offer voters the choice of supporting the party’s list ranking or indicating preferred candidates from this list. For instance, this is the case in Austria, Latvia, and the Czech Republic (compare Figures and ). However, preference votes do not exclusively determine who is elected. Additional provisions are needed to combine list votes, preference votes and the original ranking of candidates in order to assign the seats of a party to its candidates. In Table 1 we use the acronym “LV $x$ ” where  $x$  is a placeholder for the number of preference votes.

In “open list” systems the candidates of the competing party lists are not ranked—only listed. In Cyprus, Greece and Finland the candidates are listed in alphabetical order. Elsewhere the parties decide. No matter how candidates are listed, voters alone decide which candidates shall fill the seats won by a party. To this end voters cast one or more preference votes for candidates of the same party. Only in Luxembourg candidate votes may be given to nominees from different lists. Party seats are assigned to the candidates with the most votes. If a party is apportioned six seats, these are assigned to the six nominees who did best in terms of their preference votes. We use “ $y$ CV” indicating that  $y$  candidate votes are at hand.

From the voters’ perspective the difference between preference votes under a flexible list system and candidates votes in an open list system is all but obvious. Ballot papers generally do not point out to which extend preference votes actually determine the election result.

Besides list votes and preference votes some Member States allow to vote for independent candidates and coalitions. In our terminology an “independent candidate” is not affiliated to any party and thus does not come with a party list. A “coalition” is a union of two or more parties that present a single, joint list of candidates. In the Netherlands and Denmark some parties form so-called “list alliances” that come with a separate party list for each allied party.

Ireland and Malta, and the constituency of Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom use single transferable vote schemes. The vote pattern is as follows. Each voter is asked to give a preference ranking to as many candidates on the ballot as she wishes. Thereby she may choose candidates from different political parties. STV schemes put more emphasis on the personalization aspect of an election and thereby deferring the role of political parties. In a nutshell, the electorate votes candidates into seats in such a way that, from an overall viewpoint, the number of candidates who belong to a party turns out to be roughly proportional to the sum of votes for this party’s candidates.

## Seat apportionment among parties

As soon as all votes have been cast, the electoral cycle continues with the counting of votes and the seat apportionment among the competing parties. Following Oelbermann, Palomares and Pukelsheim (2010) we classify apportionment procedures by means of the regulations of Articles 1 to 3 of the European Electoral Act 2002.

(Article 1) [MEPs] shall be elected on the basis of proportional representation, using the list system or the single transferable vote.

(Article 2) [...] each Member States may establish constituencies for elections to the European Parliament or subdivide its electoral area in a different manner [...]

(Article 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.

Article 1 prescribes that seats are apportioned in proportion to votes cast for parties, coalitions and independent candidates. Oelbermann, Palomares and Pukelsheim (2010) explain the apportionment procedures used in 2009 European Parliament elections. We use their terminology for the 28 apportionment calculation that are carried out in the upcoming sections, see Table 2.

Article 2 allows Member States to allot their available seats to several districts prior to the election. After the election, the seat apportionment calculations are carried out separately for each district. There are three districts for separate evaluation in Belgium, eight in France, four in Ireland and twelve in the United Kingdom. Article 2 also allows Member States to have one or more sub-apportionment calculations, as in Germany, Italy, and Poland. Its characteristic is that the number of representatives elected per district is determined in two steps. First, all seats are apportioned among the parties according to their nationwide vote totals. Second, each party apportions its seats among the districts on the basis of votes cast locally. The first column of Table 1 indicates separate apportionments with a star (\*) and sub-apportionments with a slash (/).

Electoral thresholds, as permitted by Article 3, allow votes cast for parties or independent candidates with too small a support to be discarded. Electoral thresholds vary from 5 percent relative to votes cast to 1.8% relative to valid votes; from implicit thresholds calculated by the quotient of valid votes divided by the number seats to hybrid thresholds that treat parties and independent candidates differently. 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. Table 1 exhibits thresholds in column six.

Table 2: European elections 2014, seat apportionment among parties

<b>Divisor methods</b> (highest average formulas)	
DivDwn	Divisor method with downward rounding (Jefferson, D’Hondt, Hagenbach-Bischoff)
DivStd	Divisor method with standard rounding (Webster, Sainte-Laguë)
Div0.7	Divisor method with modified standard rounding (Scandinavian method)
<b>Quota methods</b> (greatest remainders formulas)	
HaQgrR	Hare quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders
HQ1grR	Hare quota variant 1 with residual fit by greatest remainders
HQ2grR	Hare quota variant 2 with residual fit by greatest remainders
HQ3grR	Hare quota variant 3 with residual fit by greatest remainders
HQ3-EL	Hare quota variant 3 with Greek residual fit
DQ3grR	Droop quota variant 3 with residual fit by greatest remainders
<b>Single transferable vote (STV) schemes</b>	
STVfra	Droop quota, and fractional transfer apportionment
STVran	Droop quota, and random transfer apportionment

A total of eleven different apportionment methods were used which may be categorized as divisor methods, quota methods, and STV schemes. The most popular procedure is the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn).

It is applied in AT, BE, CZ, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, LU, NL, PL, PT, RO, SI, and UK.

## Seat assignment to candidates

Proportional representation systems traditionally emphasize the role of political parties, in that the number of seats apportioned to a party ought to be proportional to the number of votes cast for this party. However, seats are eventually filled by persons affiliated to the parties. There are various ways to inject a personalization component into the systems, in particular by giving voters the opportunity to express preference votes for one (or more) particular candidates. For the purpose of this paper we do not seek for a general classification, but restrict our attention to the specific list types actually used in the European Elections 2014.

In flexible list systems most Member States demand that the number of preference votes reaches a certain quorum or threshold. Thus a fairly high proportion of voters must declare preferences different from the party's ranking in order to override it. We identify two types of bypass rules by means of which a candidate may bypass the prespecified list ordering and jump to the top of the list. The first type are "x percent bypass rules", the percentage always referring to the total number of preference votes for all candidates of the party in question. The second type are "quorum bypass rules" where the precise meaning of "quorum" varies from case to case. It turns out that in most of the nine Member States that apply a bypass rule the preference votes do not have any or only an extremely small influence. Only 19 of possibly 155 MEPs were elected due to their preference votes and would not have been elected without preference votes.

## The 2014 European Elections, by Member States

For each of the 28 Member States we present a table exhibiting the seat apportionment among parties, and the seat assignment to candidates. Each table has a label and consists of five or six columns, as follows:

**Label:** The table's label is the first entry in the first line. For example, EP2014AT-LV1 means that the table shows the data of the European Parliament elections 2014 (EP2014) for Austria (AT). The last three characters LV1 indicate the vote pattern as explained earlier.

**Column 1:** The first column contains the tabs of the domestic parties that participate in the apportionment process. The tabs are taken from the Internet site <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/elections2014-results/en/seats-member-state-absolut.html> where they are expanded to the full names of the parties.

**Column 2:** The column "Political Group" names the Political Group which the party joined upon inauguration of the 2014 European Parliament. One party (in Spain) and two coalitions (in Croatia) split their delegates between two Political Groups.

**Column 3:** The column "Votes" includes the effective votes of the parties that enter into the apportionment process. Ineffective votes, that is, votes that are valid but do not qualify to participate in the apportionment calculations, are omitted (if applicable).

**Column 4:** The column "Quotients" contains the quotients that are instrumental to determine the parties' seat numbers. For divisor methods, the bottom line shows the "(Divisor)" used. For quota methods with residual fit by greatest remainders, the bottom line shows the "(Split)" above which remainders are rounded upwards, and below which remainders are rounded downwards.

**Column 5:** The fifth column lists the parties' seat numbers. The column's label identifies the apportionment method by which these seat numbers are obtained.

**Column 6:** The column "MEPs' list positions" tells the positions of those elected in the list of candidates presented to the electorate. The column is absent when the electoral system relies on closed lists. When preference votes are allowed, specific rules determine in which way these votes alter the rank-ordering of the initial lists.

The tables for the STV schemes (IE, MT, UK) are set up in a similar fashion. Our STV tables show first preferences only, which are insufficient to reproduce the final result.

### AT – Republic of Austria

Austria has 18 seats to fill. On the ballot sheet a voter may mark a party (a list vote), or a party's candidate (a preference vote), or both. When marking both, a party and a candidate, the candidate marked must belong to the party marked; otherwise the ballot is invalid. In order to cast a preference vote the voter must write on the ballot paper into a designated box either the candidate's last name, or the candidate's rank number in the party list.

The total number of valid ballot sheets is 2,823,561, including 452,894 preference votes. There is an electoral threshold of four percent of the valid votes. That is, a party participates in the apportionment process only when getting at least 112,943 votes (since four percent of 2,823,561 equals 112,942.4). Four



parties fail the threshold, the 184,780 votes cast for them become ineffective. The remaining 2,638,781 effective votes form the basis for the seat apportionment. The apportionment uses the divisor method with downward rounding.

The seats apportioned to parties are assigned to party lists' nominees, except that a candidate may bypass the list ordering by satisfying a five percent bypass rule. The rule demands that the candidate's preference votes amount to at least five percent of the total preference votes of all candidates of the same party. When the rule is satisfied the candidate is advanced to the top of the party list. When several candidates of a party satisfy the criterion all of them precede the party list, in decreasing order of their preference votes. However, in 2014 no candidate satisfies the five percent bypass rule. All parties assign seats to candidates in the ordering given by their party lists.

EP2014AT-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
ÖVP	EPP	761,896	5.9	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
SPÖ	S&D	680,180	5.2	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
FPÖ	NI	556,835	4.3	4	1, 2, 3, 4
GRÜNE	Greens/EFA	410,089	3.2	3	1, 2, 3
NEOS	ALDE	229,781	1.8	1	1
Sum (Divisor)		2,638,781	(130,000)	18	

## BE – Kingdom of Belgium

Belgium has a contingent of 21 seats. Domestic provisions allocate the seats to three districts that are evaluated separately. The Dutch Electoral College is given twelve seats, the French Electoral College eight, and the German Language Community one. On the ballot sheets voters may mark a party (a list vote), or one candidate or more from the same party list (preference votes), or both. When no party is marked the ballot is attributed to the party to which the preference candidates belong. When no candidate is marked the ballot is considered to express some support for the party list as is.

There is no electoral threshold, whence all valid ballots become effective in the apportionment process. The Dutch Electoral College features 4,212,069 valid ballots, the French Electoral College 2,440,046, and the German Language Community 38,596. Within each district, the divisor method with downward rounding is used.

The assignment of seats to candidates starts out with an eligibility criterion. Candidates who satisfy the criterion get a seat, in the table they are marked with an asterisk (\*). Thereafter the procedure amalgamates preference votes and list votes. We illustrate the seat assignment procedure by example, by assigning the three seats of the OPEN VLD (Open Vlaamse Liberalen en Democraten) party in the Dutch Electoral College to list positions 1, 2, and 12.

First the party's eligibility figure is determined. It is OPEN VLD's Droop-quota, that is, the quotient of OPEN VLD's vote total divided by its seat number plus one, rounded upwards. Since  $859,099 / (3 + 1)$  equals 214,774.8, the eligibility figure is 214,775 votes. Candidates get a seat if they receive 214,775 or more preference votes. This rule grants the first seat to Guy Verhofstadt, on list position 1, in view of his 531,030 preference votes. No other candidate has sufficiently many preference votes to reach the eligibility figure.

At this stage the provisions inject a supportive action to bolster the upper echelons. Half of a party's pure list votes are redirected to help candidates ranked high on the list, by lifting them towards the eligibility figure and by shielding them from being overtaken too easily by candidates ranked low. The OPEN VLD has 261,855 pure list votes, whence it commands  $261,855 / 2 = 130,927.5 \rightarrow 130,928$  support votes. Annemie Neyts, on list position 2, has 79,494 preference votes. If there were 430,928 support votes, then 135,281 of them would lift Neyts to the eligibility figure ( $79,494 + 135,281 = 214,775$ ) and secure her a seat. The remaining  $430,928 - 135,281 = 295,647$  support votes would benefit subsequent list positions 3, 4, etc. Alas, there are only 130,928 support votes. They raise Neyts' index of preference-plus-support votes to  $79,494 + 130,928 = 210,422$  votes, but fail the eligibility figure.

Now the process enters the final stage of assigning the remaining two seats without regard to the eligibility figure. List positions 2–12 are rearranged in decreasing order of the preference-plus-support votes for Neyts and of the preference votes for the others. The rearrangement is found to be 2, 12, 3, 4, 7, 9, 5, 10, 11, 6, 8. In the rearrangement Neyts stays top. Next is Karel De Gucht from the last list position 12. His 88,779 preference votes shift him passed list positions 3–11. Thus the two remaining seats are filled first with Neyts, and finally with De Gucht.

In summary, the three seats of OPEN VLD are assigned to the candidates on list positions 1, 2, and 12. For the MEPs of the parties other than OPEN VLD the initial list ordering turns out to prevail.

EP2014BE-LVm	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
<i>District 1: Dutch Electoral College</i>					
N-VA	ECR	1,123,355	4.005	4	1*, 2*, 3*, 4
OPEN VLD	ALDE	859,099	3.1	3	1*, 2, 12
CD&V	EPP	840,783	2.997	2	1*, 2*
SP.A	S&D	555,348	1.98	1	1*
GROEN	Greens/EFA	447,391	1.6	1	1*
VLAAMS BELANG	NI	284,856	1.02	1	1*
1 Other	—	101,237	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		4,212,069	(280,500)	12	
<i>District 2: French Electoral College</i>					
PS	S&D	714,645	3.6	3	1*, 2*, 3
MR	ALDE	661,332	3.3	3	1*, 2*, 3*
ECOLO	Greens/EFA	285,196	1.4	1	1*
CDH	EPP	277,246	1.4	1	1*
8 Others	—	501,627	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		2,440,046	(200,000)	8	
<i>District 3: German Language Community</i>					
CSP	EPP	11,710	1.2	1	1*
ECOLO	Greens/EFA	6,429	0.6	0	
4 Others	—	20,457	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		38,596	(10,000)	1	

## BG – Republic of Bulgaria

Bulgaria's contingent is 17 seats. On the ballot sheet a voter marks either a party (a list vote) or an independent candidate. A voter may adjoin a preference vote by ticking a box with a numeral 1, 2, ..., 17, thereby endorsing the nominee who has this rank number on the corresponding party list.

The total number of valid ballot sheets is 2,239,430, of which 487,144 include a preference vote. There is an electoral threshold, applied to parties as well as to independent candidates. It is given by the quotient of valid votes and seats, and equals 131,732 votes (since  $2,239,430 / 17 = 131,731.2$ ). The threshold exceeds five percent of the votes cast (since  $131,732 / 2,361,966 = 5.6$  percent) and thus violates the five percent lid stipulated in Art. 3 of the European Electoral Act 2002. Twenty-five parties miss the threshold, their 364,669 votes become ineffective. The effective votes remaining, 1,874,761, are cast for five parties; they participate in the apportionment process. The seat apportionment is carried out using the Hare-quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders. The Hare-quota is the quotient of effective votes and seats,  $1,874,761 / 17 = 110,280.1$ .

The assignment of seats to candidates employs a fifteen percent bypass rule. That is, seats are assigned to party lists' nominees mostly in the order exhibited in the list. However, a candidate bypasses the list when the number of his or her preference votes meets or exceeds fifteen percent of the total

preference votes for all candidates of the same party. When the rule applies the candidate is advanced to the top of the party list.

The fifteen percent bypass rule affects seven elected candidates, one each of the lists of GERB, DPS, and RB, and two each of the lists of BSP, and Coal. BWC et al. In the table they are marked with an asterisk (\*). Four candidates (of GERB, DPS, Coal. BWC et al.) do not change the positions they occupy in the party list orderings. In these cases the seat assignment remains the same whether considered with preference votes, or without. In the DPS case, the candidate on list position 2 rejected the seat offered and was substituted promptly by list position 5.

For the BSP, Momchil Stefanov moves from the penultimate list position 15 to the top of the final ranking. His 34,124 preference votes constitute 28 percent of the total of 120,409 BSP preference votes. Sergej Stanischew, initially on list position 1, is relegated to the final position 2, with 28,039 preference votes (23 percent). Therefore the four BSP seats are assigned to list positions 15\*, 1\*, 2, 3.

For the RB list, Svetoslav Hristov Malinov, on list position 2, gets the most preference votes, 39,173, of a total of 83,151 RB preference votes (47 percent). He jumps to the top of the list, and conquers the one RB seat. Meglena Kuneva Shtilianova, on list position 1, also scores grandiose 21,306 preference votes (26 percent). Yet she gets no seat, since no second RB seat is available.

EP2014BG-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR	MEPs' list positions
GERB	EEP	680,838	6.174	6	1*, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
BSP	S&D	424,037	3.845	4	15*, 1*, 2, 3
DPS	ALDE	386,725	3.507	4	1*, 3, 4, 5
Coal. BWC et al.	ECR	238,629	2.164	2	1*, 2*
RB	EEP	144,532	1.311	1	2*
Sum (Split)		1,874,761	(0.5)	17	

## CY – Republic of Cyprus

Cyprus has six seats to fill. The design of the ballot sheets encourages the casting of preference votes. Every party occupies a column. The column's main body is composed of the list of candidates, in alphabetical order. The box to mark the party comes last, as the column's footline. Voters may cast one or two preference votes by marking the appropriate candidates. If voters mark more than two candidates then their preference votes are ignored.

The total number of valid ballot sheets is 258,914. There is an electoral threshold of 1.8 percent of the valid votes, that is, of 4,661 votes. Eleven parties fail the threshold, whence their 8,979 votes become ineffective. The effective votes remaining, 249,935, are cast for seven parties. The seat apportionment uses the Hare-quota variant-3 method with residual fit by greatest remainders. The Hare-quota variant-3 is the integral part of the quotient of valid votes and total seats, 43,152 (since  $258,914 / 6 = 43,152.3$ ).

For the assignment of party seats to candidates, the candidates of a party are arranged according to their preference votes. MEP's list positions refer to the within-party alphabetical order.

EP2014CY-2CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	HQ3grR	MEPs' list positions
DISY	EPP	97,732	2.346	2	2, 3
AKEL	GUE/NGL	69,852	1.677	2	6, 5
DIKO	S&D	28,044	0.673	1	4
KS EDEK	S&D	19,894	0.478	1	2
3 Others	—	34,413	—	0	
Sum (Split)		249,935	(0.45)	6	

## CZ – Czech Republic

The Czech contingent comprises 21 seats. Every political party, movement and coalition has a separate ballot sheet. Voters receive a full collection of ballot sheets, of which one ballot sheet is to be put into the official envelope. On the ballot sheet of the party of their choice, voters may cast up to two preference votes for candidates.

There are 1,515,492 valid ballots. The Czech Republic imposes an electoral threshold of five percent of the valid votes, that is, 75,775 votes. This cuts out thirty-one parties, whence their 301,245 votes turn ineffective. The effective votes remaining, 1,214,247, are cast for seven parties. They enter the apportionment calculations. The seat apportionment method used is the divisor method with downward rounding.

The assignment of seats to candidates invokes a five percent bypass rule. That is, party lists are bypassed by candidates whose preference votes meet or exceed five percent of their party's total preference votes. These candidates jump to the top of their party lists, in the table they are marked with an asterisk (\*). The rule makes a difference on who is elected for two parties only, Coalition TOP 09+STAN and KSČM.

EP2014CZ-LV2	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
ANO 2011	ALDE	244,501	4.9	4	1*, 2, 3, 4
Coal. TOP 09+STAN	EPP	241,747	4.8	4	2*, 1*, 5*, 3
ČSSD	S&D	214,800	4.3	4	1*, 2*, 3, 4
KSČM	GUE/NGL	166,478	3.3	3	1*, 4*, 2*
KDU-ČSL	EPP	150,792	3.02	3	2*, 1*, 3
ODS	ECR	116,389	2.3	2	1*, 2*
SVOBODNI	EFDD	79,540	1.6	1	1*
Sum (Divisor)		1,214,247	(50,000)	21	

## DE – Federal Republic of Germany

Germany is allocated 96 seats. The country is subdivided into sixteen electoral district, each district coinciding with a State of the Federal Republic. Two parties make use of the subdivision, whence ballots differ from State to State. The CSU submits a list of candidates only in the State of Bavaria. The CDU submits distinct lists in each of the other fifteen States. Every other party registers a single list of candidates valid for the whole Federal Republic. The first ten nominees or less of every list are printed on the ballot sheet. On the ballot sheets, voters mark a party list.

The total number of valid votes is 29,355,092. There is no electoral threshold. The seat apportionment utilizes the divisor method with standard rounding. Germany uses a closed list system; seats are assigned to candidates in the rigid sequence given by party lists.

For the assignment of the 29 CDU seats to the CDU's fifteen State lists, an additional sub-apportionment step is required. It is carried out on the basis of the CDU votes in the respective State. This determines the number of seats assigned to each State list of the CDU.

EP2014DE-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivStd
CDU	EPP	8,812,653	29.48	29
SPD	S&D	8,003,628	26.8	27
GRÜNE	Greens/EFA	3,139,274	10.503	11
DIE LINKE	GUE/NGL	2,168,455	7.3	7
AFD	ECR	2,070,014	6.9	7
CSU	EPP	1,567,448	5.2	5
FDP	ALDE	986,841	3.3	3
FREIE WÄHLER	ALDE	428,800	1.4	1
PIRATEN	Greens/EFA	425,044	1.4	1
TIERSCHUTZPARTEI	GUE/NGL	366,598	1.2	1
NPD	NI	301,139	1.0	1
FAMILIE	ECR	202,803	0.7	1
ÖDP	Greens/EFA	185,244	0.6	1
DIE PARTEI	NI	184,709	0.6	1
11 Others	—	512,442	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		29,355,092	(298,900)	96

EP2014DE-1sub	Votes	Quotient	DivStd
<i>CDU sub-apportionment</i>			
Schleswig-Holstein	334,121	1.1	1
Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	210,268	0.7	1
Hamburg	135,780	0.45	0
Niedersachsen	1,174,739	3.9	4
Bremen	43,353	0.1	0
Brandenburg	233,468	0.8	1
Sachsen-Anhalt	245,010	0.8	1
Berlin	232,274	0.8	1
Nordrhein-Westfalen	2,439,979	8.1	8
Sachsen	559,899	1.9	2
Hessen	564,294	1.9	2
Thüringen	290,703	1.0	1
Rheinland-Pfalz	661,339	2.2	2
Baden-Württemberg	1,542,244	5.1	5
Saarland	145,182	0.48	0
Sum (Divisor)	8,812,653	(300,000)	29

## DK – Kingdom of Denmark

Denmark commands 13 seats. On the ballot sheet, voters mark a party or a candidate of a party.

The total number of valid ballots is 2,276,694, of which 1,716,651 include a candidate vote. There is no electoral threshold. For the seat apportionment among parties, the divisor method with downward rounding is used.

There are two list alliances, Alliance I = A.(S)+F.(SF)+B.(RV), and Alliance II = V.(V)+C.(KF). Either alliance triggers a sub-apportionment to allot the common seats to the partners. Without alliances all seat numbers would have been just the same. Remarkably, both alliances have their partners joining different Political Groups.

The seat assignment to candidates is carried out on the basis of preference votes, with no regard to the sequence in which candidates appear on the ballot sheet.

EP2014DK-1CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
Alliance I		833,499	5.6	5	
O.(DF)	ECR	605,889	4.04	4	1, 3, 2, 6
Alliance II		588,102	3.9	3	
N.	GUE/NGL	183,724	1.2	1	1
1 Other	—	65,480	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		2,276,694	(150,000)	13	

EP2014DK-2subs	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
<i>Alliance I = A.(S)+F.(SF)+B.(RV) sub-apportionment</i>					
A.(S)	S&D	435,245	3.3	3	1, 3, 2
F.(SF)	Greens/EFA	249,305	1.9	1	1
B.(RV)	ALDE	148,949	1.1	1	1
Sum (Divisor)		833,499	(130,000)	5	
<i>Alliance II = V.(V)+C.(KF) sub-apportionment</i>					
V.(V)	ALDE	379,840	2.4	2	1, 13
C.(KF)	EPP	208,262	1.3	1	1
Sum (Divisor)		588,102	(160,000)	3	

## EE – Republic of Estonia

Estonia has six seats to fill. Voters cast a vote for one of 88 candidates, by writing the serial number of their preferred candidate on the ballot sheet or inserting it into an electronic voting form. Candidates are affiliated with one of eight parties, sixteen candidates stand as independents.

The total number of valid votes is 328,493. There is no electoral threshold. The preference votes for candidates who are affiliated with a party are aggregated to yield this party's vote count. The seat apportionment among parties and indeps is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding; independent candidates are apportioned at most one seat.

The assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates is determined solely by the number of votes cast for each candidate.

EP2014EE-1CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
ER	ALDE	79,849	2.1	2	1, 2
KE	ALDE	73,419	1.9	1	12
IRL	EPP	45,765	1.2	1	1
SDE	S&D	44,550	1.2	1	1
Indep I. Tarand	Greens/EFA	43,369	1.1	1	
19 Others	—	41,541	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		328,493	(38,000)	6	

## EL – Hellenic Republic

Greece is allocated 21 seats. Every party or coalition has its own ballot sheet. On the ballot sheet of the party of their choice, voters may cast up to four votes for specific candidates.

The total number of valid ballots is 5,715,985. The electoral threshold amounts to three percent of the valid ballots, 171,480. The threshold cuts off thirty-six parties, and renders their 978,433 votes ineffective. Yet the Greek seat apportionment procedure involves the ineffective votes in a rather unique fashion. We term the apportionment method HQ3-EL, the Hare-quota variant-3 method with Greek residual fit. The method proceeds in two phases, phase-1 and phase-2.

Phase-1 uses as electoral key the Hare-quota variant-3, 272,189, the quotient of valid votes and total seats, rounded downwards. The vote count of a party is divided by the electoral key. The integral part of the quotient is the number of seats apportioned to that party in phase-1. Altogether phase-1 distributes 13 seats.

Phase-2 apportions the remaining eight seats with a view towards a party's "unused voting power" (UVP). For example, the five phase-1 seats of SYRIZA use up  $5 \times 272,189 = 1,360,945$  votes of the 1,518,376 SYRIZA votes. This leaves an UVP of  $1,518,376 - 1,360,945 = 157,431$  SYRIZA votes. The UVPs of the other six parties are found similarly. The UVPs of the thirty-six parties that fail the threshold are the ineffective votes, 978,433. Phase-2 uses as electoral key the Droop-quota variant-5, 155,537, the quotient of total UVP (2,177,528) and remaining seats plus one (9), rounded downwards. The UVP of a party is divided by the new electoral key. The integral part of the quotient is added to the party's seat number from phase-1. This explains five of the remaining eight seats, still leaving three. The last three seats are apportioned to the parties with the largest UVP, first among the parties that so far are unsuccessful in phase-2, then among the other parties. Hence the first seat goes to TO POTAMI (remainder 0.678), the second to KKE (0.496), and the last to X.A (0.702).

The assignment of party seats to candidates follows the order of the candidates' preference votes. We are unable to report MEPs' list positions since we cannot locate proper documentation which positions candidates occupy in the publicized listings.

EP2014EL-4CV	Political Group	Votes	Quot.-1	Phase-1	UVP	Quot.-2	HQ3-EL
SY.RI.ZA.	GUE/NGL	1,518,376	5.578	5	157,431	1.012	6
N.D.	EPP	1,298,948	4.772	4	210,192	1.351	5
X.A.	NI	536,913	1.973	1	264,724	1.702 + 1	3
ELIA DA	S&D	458,514	1.685	1	186,325	1.198	2
TO POTAMI	S&D	377,622	1.387	1	105,433	0.678 + 1	2
KKE	NI	349,342	1.283	1	77,153	0.496 + 1	2
ANEL	ECR	197,837	0.727	0	197,837	1.272	1
Ineffective votes		978,433	—	—	978,433	—	—
Sum (Quotas: HQ3, DQ5)		5,715,985	(272,189)	13	2,177,528	(155,537)	21

## ES – Kingdom of Spain

Spain has 54 seats to fill. For every party or coalition a separate ballot paper is presented to the electorate. Voters take the ballot sheet of their choice, put the sheet into an apposite envelope, and cast the envelope into the ballot box.

The total number of valid votes is 15,348,649. There is no electoral threshold. The seat apportionment is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding. Twenty-nine parties, with a total of 1,176,782 votes, are too weak to obtain a seat. Spain uses a closed list system; seats are assigned to candidates in the sequence as printed on the ballot sheets.

EP2014ES-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
PP	EPP	4,098,339	16.5	16
PSOE/PSC	S&D	3,614,232	14.6	14
IP	GUE/NGL:5, Greens/EFA:1	1,575,308	6.4	6
PODEMOS	GUE/NGL	1,253,837	5.1	5
UPYD	ALDE	1,022,232	4.1	4
CEU	ALDE:2, EPP:1	851,971	3.4	3
EPDD	Greens/EFA	630,072	2.5	2
C'S	ALDE	497,146	2.005	2
LPD	GUE/NGL	326,464	1.3	1
PRIMAVERA EUROPEA	Greens/EFA	302,266	1.2	1
29 Others	—	1,176,782	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		15,348,649	(248,000)	54

### FI – Republic of Finland

Finland's due is 13 seats. Voters cast a vote for one of 252 candidates, by writing the serial number of their candidate on the ballot sheet. The ballot sheet design is frugal, just offering a circle to write-in the serial number of a candidate.

The total number of valid ballots is 1,728,294. The votes for candidates who are affiliated with the same party are aggregated to yield the party's vote count. There is no electoral threshold. The seat apportionment among parties is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding.

The assignment of seats to candidates is solely based on the candidates' preference votes. MEPs' list positions refer to the within-party alphabetical ordering.

EP2014FI-1CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
KOK	EPP	390,376	3.9	3	17, 9, 19
KESK	ALDE	339,895	3.4	3	16, 19, 4
PS	ECR	222,457	2.2	2	3, 17
SDP	S&D	212,781	2.1	2	2, 8
VIHR	Greens/EFA	161,263	1.6	1	8
VAS	GUE/NGL	161,074	1.6	1	6
SFP (RKP)	ALDE	116,747	1.2	1	19
8 Others	—	123,701	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		1,728,294	(100,000)	13	

### FR – French Republic

France has 74 seats to fill. Domestic provisions allocate the seats to eight districts for separate evaluation. The district Nord-Ouest gets ten seats, Ouest nine, Est nine, Sud-Ouest ten, Sud-Est thirteen, Massif-Central/Centre five, Ile-de-France fifteen, and Outre-Mer three. Every party or coalition presents their party list on a distinct ballot sheet. Voters cast a single list vote.

Within each district there is an electoral threshold of five percent of the district's valid votes. For the seat apportionment the divisor method with downward rounding is applied. Across the whole country valid votes add up to 18,955,761, and ineffective votes to 2,815,387.

The seat assignment to candidates strictly follows the districts' party lists. Upon having been assigned a seat from the FN list in the Quest district, Joelle Bergeron left the FN and joined the EFDD political group as an independent.



Special seat assignment provisions apply to the last district, Outre-Mer. In order to secure a fair geographical representation the district is subdivided into three sections, Atlantique, Océan Indien, and Pacifique. Each section is to be represented in the European Parliament. Party lists must include at least one nominee from every section. The seats of the strongest party are assigned to its candidates from the section where the party performs best. The seat of the second strongest party is assigned to a candidate from the remaining sections where the second strongest party scored best. In case the third strongest party gets a seat, it is assigned to a candidate from the last section.

EP2014FR-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
<i>District 1: Nord-Ouest</i>				
FN	NI	914,222	5.1	5
UMP	EPP	509,939	2.8	2
PS+PRG	S&D	320,250	1.8	1
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	255,108	1.4	1
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	194,595	1.1	1
FG	GUE/NGL	173,531	0.96	0
Sum (Divisor)		2,367,645	(180,000)	10
<i>District 2: Ouest</i>				
UMP	EPP	535,059	3.02	3
FN	NI:1, EFDD:1	526,019	2.97	2
PS+PRG	S&D	425,722	2.4	2
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	334,963	1.9	1
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	282,167	1.6	1
FG	GUE/NGL	141,341	0.8	0
Sum (Divisor)		2,245,271	(177,000)	9
<i>District 3: Est</i>				
FN	NI	703,809	4.1	4
UMP	EPP	551,809	3.2	3
PS+PRG	S&D	321,563	1.9	1
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	223,280	1.3	1
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	155,694	0.9	0
FG	GUE/NGL	127,269	0.7	0
Sum (Divisor)		2,083,424	(170,000)	9
<i>District 4: Sud-Ouest</i>				
FN	NI	726,797	3.6	3
UMP	EPP	544,551	2.7	2
PS+PRG	S&D	462,737	2.3	2
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	337,554	1.7	1
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	253,069	1.3	1
FG	GUE/NGL	252,197	1.3	1
Sum (Divisor)		2,576,905	(200,000)	10

EP2014FR-LV0 ( <i>cont.</i> )	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
<i>District 5: Sud-Est</i>				
FN	NI	935,182	5.03	5
UMP	EPP	743,343	3.996	3
PS+PRG	S&D	394,114	2.1	2
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	309,168	1.7	1
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	280,091	1.5	1
FG	GUE/NGL	197,754	1.1	1
Sum (Divisor)		2,859,652	(186,000)	13
<i>District 6: Massif-Central/Centre</i>				
FN	NI	356,098	2.4	2
UMP	EPP	314,959	2.1	2
PS+PRG	S&D	233,079	1.6	1
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	146,482	0.98	0
FG	GUE/NGL	110,087	0.7	0
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	101,331	0.7	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,262,036	(150,000)	5
<i>District 7: Ile-de-France</i>				
UMP	EPP	667,991	4.8	4
FN	NI	521,093	3.7	3
PS+PRG	S&D	437,678	3.1	3
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	367,513	2.6	2
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	296,766	2.1	2
FG	GUE/NGL	198,534	1.4	1
Sum (Divisor)		2,489,575	(140,000)	15
<i>District 8: Outre-Mer</i>				
UMP	EPP	76,168	1.5	1
PS+PRG	S&D	55,214	1.1	1
UOM	GUE/NGL	52,017	1.04	1
FN	NI	29,241	0.6	0
ALTERNATIVE	ALDE	24,059	0.5	0
EUROPE ÉCOLOGIE	Greens/EFA	19,167	0.4	0
Sum (Divisor)		255,866	(50,000)	3

## HR – Republic of Croatia

Croatia has 11 seats to fill. On the ballot sheet, voters mark a party (a list vote) and, optionally, a candidate (a preference vote). Pure preference votes are attributed to the candidates' parties.

A total of 950,980 ballots are cast. There is an electoral threshold of five percent of the ballots cast, 47,549, turning 113,913 votes for twenty-one parties ineffective. In view of 921,904 valid votes, 807,991 votes are left for the seat apportionment process. The divisor method with downward rounding is used.

The seat assignment to candidates involves the preference votes by means of a ten percent bypass rule. That is, candidates whose preference votes meet or exceed ten percent of their party's total preference votes jump to the top of the party list, in decreasing order of their preference votes. In the table, they are marked by an asterisk (\*).

EP2014HR-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
HDZ+HSP AS	EPP:5, ECR:1	381,844	6.01	6	6*, 1*, 5*, 2, 3, 4
Coal. SDP et al.	S&D:2, ALDE:2	275,904	4.3	4	5*, 1, 2, 3
ORAH	Greens/EFA	86,806	1.4	1	1
1 Other	—	63,437	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		807,991	(63,500)	11	

## HU – Hungary

Hungary gets 21 seats. On the ballot sheet, voters mark a party list showing the first five nominees.

The number of valid votes is 2,319,493. There is an electoral threshold of five percent of the valid votes, rounded downwards, 115,974. Two parties fail the threshold, turning their 21,398 votes ineffective. This leaves 2,298,095 votes that become effective for the seat apportionment. The divisor method with downward rounding is used.

The assignment of seats to candidates adheres to party lists. In other words all party lists in the Hungarian electoral system are closed lists.

EP2014HU-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
FIDESZ+KDNP	EPP	1,193,991	12.4	12
JOBBIK	NI	340,287	3.5	3
MSZP	S&D	252,751	2.6	2
DK	S&D	226,086	2.4	2
EGYÜTT+PM	Greens/EFA	168,076	1.8	1
LMP	Greens/EFA	116,904	1.2	1
Sum (Divisor)		2,298,095	(96,000)	21

## IE – Ireland

Ireland allocates its 11 seats between three districts. The Dublin district gets three seats, the Midlands-North-West district four and the South district also four. The Irish ballots are unique in that they feature a portrait photograph of each candidate. On the ballot sheet voters rank candidates by writing-in 1, 2, 3 and so on. There is no electoral threshold. The assignment of the seats to candidates is carried out using the single transferable vote scheme with random transfer of surplus votes (STVran).

EP2014IE-STV	Party	Political Group	1st Pref	STVran
<i>District 1: Dublin</i>				
Lynn Boylan	SF	GUE/NGL	83,264	1
Brian Hayes	FG	EPP	54,676	1
Mary Fitzpatrick	FF	ECR	44,283	0
Eamon Ryan	GP	Greens/EFA	44,078	0
Nessa Childers	Indep	S&D	35,939	1
Paul Murphy	SP	GUE/NGL	29,953	0
Emer Costello	LAB	S&D	25,961	0
5 further candidates	—	—	34,421	0
Sum (Droop-quota)		(88,144)	352,575	3

EP2014IE-STV ( <i>cont.</i> )	Party	Political Group	1st Pref	STVran
<i>District 2: Midlands-North-West</i>				
Luke 'Ming' Flanagan	Indep	GUE/NGL	124,063	1
Matt Carthy	SF	GUE/NGL	114,727	1
Mairead McGuinness	FG	EPP	92,080	1
Marian Harkin	Indep	ALDE	68,986	1
Pat Gallagher	FF	ECR	59,562	0
Thomas Byrne	FF	ECR	55,384	0
Jim Higgins	FG	EPP	39,908	0
Ronan Mullen	Indep	—	36,326	0
Lorraine Higgins	LAB	S&D	31,951	0
Mark Dearey	GP	Greens/EFA	9,520	0
4 further candidates	—	—	13,938	0
Sum (Droop-quota)		(129,290)	646,445	4
<i>District 3: South</i>				
Brian Crowley	FF	ECR	180,329	1
Liadh Ni Riada	SF	GUE/NGL	125,309	1
Seán Kelly	FG	EPP	83,520	1
Simon Harris	FG	EPP	51,483	0
Deirdre Clune	FG	EPP	47,453	1
Diarmuid P. O'Flynn	Indep	—	30,323	0
Phil Prendergast	LAB	S&D	30,317	0
Kieran Hartley	FF	ECR	29,987	0
Grace O'Sullivan	GP	Greens/EFA	27,860	0
6 further candidates	—	—	50,917	0
Sum (Droop-quota)		(131,500)	657,498	4

## IT – Republic of Italy

Italy is entitled to 73 seats. The Italian electoral law subdivides the country into five districts. In each district, parties present a district list of candidates. Ballot sheets in different districts have different colors. On the ballot sheet a voter marks a party vote (that is, district list vote) and may write-in up to three preference votes. In case of three preferences at least one must be for a male candidate and one for a female candidate, otherwise all three preference votes are discarded. Minority parties, that is, parties of minority groups that are officially recognized, can register an electoral alliance with a party that campaigns in all five districts. In 2014, the Südtiroler Volkspartei (SVP) is allied with the Partito democratico (PD).

The total count of valid ballots is 27,448,906. There is an electoral threshold of four percent of the valid votes, 1,097,957. Five parties fail the threshold, their 1,686,908 votes become ineffective. The remaining 25,761,998 effective votes participate in the countrywide apportionment of seats among parties. It uses the Hare-quota variant-1 method with residual fit by greatest remainders (HQ1grR). Variant-1 of the Hare-quota is the integral part of the effective votes-to-seats ratio, 352,904.

EP2014IT-3CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	HQ1grR
PD+SVP	S&D:31, EPP:1	11,341,268	32.137	32
M5S	EFDD	5,807,362	16.456	17
FI	EPP	4,614,364	13.075	13
LN	NI	1,688,197	4.784	5
NCD+UDC+PPI	EPP	1,202,350	3.407	3
L'ALTRA EUROPA	GUE/NGL	1,108,457	3.141	3
Sum (Split)		25,761,998	(0.43)	73

The 73 Italian seats are allocated between the five districts proportionately to population figures. The district Italia nord-occidentale gets 20 seats, Italia nord-orientale 14, Italia centrale 14, Italia meridionale 17, and Italia insulare 8. In order to meet these district magnitudes, provisional apportionments of seats among parties are carried out within each district. They use the Hare-quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders (HaQgrR).

The provisional five districtwise apportionments are confronted with the earlier countrywide apportionment. It is seen that, for every party except FI, the sum of its district seats differs from the number of its countrywide seats. The law stipulates that the countrywide seat apportionment is decisive and takes precedence. Therefore the districtwise apportionments are adjusted so as to compensate for the differences. The compensation procedure has a rather makeshift character. Luckily, it transpires to be workable for the 2014 data.

There are three parties for which the districtwise sum exceeds the countrywide apportionment by one seat, PD+SVP, NCD+UDC+PPI, and L'ALTRA EUROPA. For PD+SVP the smallest remainder that is rounded upwards occurs in Italia meridionale, 0.424. Here the compensation procedure retracts a seat, that is, this remainder is rounded downwards. The same happens for NCD+UDC+PPI in Italia centrale (remainder 0.525), and for L'ALTRA EUROPA in Italia nord-orientale (0.544). The sums of the districtwise seats of the three parties now fit their countrywide seat numbers.

For M5S and for LN the districtwise sum falls short of the countrywide apportionment, by one seat and by two seats, respectively. Among these two parties and the three districts where a seat is being retracted, the largest remainder that is rounded downwards occurs for LN in Italia nord-orientale, 0.469. Here the compensation procedure creates a seat, that is, this remainder is rounded upwards. The same happens for M5S in Italia meridionale (remainder 0.407), and for LN in Italia centrale (0.322). At this stage every party has its district seats summing to its countrywide seat number, and every district meets its district magnitude. Therefore the compensation procedure terminates. In the table the remainders whose rounding is reversed are marked by a trailing dot (●).

Finally, within each district, the assignment of seats to candidates is carried out based on the candidates' success as expressed by their preference votes.

EP2014IT-5subs	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR●	MEPs' list positions
<i>District 1: Italia nord-occidentale</i>				
PD	3,240,825	8.618	9	1, 3, 2, 4, 5, 11, 15, 10, 19
M5S	1,470,247	3.910	4	3, 17, 7, 20
FI	1,294,490	3.442	3	1, 4, 11
LN	933,644	2.483	2	1, 3
NCD+UDC+PPI	276,748	0.736	1	1
L'ALTRA EUROPA	305,078	0.811	1	3
Sum (Split)	7,521,032	(0.5)	20	

EP2014IT-5subs ( <i>cont.</i> )	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR●	MEPs' list positions
<i>District 2: Italia nord-orientale</i>				
PD+SVP	2,620,651	6.804	7	1, 6, 3, 2, 4, 11; SVP: 1
M5S	1,081,564	2.808	3	2, 1, 7
FI	738,911	1.919	2	1, 14
LN	565,951	1.469●	1 ↑ 2	1, 2
NCD+UDC+PPI	175,394	0.455	0	
L'ALTRA EUROPA	209,424	0.544●	1 ↓ 0	
Sum (Split)	5,391,895	(0.5)	14	
<i>District 3: Italia centrale</i>				
PD	2,657,892	6.976	7	1, 2, 9, 6, 4, 5, 3
M5S	1,243,070	3.263	3	1, 4, 12
FI	841,276	2.208	2	1, 13
LN	122,509	0.322●	0 ↑ 1	1
NCD+UDC+PPI	200,117	0.525●	1 ↓ 0	
L'ALTRA EUROPA	269,286	0.707	1	1
Sum (Split)	5,334,150	(0.5)	14	
<i>District 4: Italia meridionale</i>				
PD	2,024,687	6.424●	7 ↓ 6	2, 1, 4, 7, 5, 17
M5S	1,388,908	4.407●	4 ↑ 5	1, 11, 9, 2, 14
FI	1,281,891	4.067	4	1, 5, 14, 4
LN	43,393	0.138	0	
NCD+UDC+PPI	378,867	1.202	1	1
L'ALTRA EUROPA	240,017	0.762	1	1
Sum (Split)	5,357,763	(0.42)	17	
<i>District 5: Italia insulare</i>				
PD	797,213	2.957	3	2, 1, 4
M5S	623,573	2.313	2	1, 4
FI	457,796	1.698	2	7, 4
LN	22,700	0.084	0	
NCD+UDC+PPI	171,224	0.635	1	1
L'ALTRA EUROPA	84,652	0.314	0	
Sum (Split)	2,157,158	(0.5)	8	

## LT – Republic of Lithuania

Lithuania's due is 11 seats. The ballot sheet lists the names of all candidates. Voters mark a party and may cast up to five preference votes by inserting the list numbers of their candidates of choice.

The total number of ballots cast is 1,211,279. There is an electoral threshold of five percent of ballots cast, 60,564. If less than sixty percent of the ballots cast become effective (that is, 726,767), then the threshold must be lowered. In the present case there are 1,144,131 valid ballots, of which 1,063,650 become effective. Hence the five percent threshold persists. For the apportionment of seats to parties the Hare-quota variant-2 method with residual fit by greatest remainders is applied (HQ2grR). Variant-2 of the Hare-quota is the votes-to-seats ratio, rounded upwards, 96,696.

The assignment of seats to candidates is solely based on the candidates' preference votes.

EP2014LT-5CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	HQ2grR	MEPs' list positions
TS-LKD	EPP	199,393	2.062	2	3, 1
LSDP	S&D	197,477	2.042	2	2, 1
LRLS	ALDE	189,373	1.958	2	2, 3
TT	EFDD	163,049	1.686	2	1, 3
DP	ALDE	146,607	1.516	1	1
LLRA (AWPL)	ECR	92,108	0.953	1	1
LVZS	Greens/EFA	75,643	0.782	1	1
Sum (Split)		1,063,650	(0.6)	11	

## LU – Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

Luxembourg's contingent is six seats. Every party nominates a list of six candidates. Voters have up to six votes which they can distribute freely among candidates of various lists, with at most two votes per candidate. Alternatively voters may mark a party, in which case the mark is expanded into six votes, one for each of the party's six candidates. The total number of valid votes is 1,172,614, of which 714,804 are expanded party votes. The total number of valid ballots is 203,772. The average number of votes per ballot is  $1,172,614 / 203,772 = 5.75$ .

The apportionment of seats among parties is based on the total number of votes for the parties' candidates. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with downward rounding is applied.

The assignment of a party's seats to its candidates follows the ordering that is induced by the candidates' votes.

EP2014LU-6CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
CSV/PCS	EPP	441,578	3.7	3	1, 2, 3
DÉI GRÉN/LES VERTS	Greens/EFA	176,073	1.5	1	1
DP/PD	ALDE	173,255	1.4	1	1
LSAP/POSL	S&D	137,504	1.1	1	1
5 Others	—	244,204	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		1,172,614	(120,000)	6	

## LV – Republic of Latvia

Latvia has eight seats to fill. Every party or coalition has its own ballot paper. Voters cast one party vote. They may express a preference vote (a "plus") for one or more candidates they support, or cross out candidates whom they do not support (a "crossing-out").

Of the 445,225 ballots cast, 440,288 are valid. There is a five percent electoral threshold relative to votes cast, 22,262. The threshold gives rise to 49,277 ineffective votes, spread over nine parties. The remaining 391,011 effective votes are split among five parties. For the apportionment of seats among parties, the divisor method with standard rounding is applied.

The assignment of seats to candidates is based on the within-party ordering based on the candidates' tally of pluses minus crossings-out. The 78 candidates of the five parties that participate in the seat apportionment process accumulate a total of 474,807 pluses, and of 557,371 crossings-out.

EP2014LV-mCV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivStd	MEPs' list positions
V.	EPP	204,979	4.1	4	1, 2, 3, 4
Coal. NA	ECR	63,229	1.3	1	1
SASKAŅA SDP	S&D	57,863	1.2	1	4
Coal. ZZS	EFDD	36,637	0.7	1	3
LKS	Greens/EFA	28,303	0.6	1	1
Sum (Divisor)		391,011	(50,000)	8	

## MT – Republic of Malta

Malta's contingent is six seats. On the ballot sheet, voters write-in their preference ranking 1, 2, 3, and so on of as many candidates as they wish. A preference ranking may include candidates from different political parties. There is no electoral threshold.

For the assignment of seats to candidates the single transferable vote scheme with random transfer of surplus votes (STVran) is used.

EP2014MT-STV	Party	Political Group	1st Pref	STVran
Alfred Sant	PL/MLP	S&D	48,739	1
Roberta Metsola	PN/NP	EPP	32,360	1
Miriam Dalli	PL/MLP	S&D	23,479	1
David Casa	PN/NP	EPP	19,582	1
Marlene Mizzi	PL/MLP	S&D	14,057	1
Clint Camilleri	PL/MLP	S&D	13,484	0
Joseph Cuschieri	PL/MLP	S&D	10,461	0
Francis Zammit Dimech	PN/NP	EPP	8,660	0
Therese Comodini Cachia	PN/NP	EPP	7,859	1
Raymond Bugeja	PN/NP	EPP	7,846	0
Lino Bianco	PL/MLP	S&D	7,268	0
Norman Vella	PN/NP	EPP	7,099	0
Charlon Gouder	PL/MLP	S&D	6,719	0
Deborah Schembri	PL/MLP	S&D	5,983	0
Stefano Mallia	PN/NP	EPP	5,663	0
Kevin Cutajar	PN/NP	EPP	5,415	0
Helga Ellul	PN/NP	EPP	2,976	0
Jonathan Shaw	PN/NP	EPP	2,087	0
Ivan Grixti	PL/MLP	S&D	1,595	0
Mario Farrugia Borg	PL/MLP	S&D	1,297	0
Kevin Plumpton	PN/NP	EPP	1,238	0
Peter Cordina	PL/MLP	S&D	868	0
Fleur-Anne Vella	PL/MLP	S&D	512	0
9 further candidates	—	—	16,604	0
Sum (Droop-quota)		(35,979)	251,851	6

## NL – Kingdom of the Netherlands

The Netherlands' due is 26 seats. On the ballot sheet, voters mark one candidate of the party of their choice. There is an electoral threshold, but it is camouflaged in the numerical calculations. It amounts to the ratio of valid votes to seats,  $4,753,746/26 = 182,836 + 10/26$ . To qualify for a seat the votes for a party must exceed this "electoral divisor". The threshold turns 290,332 votes ineffective, spread over ten parties. Relative to votes cast (4,782,251) the threshold amounts to  $182,837/4,782,251 = 3.8$  percent. It is compatible with the five percent lid of the European Electoral Act 2002.

The apportionment of seats among parties is based on the remaining 4,463,414 effective votes, cast for nine parties. Among the nine parties there are two list alliances, Alliance A = CDA+CU-SGP, and Alliance B = PVDA+GROENLINKS. Hence the super-apportionment—that is, the apportionment of the 26 seats among two alliances and five parties—has to deal with seven participants. The super-apportionment uses the divisor method with downward rounding.

Alliances are rather irritating from the voters' point of view. As for Alliance A, the ballot sheets exhibit the affiliation of the CDA with the EPP, but keep quiet about the affiliation of the CU-SGP with



the ECR Political Group. Voters may fancy that casting their votes for either one of the two parties supports the EPP. But this may not be so. The system may redirect some of the votes to support the ECR Political Group. Similarly for Alliance B. The ballots says that PVDA is a partner of S&D, but it keeps quiet about GROENLINKS joining Greens/EFA.

EP2014NL-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
Alliance A		1,086,609	7.1	7	
Alliance B		778,357	5.1	5	
D66	ALDE	735,825	4.8	4	1*, 3*, 2*, 4
PVV	NI	633,114	4.1	4	10*, 1*, 2*, 3
VVD	ALDE	571,176	3.7	3	1*, 2*, 6*
SP	GUE/NGL	458,079	2.97	2	1*, 3*
PVDD	GUE/NGL	200,254	1.3	1	1*
Sum (Divisor)		4,463,414	(154,000)	26	

Every alliance calls for an additional apportionment to allot their common seats among their partners. In the present case there are two sub-apportionments, one each for alliance A and for alliance B. In either case the Hare-quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders is applied.

The superposition of two apportionment calculations makes alliances susceptible to so-called discordance pairs. That is, when comparing a pair of parties, the party with more votes finishes with fewer seats than the other. D66 and CDA are a discordance pair. D66 wins 735,825 votes and is awarded four seats. CDA has fewer votes (721,766), but gets more seats, five. Another discordance pair is SP with 458,079 votes and two seats, and PVDA with 446,763 votes and three seats.

EP2014NL-2subs	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR	MEPs' list positions
<i>Alliance A = CDA+CU-SGP sub-apportionment</i>					
CDA	EPP	721,766	4.650	5	1*, 25*, 3*, 2*, 7*
CU-SGP	ECR	364,843	2.350	2	1*, 2*
Sum (Split)		1,086,609	(0.5)	7	
<i>Alliance B = PVDA+GROENLINKS sub-apportionment</i>					
PVDA	S&D	446,763	2.870	3	1*, 2*, 3
GROENLINKS	Greens/EFA	331,594	2.130	2	1*, 2*
Sum (Split)		778,357	(0.5)	5	

For the assignment of seats to candidates, the Netherlands practice a quorum bypass rule. More precisely, candidates whose preference votes meet or exceed one tenth of the electoral divisor, 18,284, are shifted to top of the final ranking. In the tables these candidates are marked with an asterisk (\*).

## PL – Republic of Poland

Poland commands 51 seats. Every party has its own ballot paper, exhibiting the list of its candidates. The ballot papers are combined in a booklet, one for each of thirteen electoral districts. Voters have one vote with which they mark a candidate of the party of their choice. The votes cast for a party are obtained by accumulating the votes for the party's candidates. There is an electoral threshold of five percent of the valid votes,  $0.05 \times 7,069,485 \rightarrow 353,475$ . The threshold excludes seven parties and discards their 897,649 votes as ineffective.

The countrywide apportionment of seats among parties is based on the remaining 6,171,836 effective votes for five parties. We refer to this step as the super-apportionment. For the countrywide apportionment the divisor method with downward rounding is used.

EP2014PL-1CV	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
PO	EPP	2,271,215	19.6	19
PIS	ECR	2,246,870	19.4	19
SLD	S&D	667,319	5.8	5
KNP	NI	505,586	4.4	4
PSL	EPP	480,846	4.1	4
Sum (Divisor)		6,171,836	(116,000)	51

Parties do not present countrywide lists of candidates, however. Rather, all parties submit their candidate lists separately in each of the thirteen districts into which the country is subdivided. Therefore every party undergoes a sub-apportionment of its countrywide seats among the thirteen districts. All sub-apportionments apply the Hare-quota method with residual fit by greatest remainders.

The assignment of seats to candidates strictly follows the ordering that is induced by the candidates' vote tally.

EP2014PL-5subs	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR	MEPs' list positions
<i>PO sub-apportionment</i>				
Gdańsku	218,962	1.832	2	1, 10
Bydgoszczy	100,430	0.840	1	3
Olsztynie	105,541	0.883	1	1
Warszawie I	308,468	2.581	2	1, 2
Warszawie II	75,369	0.631	1	1
Łodzi	149,474	1.250	1	1
Poznaniu	192,801	1.613	2	2, 1
Lublinie	64,889	0.543	0	
Rzeszowie	73,381	0.614	1	1
Krakowie	232,330	1.944	2	1, 2
Katowicach	337,478	2.823	3	1, 3, 5
Wrocławiu	252,513	2.112	2	1, 2
Gorzowie Wielkopolskim	159,579	1.335	1	1
Sum (Split)	2,271,215	(0.6)	19	
<i>PIS sub-apportionment</i>				
Gdańsku	117,620	0.995	1	1
Bydgoszczy	96,663	0.817	1	1
Olsztynie	140,342	1.187	1	1
Warszawie I	216,773	1.833	2	1, 5
Warszawie II	163,775	1.385	1	4
Łodzi	177,654	1.502	1	1
Poznaniu	142,675	1.206	1	1
Lublinie	164,578	1.392	1	2
Rzeszowie	196,247	1.660	2	1, 3
Krakowie	307,624	2.601	3	2, 1, 4
Katowicach	234,515	1.983	2	1, 2
Wrocławiu	179,432	1.517	2	1, 2
Gorzowie Wielkopolskim	108,972	0.921	1	1
Sum (Split)	2,246,870	(0.51)	19	

EP2014PL-5subs ( <i>cont.</i> )	Votes	Quotient	HaQgrR	MEPs' list positions
<i>SLD sub-apportionment</i>				
Gdańsku	35,164	0.263	0	
Bydgoszczy	74,833	0.561	1	1
Olsztynie	41,422	0.310	0	
Warszawie I	57,010	0.427	0	
Warszawie II	24,647	0.185	0	
Łodzi	35,344	0.265	0	
Poznaniu	74,695	0.560	1	1
Lublinie	21,248	0.159	0	
Rzeszowie	18,761	0.141	0	
Krakowie	62,748	0.470	0	
Katowicach	79,543	0.596	1	1
Wrocławiu	78,557	0.589	1	1
Gorzowie Wielkopolskim	63,347	0.475	1	1
Sum (Split)	667,319	(0.472)	5	
<i>KNP sub-apportionment</i>				
Gdańsku	30,324	0.240	0	
Bydgoszczy	20,753	0.164	0	
Olsztynie	28,412	0.225	0	
Warszawie I	49,794	0.394	1	1
Warszawie II	27,671	0.219	0	
Łodzi	29,202	0.231	0	
Poznaniu	40,540	0.321	0	
Lublinie	27,482	0.217	0	
Rzeszowie	28,474	0.225	0	
Krakowie	72,393	0.573	1	1
Katowicach	73,573	0.582	1	1
Wrocławiu	47,615	0.377	1	1
Gorzowie Wielkopolskim	29,353	0.232	0	
Sum (Split)	505,586	(0.35)	4	
<i>PSL sub-apportionment</i>				
Gdańsku	14,817	0.123	0	
Bydgoszczy	32,507	0.270	0	
Olsztynie	36,221	0.301	0	
Warszawie I	19,098	0.159	0	
Warszawie II	61,259	0.510	1	1
Łodzi	29,615	0.246	0	
Poznaniu	61,431	0.511	1	1
Lublinie	70,055	0.583	1	2
Rzeszowie	28,927	0.241	0	
Krakowie	58,541	0.487	1	1
Katowicach	18,480	0.154	0	
Wrocławiu	28,087	0.234	0	
Gorzowie Wielkopolskim	21,808	0.181	0	
Sum (Split)	480,846	(0.4)	4	

## PT – Portuguese Republic

Portugal has 21 seats to fill. On the ballot sheets voters cast a single vote for a closed list of a party. Ballots repeat party denominations three times, by spelled-out party names, by party initials, and by party emblems. The names of the parties' candidates do not appear on the ballot sheet. There is no electoral threshold.

The apportionment of seats among parties uses the divisor method with downward rounding. The assignment of seats to candidates strictly follows the list ordering as is typical for closed list systems.

EP2014PT-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
PS	S&D	1,034,249	8.9	8
Coal. PSD+CDS-PP	EPP	910,647	7.9	7
Coal. PCP+PEV	GUE/NGL	416,925	3.6	3
MPT	ALDE	234,788	2.02	2
B.E.	GUE/NGL	149,764	1.3	1
11 Others	—	294,399	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		3,040,772	(116,000)	21

## RO – Romania

Romania has 32 seats. Every voter receives a booklet and a stamp. The booklet contains the lists of candidates of every party. Voters stamp next to the symbol of the party of their choice.

The total count of valid votes is 5,566,616. For parties, there is an electoral threshold of five percent of the valid votes, 278,331. Ten parties fail the threshold. For independent candidates, there is an electoral threshold given by the votes-to-seats ratio, 173,957. Seven indeps fail to pass the threshold. Together the two thresholds dispose of 880,754 votes as ineffective.

The apportionment of seats among parties and indeps is based on the effective votes remaining, 4,685,862, using the divisor method with downward rounding. If the independent candidate Mircea Diaconu had submitted a list of congenial candidates, the list would have won two seats.

The assignment of seats to candidates strictly follows the prespecified ordering of the party lists.

EP2014RO-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
Coal. PSD+UNPR+PC	S&D	2,093,234	16.1	16
PNL	EPP	835,531	6.4	6
PDL	EPP	680,853	5.2	5
Indep M. Diaconu	ALDE	379,582	2.9•	1
UDMR	EPP	350,689	2.7	2
PMP	EPP	345,973	2.7	2
Sum (Divisor)		4,685,862	(130,000)	32

## SE – Kingdom of Sweden

Sweden's contingent is 20 seats. Every party has its own ballot paper. Each voter casts a party vote, and may adjoin one preference vote. If the word *anmälda* is printed on the ballot paper then the voter must not vote for a candidate not listed.

There are 3,716,778 valid votes. There is an electoral threshold of four percent of the valid votes, that is, 148,672 votes. The threshold excludes eleven parties, whose 109,911 votes become ineffective.

The apportionment of seats among parties is based on the 3,606,867 effective votes that are cast for nine parties. The Swedish variant of the divisor method with standard rounding is used (Div0.7).

The method places the dividing point in the range between zero and one at 0.7, while all subsequent dividing points agree with those of the divisor method with standard rounding, 1.5, 2.5, 3.5 and so on.

There is a total of 1,859,375 preference votes. They carry the candidates' rankings only if they meet or exceed five percent of the party's total preference votes. In the table candidates profiting from the five percent bypass rule are marked by an asterisk (\*). C's MEP Fredrick Federley owes his seat to the bypass rule.

EP2014SE-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	Div0.7	MEPs' list positions
S	S&D	899,074	5.499	5	1*, 2, 3, 4, 5
MP	Greens/EFA	572,591	3.502	4	1*, 2*, 3, 4
M	EPP	507,488	3.1	3	3*, 1*, 2*
FP	ALDE	368,514	2.3	2	1*, 2*
SD	EFDD	359,248	2.2	2	1*, 2*
C	ALDE	241,101	1.47	1	3*
V	GUE/NGL	234,272	1.4	1	1*
KD	EPP	220,574	1.3	1	1*
FI	S&D	204,005	1.2	1	1*
Sum (Divisor)		3,606,867	(163,500)	20	

## SI – Republic of Slovenia

Slovenia's contingent is eight seats. There is a single ballot paper listing all candidates of all parties. Voters mark a party vote by circling the party's serial number and may add one preference vote.

The total number of votes cast is 419,661, of which 402,071 votes are valid. There is an electoral threshold of four percent of votes cast. The threshold disposes of 60,601 votes and eight parties. The apportionment of seats among parties is based on the remaining 341,470 effective votes. The divisor method with downward rounding is used.

The assignment of seats to candidates incorporates the preference votes, which total 310,934. They may overrule the list ranking due to a quorum bypass rule. A party's quorum is one half of the quotient of the party's vote count and number of its list candidates. In the table candidates who satisfy the rule are marked by an asterisk (\*). Two of the eight seats are filled due to the quorum bypass rule.

EP2014SI-LV1	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn	MEPs' list positions
SDS	EPP	99,643	3.3	3	1*, 2*, 3
Coal. NSi+SLS	EPP	66,760	2.2	2	8*, 1*
VERJAMEM	Greens/EFA	41,525	1.4	1	1*
DEUSUS	ALDE	32,662	1.1	1	1*
SD	S&D	32,484	1.1	1	2*
3 Others	—	68,396	—	0	
Sum (Divisor)		341,470	(30,000)	8	

## SK – Slovak Republic

The Slovak Republic has 13 seats to fill. Every party has its own ballot paper. Voters cast a list vote, and may circle the serial number of at most two candidates to indicate preference votes.

The total number of valid votes is 560,603. There is an electoral threshold of five percent of the valid votes, 28,031. The threshold excludes twenty-one parties, and disposes of their 121,081 party votes and 109,710 preference votes as ineffective.

The apportionment of seats among parties applies the Droop-quota variant-3 method with residual fit by greatest remainder (DQ3grR). In the family of Droop-quotas, variant-3 is obtained by dividing the effective votes total (439,522) by the seats total plus one (14), and then rounding the result to the nearest whole number, that is,  $439,522 / 14 = 31,394.4 \rightarrow 31,394$ .

The assignment of seats to candidates is influenced by preference votes. There are 676,461 preference votes for the candidates of the parties participating in the apportionment process. A quorum bypass rule is employed. More precisely, a candidate is lifted to the top of the party list when attracting at least three percent of the party's vote total. All elected candidates fulfill the rule, five would not have been seated without it.

EP2014SK-LV2	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DQ3grR	MEPs' list positions
SMER-SD	S&D	135,089	4.303	4	1*, 2*, 5*, 4*
KDH	EPP	74,108	2.361	2	1*, 2*
SDKÚ-DS	EPP	43,467	1.385	2	2*, 1*
OL'ANO	ECR	41,829	1.332	1	4*
NOVA	ECR	38,316	1.220	1	2*
SAS	ALDE	37,376	1.191	1	3*
SMK-MPK	EPP	36,629	1.167	1	1*
MOST-HID	EPP	32,708	1.042	1	2*
Sum (Split)		439,522	(0.37)	13	

## UK – United Kingdom

The United Kingdom's contingent is 73 seats. The electoral area is subdivided into twelve districts. The district East Midlands gets five seats, East of England seven, London eight, North East three, North West eight, South East ten, South West and Gibraltar six, West Midlands seven, Yorkshire and the Humber six, Wales four, Scotland six, and Northern Ireland three. Districts are evaluated separately. There are no electoral thresholds.

In all districts but Northern Ireland, parties present closed lists of candidates and voters cast a single list vote. The apportionment of seats among parties is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding. The Northern Ireland district uses a single transferable vote scheme with fractional transfer of surplus votes (STVfra). On the ballots, voters assign preference ranks to as many candidates as they wish, possibly including candidates from different parties.

EP2014UK-LV0	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
<i>District 1: East Midlands</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	368,734	2.6	2
CONS	ECR	291,270	2.1	2
LAB	S&D	279,363	1.995	1
GP	Greens/EFA	67,066	0.5	0
LDP	ALDE	60,772	0.4	0
4 Others	—	53,516	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,120,721	(140,000)	5

EP2014UK-LV0 ( <i>cont.</i> )	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
<i>District 2: East of England</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	542,812	3.9	3
CONS	ECR	446,569	3.2	3
LAB	S&D	271,601	1.9	1
GP	Greens/EFA	133,331	0.95	0
LDP	ALDE	108,010	0.8	0
5 Others	—	72,023	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,574,346	(140,000)	7
<i>District 3: London</i>				
LAB	S&D	806,959	4.2	4
CONS	ECR	495,639	2.6	2
UKIP	EFDD	371,133	1.95	1
GP	Greens/EFA	196,419	1.03	1
LDP	ALDE	148,013	0.8	0
12 Other	—	182,312	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		2,200,475	(190,000)	8
<i>District 4: North East</i>				
LAB	S&D	221,988	2.02	2
UKIP	EFDD	177,660	1.6	1
CONS	ECR	107,733	0.98	0
LDP	ALDE	36,093	0.3	0
GP	Greens/EFA	31,605	0.3	0
3 Others	—	35,573	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		608,652	(110,000)	3
<i>District 5: North West</i>				
LAB	S&D	594,063	3.96	3
UKIP	EFDD	481,932	3.2	3
CONS	ECR	351,985	2.3	2
GP	Greens/EFA	123,075	0.8	0
LDP	ALDE	105,487	0.7	0
6 Others	—	97,861	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,754,403	(150,000)	8
<i>District 6: South East</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	751,439	4.1	4
CONS	ECR	723,571	3.9	3
LAB	S&D	342,775	1.9	1
GP	Greens/EFA	211,706	1.2	1
LDP	ALDE	187,876	1.02	1
10 Others	—	120,683	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		2,338,050	(184,000)	10
<i>District 7: South West and Gibraltar</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	484,184	2.95	2
CONS	ECR	433,151	2.6	2
LAB	S&D	206,124	1.3	1
GP	Greens/EFA	166,447	1.01	1
LDP	ALDE	160,376	0.98	0
3 Others	—	49,160	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,499,442	(164,000)	6

EP2014UK-LV0 ( <i>cont.</i> )	Political Group	Votes	Quotient	DivDwn
<i>District 8: West Midlands</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	428,010	3.3	3
LAB	S&D	363,033	2.8	2
CONS	ECR	330,470	2.5	2
LDP	ALDE	75,648	0.6	0
GP	Greens/EFA	71,464	0.5	0
6 Others	—	90,582	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,359,207	(130,000)	7
<i>District 9: Yorkshire and the Humber</i>				
UKIP	EFDD	403,630	3.1	3
LAB	S&D	380,189	2.9	2
CONS	ECR	248,945	1.9	1
GP	Greens/EFA	102,282	0.8	0
LDP	ALDE	81,108	0.6	0
5 Others	—	80,547	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,296,701	(130,000)	6
<i>District 10: Wales</i>				
LAB	S&D	206,332	1.9	1
UKIP	EFDD	201,983	1.8	1
CONS	ECR	127,742	1.2	1
PL-PW	Greens/EFA	111,864	1.02	1
GP	Greens/EFA	33,275	0.3	0
LDP	ALDE	28,930	0.3	0
5 Others	—	22,934	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		733,060	(110,000)	4
<i>District 11: Scotland</i>				
SNP	Greens/EFA	389,503	2.8	2
LAB	S&D	348,219	2.5	2
CONS	ECR	231,330	1.7	1
UKIP	EFDD	140,534	1.004	1
GP	Greens/EFA	108,305	0.8	0
LDP	ALDE	95,319	0.7	0
3 Others	—	30,273	—	0
Sum (Divisor)		1,343,483	(140,000)	6

EP2014UK-STV	Party	Political Group	1st Pref	STVfra
<i>District 12: Northern Ireland</i>				
Martina Anderson	SF	GUE/NGL	159,813	1
Diane Dodds	DUP	NI	131,163	1
Jim Nicholson	UUP	ECR	83,438	1
Alex Attwood	SDLP	S&D	81,594	0
Henry Reilly	UKIP	EFDD	24,584	0
Ross Brown	GP	Greens/EFA	10,598	0
Mark Brotherston	CONS	ECR	4,144	0
3 further candidates	—	—	130,791	0
Sum (Droop-quota)		(156,532)	626,125	3



## Conclusions

This review of the electoral systems employed by the Union's Member States during the 2014 European elections confirms once again that no two of these systems are the same. The diversity of these electoral systems is folklore. The challenge is to classify the diversity in a way that aids in understanding domestic peculiarities, and in identifying options to increase the level of uniformity.

To this end the paper starts out from the well-known distinction between electoral systems with closed lists, with flexible lists, and with open lists. Accordingly, ballot structures and vote patterns are classified by means of a list vote plus no preference vote (LV0, closed lists), a list vote plus at most  $x$  preference votes (LV $x$ , flexible lists), and up to  $y$  candidate votes ( $y$ CV, open lists). The classification provides a viable starting point to discriminate between the electoral systems of the twenty-eight Member States.

Within each Member State the translation of votes into seats is analyzed in two steps. The first step is the apportionment of seats among parties. The most popular seat apportionment method is the divisor method with downward rounding, also known as the method of Jefferson, D'Hondt, or Hagenbach-Bischoff. However, a variety of other apportionment methods are also in use.

The second step is the within-party assignment of seats to candidates. In closed list systems (LV0) voters have no say, they must accept the prespecified ordering of candidates as announced on the parties' lists of nominees. In open list systems ( $y$ CV) the ordering of candidates entirely results from the voters' input. In flexible list systems (LV $x$ ) the ordering that is prespecified by party headquarters and the ordering that results from preference voting are amalgamated in one way or the other.

The diversity of technical aspects is cumbersome, but more disturbing is the absence of a European perspective of the Member States' domestic parties. In just two Member States (the Netherlands, Ireland) ballots advertise the affiliation of domestic parties with political parties at European level. Even so, the presence of alliances across political rifts (in Denmark, as well as in the Netherlands) makes voters wonder which effects their votes will have in EP politics. In many Member States two or more domestic parties become part of the same EP Political Group (BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, EL, ES, FI, HU, IT, LT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, UK). In two Member States (ES, HR) the delegates of a domestic party become members of different EP Political Groups. Romania provides an instance showing that the European outlook pays off. The three parties that lean towards the S&D Political Group form a coalition and submit a joint list of candidates. Their 2,093,234 votes secure them half the seats, 16. Of the four parties that become affiliated to the EPP Political Group, each stands for itself. Together they are awarded 15 seats, although the sum of their votes is 2,213,046 and puts them ahead of their competitors. They would have been better off by forming another coalition.

A strong plea for strengthening the role of the political parties at European level is put forward by Leinen and Pescher (2014). The June 2015 Draft Report of Huebner and Leinen (2015) for the EP's Committee on Constitutional Affairs *proposes that the visibility of European parties be enhanced by placing their names and logos on the ballot papers*. There is reason to trust that the European elections 2019 will make a further step towards uniform electoral procedures.

## Acknowledgments

We thank electoral offices, ministries and universities who responded helpfully when we asked for assistance. Without this generous support we would not have been able to complete this work:

- BE: Caroline Van Steenberghe, General Directorate Institutions and Population
- BG: Ivilina Aleksieva, Central Election Commission
- CY: D. Demetriou, Ministry of Interior Central Electoral Service
- CZ: Pavel Hájek, Czech Statistical Office, and Silvia Rákocová, Ministry of the Interior
- DK: Christine Boeskov, Chief Electoral Officer
- EE: Arne Koitmäe, Elections Department
- EL: Ministry of Interior and Administrative Reconstruction

- ES: Ministry of the Interior  
 FR: Ministry of the Interior  
 HR: Marina Buntić Juričić, Croatian Parliament, and Albina Rosandić, State Electoral Commission  
 HU: Listár Dániel, National Election Office  
 LT: Rokas Stabingis, Central Electoral Commission  
 MT: Roderick Pace and Josef Lauri, University of Malta  
 NL: Lucas Brouwers, Electoral Council  
 PL: Dorota Tulczyńska, National Electoral Office  
 RO: Ana Maria Patru, Permanent Electoral Authority, and Alexandru Constantinescu, FU Berlin  
 SE: Helena Ihrstedt, Election Authority  
 SI: Karolina Kušević, State Election Commission  
 SK: Eva Chmelov, Ministry of the Interior, and Antala Marián, Statistical Office, and Vladimír Dančišin, University of Prešov  
 UK: John Doyle, Electoral Commission London.

We are also very grateful to our colleague Antonio Palomares, from Granada, for providing critical remarks and valuable suggestions, and to Steven Verbanck, VVSG Brussels, for correcting erroneous numbers.

## References

- EUR-LEX. 2013. European council decision of 28 June 2013 establishing the composition of the European Parliament (2013/312/EU). *Official Journal of the European Union*. L 181, 57–58.
- GALLAGHER, M., MITCHELL, T. 2008. *The Politics of Electoral Systems*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- GRIMMETT, G. R. et al. 2011. The Allocation Between the EU Member States of the Seats in the European Parliament. Note. *European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs*, PE 432.760.
- HÜBNER, D. M., LEINEN, J. 2015. Draft report on a proposal for amendment of the Act of 20 September 1976 concerning the election of the Members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage (2015/2035(INL)) MEP. *Committee on Constitutional Affairs*.
- KAEDING, M., SWITEK, N. 2015. *Die Europawahl 2014 – Spitzenkandidaten, Protestparteien, Nichtwähler*. Springer, Wiesbaden.
- LASLIER, J.-F. et al. (2015). The EuroVotePlus experiment. *European Union Politics*. 0/2015, 0–15.
- LEHMANN, W. 2014. The European Elections: EU legislation, national provisions and civic participation. Study for the AFCO Committee. *European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs*, PE 493.047.
- LEINEN, J., PESCHER, F. 2014. Von Parteibündnissen zu echten Parteien auf europäischer Ebene? Hintergrund, Gegenstand und Folgen der neuen Regeln für Europäische Parteien. *Integration*. 37/2014, 228–246.
- OELBERMANN, K.-F., PALOMARES, A., PUKELSHEIM, F. 2010. The 2009 European Parliament Elections: From Votes to Seats in 27 Ways. *European Electoral Studies* 5, pp. 148–182.
- OELBERMANN, K.-F., PUKELSHEIM, F. 2014. Reform of the European Electoral Law. *Zeitschrift für Staats- und Europawissenschaften – Journal for comparative Government and European policy*. 4/2014, pp. 549–559.
- PUKELSHEIM, F. 2014. *Proportional Representation – Apportionment Methods and Their Applications*. With a Foreword by Andrew Duff MEP. Spriger, Cham (CH).