European Parliament

The European Elections of May 2019

Electoral systems and outcomes

STUDY

EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service

Kai Friederike Oelbermann and **Friedrich Pukelsheim**

EN

The European Elections of May 2019

Electoral systems and outcomes

This EPRS study provides an overview of the electoral systems and outcomes in the May 2019 elections to the European Parliament. It analyses the procedural details of how parties and candidates register their participation, how votes are cast, how valid votes are converted into seats, and how seats are assigned to candidates. For each Member State the paper describes the ballot structure and vote pattern used, the apportionment of seats among the Member State's domestic parties, and the assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates. It highlights aspects that are common to all Member States and captures peculiarities that are specific to some domestic provisions.

EPRS | European Parliamentary Research Service

AUTHOR(S)

This study has been written by Kai-Friederike Oelbermann (Anhalt University of Applied Sciences) and Friedrich Pukelsheim (University of Augsburg) at the request of the Members' Research Service, within the Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services (EPRS) of the Secretariat of the European Parliament.

The authors acknowledge the useful comments made by Wilhelm Lehmann (European Parliament/European University Institute) on drafts of this paper.

Executive summary

In this study, the European Parliament (EP) elections of May 2019 are analysed with a particular emphasis on procedural electoral rules: on how votes are cast, how seats are distributed among the different political parties and how they are distributed afterwards within the different electoral lists to determine the elected candidates. Ballot structure and vote pattern, the apportionment of seats among domestic parties, and the assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates are discussed in detail, separately for every Member State of the European Union.

Section 2 divides the conversion of votes into seats into three phases: (1) the allocation of all seats between the Member States; (2) the apportionment of the seat contingent of a Member State among its domestic parties; and (3) the assignment of the seats of a domestic party to its candidates. The situations before and after the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the European Union are treated, with a total of 751 and 705 EP seats respectively. For the apportionment of seats among parties, nine different methods were used at the elections; they are reviewed in a unified manner. The voting patterns in the Member States comprised various list systems and single transferable vote schemes. The voting patterns are detailed and labelled in a way that is indicative of how they actually determine successful candidates. Table 2.3.1 puts together some of the structural data; Table 2.4.1 shows the Political Groups that formed in the new EP.

Section 3 present pertinent data from the 2019 elections separately for every Member State, such as number of constituencies or electoral districts, vote pattern, electoral threshold, parties who participate in the apportionment process, and vote counts that enter into the calculations. The transition from the parties' votes to their seats and from the seats of a party to its successful candidates is followed up so as to identify incumbent Members of the EPs.

Section 4 provides an attempt to see the 2019 elections from a Union-wide perspective. The actual size of a political group in the EP is compared with the hypothetical number of seats the group would have been apportioned on the basis of its electoral support. The electoral support of a group is obtained by summing up the votes of all domestic parties who joined it. The emerging discrepancies emphasise yet again the political challenges evolving from trying to raise the implementation of common principles to a higher level at future European elections.

Section 5 concludes with a brief 'contextualisation' to the history and political impact of the electoral reform. Important work in electoral-systems research suggests that further harmonisation of the current system of quasi-national elections analysed in this study will remain an essential ambition for European decision-makers if they wish to make the European elections a more effective instrument of Union-wide democratic legitimation.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The ninth European Parliament (EP), with a five-year term from 2019 to 2024 was elected on 23-26 May 2019. This study is devoted to the electoral procedures leading from votes to parliamentary seats, and from seats to Members of the European Parliament (MEPs). Our focus is on procedural standards implemented by the Member States of the European Union (EU) at the 2019 elections, rather than on the political consequences of the elections as such.[1]

The heterogeneity of electoral regulations is formidable and perplexing.[2] The common principles which the 2019 elections had to follow are laid down in the 1976 European Election Act. This decrees a number of general rules to be observed by all Member States, such as to adopt a proportional representation system, while leaving much leeway for each Member State when incorporating the common principles into its domestic provisions. Duff (2011) reviews the history of the Election Act and includes a consolidated version of the 1976 Election Act amended by the 2002 act.[3]

Below we compile data on procedures, voters, parties, candidates and MEPs, with as much of a unified structure and terminology as possible, in an attempt to survey the paths from voters to MEPs in comparative perspective between Member States.[4] Member States are discussed in the alphabetical order of their two-letter codes because the latter are language-independent.[5]

Section 2 sets out with an overview of general aspects of how seats are allocated between Member States (Section 2.1), how seats are apportioned among parties (Section 2.2), and how seats are assigned to candidates (Section 2.3). As political work in the EP is carried out by a few Political Groups rather than by the plethora of the political parties of the Member States, Section 2.4 lists the Political Groups in the EP, at the time of the constitution of the new Parliament on 2 July 2019. Incorporation of the Political Groups enables a united view of the otherwise diverse elections, true to the Union's motto of 'United in diversity'.

---

[1] We would like to thank Lorenzo Cicchi (Firenze), Svante Janson (Stockholm), Dragana Kopčić (Ljubljana) and officials from the EP´s information offices in the Member States for valuable help. – All calculations in this paper were carried out using the software *BAZI – Calculation of Allocations by Apportionment Methods in the Internet* which is freely available at www.th-rosenheim.de/bazi.

[2] A compact synopsis is Giulio Sabbati, Gianluca Sgueo and Alina Dobreva (2019): 2019 European elections: National rules. At a Glance Infographic. European Parliamentary Research Service, PE 623.556. For general analyses see, e.g., Donatella M. Viola (Editor) (2016): *Routledge Handbook of European Elections, With a Foreword by J.H.H. Weiler*, Routledge, London. For a specific analysis of the 2019 elections see, e.g., Rudolf Hrbek (2019): Europawahl 2019: neue politische Konstellationen für die Wahlperiode 2019–2024, *Integration – Vierteljahreszeitschrift des Instituts für Europäische Politik in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration* 42, 167–186.

[3] Andrew Duff (2011): Report (A7-0176/2011, 28.7.2011) on a Proposal for a Modification of the Act Concerning the Election of the Members of the European Parliament by Direct Universal Suffrage of 20 September 1976 (2009/2134(INI)). Committee on Constitutional Affairs of the European Parliament, PE 440.210v04-00. See also Edward Whitfield (2015): 40th Anniversary of the 1976 Act on Direct Elections to the European Parliament, European Parliamentary Research Service Historical Archive Unit, PE 563.513. Olivier Costa (2016): The history of European electoral reform and the Electoral Act 1976, Issues of democratisation and political legitimacy, Study, European Parliamentary Research Service Historical Archive Unit, PE 563.516, and Silvia Kotanidis (2019): European Union electoral law. Current situation and historical background. European Parliamentary Research Service, PE 642.250.

[4] Similar material for the 2014 elections is provided by Wilhelm Lehmann (2014): The European elections: EU legislation, national provisions and civic participation, Study for the AFCO Committee, Revised edition, European Parliament, PE 493.047, and Luciano Bardi and Lorenzo Cicchi (2015): Electoral rules and electoral participation in the European elections: the ballot format and structure. Study for the AFCO Committee, European Parliament, PE 536.464.

[5] See the appendix for a table listing two-letter code, short name and official name of each Member State.

Section 3 is the data section. For every Member State we present some descriptive data, the transition from votes to seats, and the assignment of seats to candidates (Section 3.1–3.28).

Section 4 adjoins a hypothetical assessment how the Union-wide votes that are accumulated by the Political Groups relate to the Union-wide seats with which the Political Groups finished under the current Election Act.[6]

Section 5 concludes the study, which has its focus on quantitative aspects, with some remarks of a more qualitative nature.

References are compiled in Section 6. Acronyms, country codes, party tabs and source links are listed in an appendix (Section 7).

As a supplement to this study we generated the site www.uni-augsburg.de/bazi/EP2019Ballots.html which exhibits facsimiles of ballot sheets, ballot papers, ballot booklets, and ballot interfaces from the 2019 elections. The variety of designs illustrates the challenge of achieving a broader alignment of electoral procedures at future EP elections.

---

[6] For surveys of past elections see Kai-Friederike Oelbermann and Friedrich Pukelsheim (2015): European elections 2014: From voters to representatives, in twenty-eight ways. *Evropská volební studia – European Electoral Studies* 10, 91–124, and Kai-Friederike Oelbermann, Antonio Palomares and Friedrich Pukelsheim (2010): The 2009 European Parliament elections: From votes to seats in 27 ways. *Evropská volební studia – European Electoral Studies 5*, 148–182. Erratum, *ibidem* 6 (2011) 85.

2. From votes to seats, and from seats to MEPs

The Treaty on European Union stipulates that the EP shall be composed of representatives of the Union's citizens and that representation of citizens shall be degressively proportional (Article 14(2)). The passage from citizens to representatives may be divided into three phases:

–   the allocation of all EP seats between the Member States (Section 2.1),
–   the apportionment of the seat contingent of a Member State among its domestic parties (Section 2.2), and
–   the assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates (Section 2.3).

The phases include many particulars specified by domestic provisions in terms and wordings to which the particular Member State is accustomed. The following review merges these diverse formulations into a uniform terminology, in order to prepare for a comparative presentation of the electoral systems of the Member States in Section 3.

2.1. Allocation of seats between Member States

The composition of the ninth EP – i.e. the allocation of all seats between the Union's Member States on the basis of population figures – was troubled by two issues.

The first problem originated from primary law's stipulation that the Union's citizens shall be represented degressively. This very sensitive question had been a recurrent theme on the political agenda.[7] Since the composition of the previous eighth EP had failed to achieve degressive representation fully, some action was deemed necessary to rectify the deficiency in the ninth EP.

The second question was what to do following the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the EU at which point in time the seventy-three UK seats would fall vacant.

The negotiated solution was a compromise addressing both issues.[8] Up until the withdrawal of the UK from the EU, the ninth EP would carry on with the composition of the previous eighth EP, notwithstanding its non-degressivity. Upon the UK's withdrawal, twenty-seven of the vacated UK seats would be employed to achieve full degressivity, by raising the seat contingents of some Member States and maintaining the status quo for the others.

The Member States whose seat contingents increase are ES and FR (each by five seats), IT and NL (three), IE (two), and AT, DK, EE, FI, HR, PL, RO, SE and SK (one). The increments are visualised by explicit plus-signs '+' in Table 2.3.1 and Section 3.

---

[7]   See, e.g., Geoffrey Grimmett, Jean-François Laslier, Friedrich Pukelsheim, Victoriano Ramírez González, Richard Rose, Wojciech Słomczyński, Martin Zachariasen and Karol Życzkowski (2011): The Allocation Between the EU Member States of the Seats in the European Parliament – Cambridge Compromise. Note. European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, PE 432.760, and Geoffrey Grimmett, Friedrich Pukelsheim, Victoriano Ramírez González, Wojciech Słomczyński and Karol Życzkowski (2017): The Composition of the European Parliament. Workshop 30 January 2017. Compilation: Two briefings and one in-depth analysis. European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, PE 583.117.

[8]   See Friedrich Pukelsheim and Geoffrey Grimmett (2018): Degressive representation of Member States in the European Parliament 2019–2024. *Representation – Journal of Representative Democracy* 54, 147–158.

2.2. Apportionment of seats among parties

Article 1 of the 2002 Election Act reads as follows: '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.' The current section specifies the arithmetical procedures decreed by the Member States in order to realise the proportional representation imperative. Section 2.3 describes the list systems and single transferable vote (STV) schemes used in greater detail, together with their accompanying vote patterns.

Proportional representation systems often set an electoral threshold, i.e. a minimum number of votes a party must get in order to participate in the seat apportionment process. Eleven Member States refrain from imposing an electoral threshold (BE, DE, DK, EE, ES, FI, IE, LU, MT, PT, UK).

When a threshold is set, it is usually defined as a percentage relative to the total number of valid votes. Occasionally, the percentage is referred to the total number of votes cast, i.e. the sum of valid votes plus blank votes (where applicable) plus invalid votes. Article 3 of the 2002 Election Act states that the threshold may not exceed five per cent of votes cast.

Thirteen Member States define the threshold to be a percentage of valid votes (AT 4%, CY 1.8%, CZ 5%, EL 3%, FR 5%, HR 5%, HU 5%, IT 4%, PL 5%, RO 5%, SE 4%, SI 4%, SK 5%). Two Member States refer the percentages to the number of votes cast (LT 5%, LV 5%). Two Member States (NL, BG) set a quorum threshold. For NL the quorum amounts to 3.8% of votes cast. For BG the quorum reaches 5.9% of votes cast and exceeds the five per cent ceiling of the Election Act.

In this study a party passing the electoral threshold is called an apportionment party. In other words the apportionment parties are the parties that participate in the seat apportionment process. A valid vote that is cast for one of the apportionment parties is called an effective vote. Conversely, an ineffective vote is a vote which, although valid, has no role to play in the apportionment calculations; ineffective votes are neglected hereinafter.

Apportionment parties and effective votes by Member State are documented in Section 3. Party names are abbreviated by the party tabs which appear on the internet site election-results.eu and which are reproduced in the appendix (Section 7).

The apportionment of seats among (apportionment) parties proportionally to (effective) votes is accomplished by procedures called apportionment methods. Their history of more than two centuries has provided an abundant supply of procedures.[9] This abundance is reflected not only by the diversity of methods implemented by the Member States, but also by the diverse descriptions with which one and the same method is specified in different domestic provisions.

For the purpose of comparability we present the apportionment methods in a unified fashion.

In short, every apportionment method operates in two steps. In the first step a party's vote count is scaled down to obtain an interim quotient, by dividing the vote counts of all parties by a common electoral key. In the second step the interim quotient is turned into the seat number sought, by rounding the quotient to a neighbouring whole number.

Either step may be instrumental to ensure that the number of seats handed out becomes exactly equal to the number of seats available. The distinct role played by the two steps is the key to a classification of apportionment methods into two groups, divisor methods and quota methods.

---

[9]   See, e.g., Friedrich Pukelsheim (2017): *Proportional Representation – Apportionment Methods and Their Applications, With a foreword by Andrew Duff MEP, Second Edition,* Springer International Publishing AG, Cham (CH).

A divisor method applies a fixed rounding rule in the second step and, in order to reach the targeted seat total, invokes flexible electoral keys in the first step. Jargon refers to a flexible electoral key as a divisor, which is why the methods are called divisor methods. From the ensemble of all flexible divisors that reach the targeted seat total we quote in every instance a select divisor which has as many trailing zeros as possible.

Three divisor methods were used at the 2019 elections and will make an appearance in Section 3:

DivDwn Divisor method with downward rounding (AT, BE, CZ, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, LU, NL, PL, PT, RO, SI, UK): Every vote count is divided by the select divisor; all interim quotients are rounded downwards. This procedure is also known as the method of D'Hondt, Hagenbach-Bischoff or Jefferson.

DivStd Divisor method with standard rounding (DE, LV): Every vote count is divided by the select divisor; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than one half. This procedure is also known as the method of Sainte-Laguë, Schepers or Webster.

Div0.6 Swedish modification of the divisor method with standard rounding (SE): Every vote count is divided by the select divisor; an interim quotient smaller than one is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether it is smaller or larger than 0.6, and every other quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than one half.

The second group of apportionment methods are quota methods. A quota method uses a fixed electoral key in the first, scaling step and, in order to match the given seat total, invokes flexible split-points in the second, rounding step. Jargon refers to a fixed electoral key as a quota, thereby justifying the term quota methods. From the ensemble of all split-points that accomplish the fitting in the rounding step we quote in each case a select split which has as few decimal digits as possible.

Six quota methods were used at the 2019 elections and will make an appearance in Section 3. Five of them rely on the Hare-quota and its variants. The proper Hare-quota (HaQ) is the ratio of effective votes relative to seats. When the Hare-quota is rounded downwards its variant-1 (HQ1) is obtained, when it is rounded upwards, variant-2 (HQ2). Variant-3 (HQ3) is the integer part of the ratio of valid votes (i.e. effective votes plus ineffective votes) to seats.

HaQgrR Hare-quota method with fit by greatest remainders (BG, NL, PL): Every vote count is divided by the Hare-quota; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than the select split. This procedure is also known as the method of largest remainders, or method of Hare, Niemeyer, Hamilton.

HQ1grR Hare-quota variant-1 method with fit by greatest remainders (IT): Every vote count is divided by the Hare-quota variant-1; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than the select split.

HQ2grR Hare-quota variant-2 method with fit by greatest remainders (LT): Every vote count is divided by the Hare-quota variant-2; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than the select split.

HQ3grR Hare-quota variant-3 method with fit by greatest remainders (CY): Every vote count is divided by the Hare-quota variant-3; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its fractional part is smaller or larger than the select split.

HQ3-EL Hare-quota variant-3 method with Greek fit (EL): Every vote count is divided by the Hare-quota variant-3; the interim quotients are evaluated as in Greece (Section 3.9).

DQ3grR Droop-quota variant-3 method with fit by greatest remainders (SK): Every vote count is divided by the Droop-quota variant-3; an interim quotient is rounded downwards or upwards according to whether its remainder is smaller or larger than the select split.

The last method involves a variant of the Droop-quota. The proper Droop-quota is the downward rounding of $(V/(S+1)) + 1$, where V is the sum of all effective votes and S is the seat total. Its variant-3 (DQ3) is the standard rounding of $V/(S+1)$. The proper Droop-quota itself is used in STV schemes.

STV schemes ask voters to mark on the ballot sheet their preference order of the candidates. A candidate whose tally of top preferences (first preferences in the first count, first plus lower-order preferences in later counts) meets or exceeds the Droop-quota is assigned a seat. Surplus ballots in excess of the quota as well as ballots of eliminated lower ranked candidates are transferred to the remaining candidates for second and subsequent counts. Two transfer strategies were employed at the 2019 elections:

STVran STV scheme with random transfers (IE, MT): Surplus ballots and ballots of eliminated candidates are selected for transfer through a random mechanism.

STVfra STV scheme with fractional transfers (Northern Ireland district of UK): Surplus ballots and ballots of eliminated candidates are transferred through a fractional mechanism.

When the STV results are lifted from the level of candidates to the level of parties, it transpires that the schemes equip the parties with seat contingents which conform to the goal of the proportional representation ideal, see the final paragraphs in Sections 3.15 (IE) and 3.20 (MT).

Terms such as vote totals and seat totals depend on the electoral area where the aggregation into totals takes place. At the 2019 elections twenty-two Member States treated their territory as a single electoral constituency.

Three Member States established multiple constituencies and evaluated the electoral results separately within each of them, i.e. without consideration of state-wide totals. BE established 3 constituencies, IE 3, UK 12. To this end the state-wide seat contingent was allotted to constituencies well ahead of the May 2019 elections.

Another three Member States subdivided their territory into two or more electoral districts. DE is subdivided into 16 districts, IT 5, PL 13. These states apportioned their state-wide seats in a two-tier process. The initial tier, called super-apportionment, is the apportionment of the state-wide seat contingent among the state's apportionment parties, without any regard to the district-wise subdivision. The second tier, called sub-apportionment, comprises, for each party separately, the apportionment of the party's overall seats among its various district-lists of candidates.

A two-tier process with super-apportionment and sub-apportionments also evolves in the presence of list alliances. At the 2019 elections, only DK featured list alliances (4).

The ways in which party votes are determined are contingent on the ballot design and vote pattern with which voters can express their will. These particulars of a voting system also constitute the core elements when in the end identifying successful candidates and assigning seats to them.

2.3. Assignment of seats to candidates

Article 1 of the 2002 Election Act leaves it to the Member States whether to realise the proportional representation principle by means of a list system or an STV scheme. Twenty-five Member States choose a list system, IE and MT implement STV schemes, and the UK makes use of both.

The classification of a voting system as a list system has a generic character calling for further specification. In a system with closed lists, voters can only vote for a list of candidates of a party, without the possibility to change the order of candidates on the list. In systems with semi-open lists, voters vote for a party's list of candidates and, optionally, may add one or more preference votes to express their particular support for some of the candidates. In systems with open lists, the lists simply serve as a menu of names presented in alphabetical order, reverse alphabetical order, random order, or any other arbitrary order. Voters are free to select the candidate whom they wish to support. Some systems grant each voter multiple votes with the option to cast the votes for candidates of different parties (panachage).

A related design allows a vote to be cast for a candidate as a person. Only thereafter, implied by the candidates' affiliation with a particular party, the vote is credited towards the vote tally of the candidate's party. This design puts a demonstrative emphasis on the personalisation component of an election. Another option of honouring the personalisation aspect is provided by STV schemes. In yet other instances candidates are independent and contest the election without affiliation to any of the domestic parties.

The role of parties in list systems needs to be viewed with care. Strictly speaking votes are cast in favour of a list of candidates rather than in favour of a party. In many instances lists and parties are in a one-to-one correspondence, and using the terms list and party synonymously is unambiguous. In other instances several parties team up and together present a joint list of candidates. In these cases the term party refers to a coalition of parties and their joint candidate list.

To account for the manifold designs of voting systems we distinguish in the sequel between two vote patterns, list votes and candidate votes. The term list vote (LV) indicates that the vote is cast in the first place for a list of candidates, notwithstanding the possibility that the voting system may grant voters additional preference votes to express their particular support for some of the candidates. The term candidate vote (CV) is used when voters must vote for a person, the attribution to a party being implied only through the person's party affiliation.

Vote pattern LV0 designates a list system with closed lists. Citizens vote for a list of candidates and are granted no (zero) preference votes. The seats are assigned to the top-ranked candidates on the lists. This is the preferred pattern in larger Member States (DE, ES, FR, HU, PT, RO, UK).

Vote patterns LV1, LV2 and LVm are used for list systems with semi-open lists. With vote pattern LV1, citizens not only vote for a list of candidates, but may adjoin up to one preference vote (AT, BG, HR, NL, SE, SI). With vote pattern LV2, up to two preference votes are permitted (CZ, SK). Vote pattern LVm allows multiple preference votes, how many is at the discretion of the voters (BE).

For voting systems with semi-open lists domestic provisions include a bypass rule specifying when a candidate's preference votes tally lets her or him bypass the preordained rank-order on the official party-list. There are two types of bypass rules. A percentage bypass rule requires the candidate's preference votes to meet or exceed a certain percentage of the party's vote total (AT 5%, BG 15%, HR 10%, SE 5%). A quorum bypass rule defines a quorum of one sort or another that preference votes must reach for a candidate to be placed top (BE, NL, SI). When several candidates succeed to overcome the bypass hurdle they are ranked by their preference votes tallies in decreasing order.

Vote patterns 1CV, 2CV, 3CV, 4CV, 5CV, 6CV, mCV cover voting systems with open lists. They allow every voter to cast votes for up to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or more candidates of the same party, with the implied consequence that this party is considered to be the voter's party of choice. The seats of a party are assigned to those candidates who rank top in terms of their preference votes tally. Four Member States permit just one candidate vote (1CV: DK, EE, FI, PL). Six Member States allow two or more candidate votes (2CV: CY; 3CV: IT; 4CV: EL; 5CV: LT; mCV: LV). In LU voters can vote for up to six candidates (6CV) who may belong to different parties.

Vote pattern STV is peculiar to STV schemes. Every voter indicates his or her preference order of the candidates on the ballot sheet, in terms of first preference, second preference, etc.

Table 2.3.1 provides an overview of essential structural information of the 2019 European elections. Detailed results per Member State follow in Section 3.

Table 2.3.1: Structural data, 2019 European elections.

Section		Member State	Seat Contingent upon Withdrawal of the UK			Electoral Threshold	Apportionment Method	Vote Pattern
			before		after			
3.1	AT	Austria	18	+1	19	4% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV1
3.2	BE	ªBelgium*3	21		21	none	DivDwn	LVm
3.3	BG	Bulgaria	17		17	5.7% of votes cast	HaQgrR	LV1
3.4	CY	Cyprus	6		6	1.8% of valid votes	HQ3grR	2CV
3.5	CZ	Czechia	21		21	5% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV2
3.6	DE	ᵇGermany/16	96		96	none	DivStd	LV0
3.7	DK	ᶜDenmark+4	13	+1	14	none	DivDwn	1CV
3.8	EE	Estonia	6	+1	7	none	DivDwn	1CV
3.9	EL	Greece	21		21	3% of valid votes	HQ3-EL	4CV
3.10	ES	Spain	54	+5	59	none	DivDwn	LV0
3.11	FI	Finland	13	+1	14	none	DivDwn	1CV
3.12	FR	France	74	+5	79	5% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV0
3.13	HR	Croatia	11	+1	12	5% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV1
3.14	HU	Hungary	21		21	5% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV0
3.15	IE	ªIreland*3	11	+2	13	none	STVran	STV
3.16	IT	ᵇ,ᵈItaly/5	73	+3	76	4% of valid votes	HQ1grR, HQ1grR	3CV
3.17	LT	Lithuania	11		11	5% of votes cast	HQ2grR	5CV
3.18	LU	Luxembourg	6		6	none	DivDwn	6CV
3.19	LV	Latvia	8		8	5% of votes cast	DivStd	mCV
3.20	MT	Malta	6		6	none	STVran	STV
3.21	NL	Netherlands	26	+3	29	3.8% of votes cast	DivDwn	LV1
3.22	PL	ᵇPoland/13	51	+1	52	5% of valid votes	DivDwn, HaQgrR	1CV
3.23	PT	Portugal	21		21	none	DivDwn	LV0
3.24	RO	Romania	32	+1	33	5% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV0
3.25	SE	Sweden	20	+1	21	4% of valid votes	Div0.6	LV1
3.26	SI	Slovenia	8		8	4% of valid votes	DivDwn	LV1
3.27	SK	Slovakia	13	+1	14	5% of valid votes	DQ3grR	LV2
3.28	UK	ªUnited Kingdom*12	73	−73	–	none	DivDwn, STVfra	LV0, STV
Sum			**751**	**– 73+27**	**705**			

ª) Belgium*3 indicating that Belgium establishes 3 constituencies (similarly: Ireland*3, United Kingdom*12).
ᵇ) Germany/16 indicating that Germany subdivides its area into 16 districts (similarly: Italy/5, Poland/13).
ᶜ) Denmark+4 indicating that Denmark features 4 list alliances.
ᵈ) Italian district sub-apportionments are adjusted so as to match the state-wide super-apportionment.

2.4. Political Groups in the new European Parliament

While MEPs are assigned parliamentary seats via home states and domestic parties, of which there are plenty, parliamentary business in the EP is organised by Political Groups. At the time of writing, there were seven Political Groups, plus non-attached MEPs who did not join any of the Political Groups. The latter are referred to as NI (non-attached MEPs, from the French non-inscrits).

Table 2.4.1 shows the Political Groups in the EP that formed at the constitutive session on 2 July 2019. The then house size was 748 seats since three Spanish MEPs were barred from taking their seats due to pending litigation.

Table 2.4.1: Political Groups in the EP, constitutive session on 2 July 2019.

Acronym	Political Group	Size
EPP	Group of the European People's Party (Christian Democrats)	182
S&D	Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats in the EP	154
Renew Europe	Renew Europe Group	108
Greens/EFA	Group of the Greens / European Free Alliance	74
ID	Identity and Democracy Group	73
ECR	European Conservatives and Reformists Group	62
GUE/NGL	Confederal Group of the European United Left – Nordic Green Left	41
NI	Non-attached Members	54
Sum		**748**

Section 3 documents the attachment of MEPs to one of the Political Groups or to NI.

In the majority of cases all MEPs of a domestic party join the same Political Group. In these cases we add the Political Group to the line showing the party name in the tables 'From votes to seats' (i.e. the second of the triplet tables devoted to a Member State).

In some instances MEPs of a party become members of different groups (DE, ES, NL, PL, SK). In these instances we mention the Political Group in the tables 'From seats to MEPs' (i.e. the third of the three tables).

For every Member State the first table 'Base data' collects some basic information, such as number of seats to be filled, size of the electorate, number of votes (votes cast, valid votes, effective votes – as applicable), vote pattern, number of parties contesting the election and number of parties participating in the seat apportionment process, gender distribution, etc. Since the Member States' electoral systems are so different we do not enforce an identical template for the base data, but rather confine the tables to the data pertinent for the particular Member State under review.

3. The 2019 elections, by Member State

3.1. AT – Republic of Austria

Austria has a contingent of eighteen seats, which was raised by one seat after the UK left the EU. Seven parties campaigned at the election. Parties must submit their list of candidates to the Federal Election Authority at the latest by 5 p.m. on the forty-fourth day before election day. A party-list contains a maximum of forty-two candidates.

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. A preference vote is expressed on the ballot sheet by writing into a designated box either the candidate's last name, or the candidate's reference number in the party-list.

Table 3.1.1: Austria, base data.

EP2019AT-1	
Seat contingent	18 + 1
Electorate	6 416 177
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Valid votes	3 779 764
Parties admitted	7
Electoral threshold	151 191 (= 4% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	5
Effective party votes	3 710 438
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	5% bypass rule
Candidates admitted	119 female + 145 male = 264
MEPs gender	9 female + 9 male = 18

There is an electoral threshold of four per cent of the valid votes. Thus a party participates in the seat apportionment process only when garnering 151 191 votes or more (since four per cent of 3 779 764 equals 151 190.56). Two parties failed the threshold, leaving five apportionment parties.

The apportionment of the contingent of eighteen seats is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 180 000 votes justify roughly[10] one seat. The values of the interim quotients indicate that the next, nineteenth seat will be apportioned to GRÜNE (divisor 170 000).

Table 3.1.2: Austria, from votes to seats.

EP2019AT-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
ÖVP	1 305 956	7.3	7	EPP
SPÖ	903 151	5.02	5	S&D
FPÖ	650 114	3.6	3	ID
GRÜNE	532 193	2.96	2+1	Greens/EFA
NEOS	319 024	1.8	1	Renew Europe
Sum	**3 710 438**	**[180 000]**	**18+1**	

---

[10]   The term 'roughly' is taken to be synonymous for 'up to the final step of rounding', here: of rounding downwards.

The seats apportioned to a party are assigned to its candidates following the rank-order on the party-list, except that a candidate bypasses the order when satisfying a five per cent bypass rule. The bypass rule demands a candidate's preference votes tally to meet or exceed five per cent of the party's vote total. When the rule is satisfied the candidate advances to the top of the list irrespective of the initial list place.

In 2019 nine candidates were elected due to their preference vote tallies. Two of them resigned promptly and did not take their seats. The list places of these candidates were not decisive for the seat assignment, yet a favourable placement may have been conducive for them to acquire so many preference votes. In Table 3.1.3 the list places of these candidates are crossed out. The other MEPs got a seat on the grounds of their rank-place on the party-list, not on the grounds of their preference votes tallies. This is indicated in Table 3.1.3 by crossing out their preference vote tallies.

Table 3.1.3: Austria, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019AT-3	List Place	Preference Votes
ÖVP (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 1 305 956 = 65 298)		
1. Karoline Edtstadler	~~2~~	115 906
2. Othmar Karas	~~1~~	103 035
3. Angelika Winzig	~~3~~	85 031
4. Simone Schmiedtbauer	4	~~64 240~~
5. Lukas Mandl	5	~~38 605~~
6.[a] Barbara Thaler	8	~~38 285~~
7.[a] Alexander Bernhuber	11	~~30 338~~
SPÖ (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 903 151 = 45 158)		
1. Andreas Schieder	~~1~~	72 863
2. Evelyn Regner	2	~~12 089~~
3. Günther Sidl	3	~~8 421~~
4. Bettina Vollath	4	~~7 738~~
5. Hannes Heide	5	~~12 455~~
FPÖ (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 650 114 = 32 506)		
1. Harald Vilimsky	~~1~~	64 525
2.[b] Petra Steger	3	~~3 380~~
3. Georg Mayer	2	~~2 514~~
GRÜNE (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 532 193 = 26 610)		
1.[c] Monika Vana	3	~~6 569~~
2. Sarah Wiener	~~2~~	35 741
+3. Thomas Waitz	4	~~4 742~~
NEOS (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 319 024 = 15 952)		
1. Claudia Gamon	~~1~~	64 341

[a]) List places 6, 7 and 9, 10 resigning in favour of preference votes ranking.
[b]) Petra Steger incoming for Heinz-Christian Strache (44 751 preference votes, list place ~~42~~).
[c]) Monika Vana incoming for Werner Kogler (70 821 preference votes, list place ~~1~~).

3.2. BE – Kingdom of Belgium

Belgium is allocated a contingent of twenty-one seats. Candidates had to be nominated by the fifty-seventh day prior to the election. A total of 316 candidates were named. There were 148 female candidates and 168 male candidates.

On the ballot sheets voters may mark a party (a list vote), or one candidate or more from the same party (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 support for the party-list as is.

Table 3.2.1: Belgium, base data.

EP2019BE-1	
Seat contingent	21
Electorate	8 122 985
Constituencies	3
Vote pattern	LVm
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	22
Effective party votes	6 732 157
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	Quorum bypass rule
Candidates admitted	148 female + 168 male = 316
MEPs gender	8 female + 13 male = 21

Domestic provisions establish three constituencies for separate evaluation of electoral results:

1. Dutch Electoral College – 12 seats,
2. French Electoral College – 8 seats,
3. German Language Community – 1 seat.

There is no electoral threshold. Seats are apportioned among parties using the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn), in each constituency separately. In the Dutch Electoral College every 270 000 votes justify roughly one seat, in the French Electoral College, 218 000, and in the German Language Community, 10 000.

Table 3.2.2: Belgium, from votes to seats.

EP2019BE-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
1. Dutch Electoral College				
N-VA	954 048	3.5	3	ECR
VLAAMS BELANG	811 169	3.004	3	ID
Open Vld	678 051	2.5	2	Renew Europe
CD&V	617 651	2.3	2	EPP
GROEN	525 908	1.9	1	Greens/EFA
sp.a	434 002	1.6	1	S&D
2 Others	230 776	–	0	
Sum	**4 251 605**	**[270 000]**	**12**	
2. French Electoral College				
PS	651 157	2.99	2	S&D
ECOLO	485 655	2.2	2	Greens/EFA
MR	470 654	2.2	2	Renew Europe
PTB	355 883	1.6	1	GUE/NGL
CDH	218 078	1.004	1	EPP
2 Others	258 348	–	0	
Sum	**2 439 775**	**[218 000]**	**8**	

3. German Language Community				
CSP	14.247	1,4	1	EPP
6 Others	26 530	–	0	
Sum	**40 777**	**[10 000]**	**1**	

The assignment of seats to candidates relies on a quorum bypass rule. The quorum of a party is the upward rounding of its vote total divided by its seat number plus one (Droop-quota). A candidate with more preference votes than required by the quorum of her or his party is assigned a seat.

In addition, in order to aid the upper echelons on a list to bridge a remaining gap between their preference votes tally and the bypass quorum, the system provides what it calls 'devolution votes'. The number of devolution votes is taken to be half the number of pure list votes, i.e. votes which do not include a preference vote for any of the titular candidates. Presumably it is thought that every second of these voters intends not only to support the party, but also to endorse the sequencing of candidates on the party-list. Devolution votes, one after the other, are dealt out to candidates who rank high on their party-list until their preference votes tally reaches the bypass quorum or the devolution pool is exhausted. The main effect of this action is that the list sequence of candidates, as submitted by party headquarters, is shielded against the ranking by preference vote tallies that are induced by the voters.

For example, in the Dutch Electoral College, party N-VA has bypass quorum 238 512. Geert BOURGEOIS, list place 1, garners more preference votes and hence is assigned the first seat. Assita KANKO, list place 2, has 85 950 preference votes and fails the quorum. From the devolution pool of 246 206 votes, 152 562 are granted to KANKO. Since the sum of 85 950 and 152 562 is 238 512, she now meets the quorum and is assigned the second seat. The remaining devolution votes, 246 206 – 152 562 = 93 644, benefit Johan VAN OVERTVELDT on list place 3. His updated tally 198 367 still fails the quorum, but outperforms all subsequent candidates on the list. Hence VAN OVERTVELDT is assigned the third seat.

Table 3.2.3: Belgium, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019BE-3	List Place	Preference Votes + Devolution Votes
1. Dutch Electoral College		
N-VA (Bypass quorum: 238 512; devolution votes: 246 206)		
1. Geert BOURGEOIS	~~1~~	343 290
2. Assita KANKO	~~2~~	85 950 + 152 562 = 238 512
3. Johan VAN OVERTVELDT	3	104 723 + 93 644 = ~~198 367~~
VLAAMS BELANG (Bypass quorum: 202 793; devolution votes: 256 429)		
1. Gerolf ANNEMANS	~~1~~	207 054
2.ᵃ Tom VANDENDRIESSCHE	substitute	68 871 + 133 922 = 202 793
3. Filip DE MAN	3	58 486 + 105 614 = ~~164 100~~
Open Vld (Bypass quorum: 226 017; devolution votes: 129 188)		
1. Guy VERHOFSTADT	~~1~~	342 460
2. Hilde VAUTMANS	2	63 225 + 129 188 = ~~192 413~~
CD&V (Bypass quorum: 205 884; devolution votes: 126 059)		
1. Kris PEETERS	~~1~~	256 822
2. Cindy FRANNSEN	2	50 014 + 126 059 = ~~176 073~~
GROEN (Bypass quorum: 262 954; devolution votes: 145 957)		
1. Petra DE SUTTER	~~1~~	143 377 + 119 577 = 262 954
sp.a (Bypass quorum: 217 001; devolution votes: 116 481)		
1. Kathleen VAN BREMPT	~~1~~	127 053 + 89 948 = 217 001

2. French Electoral College		
PS (Bypass quorum: 217 053; devolution votes: 140 818)		
1.[b] Marc TARABELLA	substitute	54 154 + 162 889 = 217 053
2. Maria ARENA	2	68 981 + 140 818 = ~~209 799~~
ECOLO (Bypass quorum: 161 885; devolution votes: 144 273)		
1. Philippe LAMBERTS	~~1~~	115 922 + 45 963 = 161 885
2. Saskia BRICMONT	2	57 261 + 98 310 = ~~155 571~~
MR (Bypass quorum: 156 885; devolution votes: 124 299)		
1. Olivier CHASTEL	~~1~~	123 331 + 33 554 = 156 885
2. Frédérique RIES	~~2~~	111 477 + 45 408 = 156 885
PTB (Bypass quorum: 177 942; devolution votes: 115 826)		
1. Marc BOTENGA	~~1~~	68 033 + 109 909 = 177 942
CDH (Bypass quorum: 109 039; devolution votes: 49 132)		
1. Benoît LUTGEN	~~1~~	95 783 + 13 256 = 109 039
3. German Language Community		
CSP (Bypass quorum: 7 124; devolution votes: 2 628)		
1. Pascal ARIMONT	~~1~~	8 992

[a]) Tom VANDENDRIESSCHE, first on list of substitute candidates, incoming for Patsy VALET (51 978 + 150 815 = 202 793).
[b]) Marc TARABELLA, first substitute candidate, incoming for Paul MAGNETTE (295 339 preference votes, list place 1).

3.3. BG – Republic of Bulgaria

Bulgaria is allocated a contingent of seventeen seats. Twenty-one parties and six independent candidates were admitted at the election. A party-list may contain no more than seventeen candidates. The registration of the candidate lists had to be effected not later than 32 days in advance of polling day. Altogether 318 candidates were admitted to the election.

On the ballot sheets voters mark either a party (a list vote) or an independent candidate. When casting a list vote, 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 on the marked list.

There is a quorum electoral threshold applying to parties as well as to independent candidates. The threshold is the valid votes-to-seats ratio and equals 118 548 votes (as 2 015 314 / 17 = 118 547.88). The threshold exceeds five per cent of votes cast (since 118 548 / 2 095 561 = 5.7 per cent), thus violating Art. 3 of the 2002 Electoral Act. Five parties passed the threshold, but no independent candidates did.

Table 3.3.1: Bulgaria, base data.

EP2019BG-1	
Seat contingent	17
Electorate	6 838 863
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Votes cast	2 095 561
Valid votes	2 015 314
Parties admitted	21, plus 6 independent candidates
Electoral threshold	118 548 (= 5.7% of votes cast)
Apportionment parties	4 parties plus 1 coalition
Effective party votes	1 667 178
Apportionment method	HaQgrR
Preference vote hurdle	15% bypass rule
Candidates admitted	93 female + 225 male = 318
MEPs gender	5 female + 12 male = 17

The seat apportionment is carried out using the Hare-quota method with fit by greatest remainders (HaQgrR). The Hare-quota is the effective votes-to-seats ratio, 1 667 178 / 17 = 98 069.29. That is, every 98 069.29 shares of vote justify roughly one seat. Interim quotients with a remainder below the split .4 are rounded downwards. With a remainder above the split .4 they are rounded upwards.

Table 3.3.2: Bulgaria, from votes to seats.

EP2019BG-2	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HaQgrR)	Political Group
Coal. GERB	607 194	6.2	6	EPP
BSP	474 160	4.8	5	S&D
DPS	323 510	3.3	3	Renew Europe
VMRO	143 830	1.5	2	ECR
Demokratichna Bulgaria	118 484	1.2	1	EPP
Sum	**1 667 178**	**[.4]**	**17**	

The assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates follows the rank-order of the party-list, except for a fifteen per cent bypass rule to honour preference votes. A candidate advances to the

top of the list when his or her preference votes tally meets or exceeds fifteen per cent of the party's vote total.

The fifteen per cent bypass rule reinforces the standing of the top-listed candidates of BSP, VMRO and Demokratichna Bulgaria. It makes no difference to the seat assignment, though it may please the candidates' kudos.

Table 3.3.3: Bulgaria, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019BG-3	List Place	Preference Votes
GERB (Bypass hurdle: 15% of 607 194 = 91 080)		
1.ᵃ Emil RADEV	8	~~24 168~~
2. Andrey KOVATCHEV	2	~~9 357~~
3. Andrey NOVAKOV	3	~~9 218~~
4. Eva MAYDELL	4	~~7 432~~
5. Asim ADEMOV	5	~~7 220~~
6. Alexander ALEXANDROV YORDANOV	6	~~13 752~~
BSP (Bypass hurdle: 15% of 474 160 = 71 124)		
1. Elena YONCHEVA	~~1~~	82 009
2. Petar VITANOV	2	~~3 601~~
3. Tsvetelina PENKOVA	3	~~2 670~~
4. Ivo HRISTOV	4	~~13 958~~
5. Sergei STANISHEV	5	~~30 268~~
DPS (Bypass hurdle: 15% of 323 510 = 48 527)		
1.ᵇ Iskra MIHAYLOVA	4	~~3 565~~
2.ᶜ Atidzhe ALIEVA-VELI	5	~~2 591~~
3. Ilhan KYUCHYUK	3	~~4 377~~
VMRO (Bypass hurdle: 15% of 143 830 = 21 575)		
1. Angel DZHAMBAZKI	~~1~~	49 109
2. Andrey SLABAKOV	4	~~9 425~~
Demokratichna Bulgaria (Bypass hurdle: 15% of 118 484 = 17 773)		
1. Radan KANEV	~~1~~	34 735

ᵃ) Emil RADEV incoming for Мария Иванова ГАБРИЕЛ (list place 1, ~~82 536~~ preference votes) and Лиляна Павлова ПАВЛОВА (list place 7, ~~27 313~~ preference votes).
ᵇ) Iskra MIHAYLOVA incoming for Мустафа Сали КАРАДАЙЪ (list place 1, ~~12 007~~ preference votes).
ᶜ) Atidzhe ALIEVA-VELI incoming for Делян Славчев ПЕЕВСКИ (list place 2, ~~6 306~~ preference votes).

3.4. CY – Republic of Cyprus

Cyprus is allocated a contingent of six seats. The date of the nomination must be at least seven days prior to the election. Thirteen parties and three independent candidates were admitted at the election. A maximum of six candidates may be listed per party-list.

The ballot sheet format is supportive for voters to cast two candidate votes. Every party occupies a column displaying the names of its candidates, in alphabetical order. A voter may cast one or two candidate votes. If voters mark more than two candidates of the same party, their vote is taken to count towards the party. It is possible to vote just for the party by checking a box that comes last in the column's footline.

Table 3.4.1: Cyprus, base data.

EP2019CY-1	
Seat contingent	6
Electorate	641 181
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	2CV
Valid votes	280 935
Parties admitted	13, plus 3 independent candidate
Electoral threshold	5 057 (= 1.8% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	7
Effective party votes	270 323
Apportionment method	HQ3grR
Candidates admitted	18 female + 60 male = 78
MEPs gender	0 female + 6 male = 6

There is an electoral threshold of 1.8 per cent of the valid votes (5 057 votes). Six parties and the three independent candidates miss the threshold, their 10 612 votes are discarded. The effective votes (270 323) are cast for seven parties. The seat apportionment uses the Hare-quota variant-3 method with fit by greatest remainders (HQ3grR). The Hare-quota variant-3, the valid votes-to-seats ratio without fraction, amounts to 46 822 (since 280 935 / 6 = 46 822.5). Every 46 822 votes justify roughly one seat. Quotients below the split .6 are rounded downwards, above, upwards.

Table 3.4.2: Cyprus, from votes to seats.

EP2019CY-2	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HQ3grR)	Political Group
DISY	81 539	1.7	2	EPP
AKEL	77 241	1.65	2	GUE/NGL
DIKO	38 756	0.8	1	S&D
EDEK	29 715	0.63	1	S&D
3 Others	43 072	–	0	
Sum	**270 323**	**[.6]**	**6**	

The seats of a party are assigned to candidates in the order of preference vote tallies.

Table 3.4.3: Cyprus, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019CY-3	Votes		
		2. Niyazi KIZILYÜREK	11 606
DISY		DIKO	
1. Loukas FOURLAS	43 156	1. Costas MAVRIDES	21 155
2. Lefteris CHRISTOFOROU	39 616	EDEK	
AKEL		1. Demetris PAPADAKIS	11 789
1. Giorgos GEORGIOU	27 063		

3.5. CZ – Czech Republic

Czechia is allocated a contingent of twenty-one seats. Parties, movements or coalitions must present their candidate lists to the Ministry of the Interior no later than sixty-six days prior to election day. A list may exceed the number of MEPs to be elected by one third, i.e. it may include twenty-eight names. Altogether there were 841 candidates. Independent candidacies were not allowed.

Every party, movement or coalition has a ballot sheet of its own. Voters receive a full set of ballot sheets. On the ballot sheet of the party of their choice voters may cast up to two preferential votes for specific candidates. They insert this sheet into an official envelope to go into the ballot box.

Table 3.5.1: Czechia, base data.

EP2019CZ-1	
Seat contingent	21
Electorate	8 316 737
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV2
Valid votes	2 370 765
Parties admitted	39
Electoral threshold	118 539 (= 5% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	7
Effective party votes	2 007 357
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	5% bypass rule
Candidates admitted	191 female + 650 male = 841
MEPs gender	7 female + 14 male = 21

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of valid votes. With 2 370 765 valid votes the threshold amounts to 118 539 votes. It is missed by thirty-two parties, leaving seven apportionment parties and coalitions. The seat apportionment is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 83 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.5.2: Czechia, from votes to seats.

EP2019CZ-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
ANO 2011	502 343	6.1	6	Renew Europe
ODS	344 885	4.2	4	ECR
Piráti	330 844	3.99	3	Greens/EFA
TOP 09 + STAN	276 220	3.3	3	EPP
SPD	216 718	2.6	2	ID
KDU-ČSL	171 723	2.1	2	EPP
KSČM	164 624	1.98	1	GUE/NGL
Sum	**2 007 357**	**[83 000]**	**21**	

The seats of a party are assigned to its list nominees in the order exhibited in the list. However, a candidate bypasses the rank-order of the list and advances to the top when the number of his or her preference votes meets or exceeds five per cent of the total of the party's votes.

Table 3.5.3: Czechia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019CZ-3	List Place	Preference Votes
ANO 2011 (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 502 343 = 25 118)		
1. Dita CHARANZOVÁ	~~1~~	53 924
2. Martina DLABAJOVÁ	~~2~~	31 401
3. Martin HLAVÁČEK	3	~~5 948~~
4. Radka MAXOVÁ	4	~~11 286~~
5. Ondřej KNOTEK	5	~~3 798~~
6. Ondřej KOVAŘÍK	6	~~6 867~~
ODS (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 344 885 = 17 245)		
1. Jan ZAHRADIL	~~1~~	51 381
2. Alexandr VONDRA	~~15~~	29 536
3. Evžen TOŠENOVSKÝ	~~2~~	25 644
4. Veronika VRECIONOVÁ	3	~~8 460~~
Piráti (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 330 844 = 16 543)		
1. Marcel KOLAJA	1	~~15 398~~
2. Markéta GREGOROVÁ	2	~~14 158~~
3. Mikuláš PEKSA	3	~~9 594~~
TOP 09 + STAN (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 276 220 = 13 811)		
1. Luděk NIEDERMAYER	~~3~~	67 430
2. Jiří POSPÍŠIL	~~1~~	37 231
3. Stanislav POLČÁK	~~2~~	25 352
SPD (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 216 718 = 10 836)		
1. Hynek BLAŠKO	~~8~~	47 505
2. Ivan DAVID	~~1~~	33 055
KDU-ČSL (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 171 723 = 8 587)		
1. Tomáš ZDECHOVSKÝ	~~2~~	24 823
2. Michaela ŠOJDROVÁ	~~3~~	22 649
KSČM (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 164 624 = 8 232)		
1. Kateřina KONEČNÁ	~~1~~	38 650

3.6. DE – Federal Republic of Germany

Germany has ninety-six seats to fill. Election proposals must be presented to the Federal Election Officer by the eighty-third day prior to the election. Independent candidates are not admitted.

Germany divides its area into sixteen electoral districts identical to the sixteen states of the federation. Parties may register a single federal list, or separate lists by district. All parties with the exception of CDU and CSU registered a single party-list valid for the whole country. The CSU registered a list just for the one district in which they campaigned (Bavaria). The CDU chose to submit separate lists for each of the fifteen districts where the party stood (all districts except Bavaria). Forty-one parties were admitted at the election, with a total of 1 399 candidates.

Ballot papers vary across the sixteen districts due to distinct district-lists of CDU and CSU. The first ten (or fewer when enforced by lack of space) names of every list are printed on the ballot sheet. Every voter has one vote to mark the party of her or his choice. There is no electoral threshold.

Table 3.6.1: Germany, base data.

EP2019DE-1	
Seat contingent	96
Electorate	61 600 263
Electoral districts	16
Vote pattern	LV0
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	41
Effective party votes	37 396 889
Apportionment method	DivStd, DivStd
Candidates admitted	483 female + 915 male + 1 divers= 1 399
MEPs gender	35 female +61 male =96

The apportionment of seats among parties is a two-tier process due to the fifteen CDU district lists. Both tiers employ the divisor method with standard rounding (DivStd). The super-apportionment distributes the contingent of ninety-six seats among all forty-one parties; every 374 000 votes justify roughly one seat. Twenty-seven parties are left with no seat.

Table 3.6.2: Germany, from votes to seats.

EP2019DE-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivStd)	Political Group
Super-apportionment of 96 seats among 41 parties				
CDU	8 438 975	22.6	23	EPP
GRÜNE	7 677 071	20.53	21	Greens/EFA
SPD	5 916 882	15.8	16	S&D
AfD	4 104 453	11.0	11	ID
CSU	2 355 067	6.3	6	EPP
DIE LINKE	2 056 049	5.497	5	GUE/NGL
FDP	2 028 594	5.4	5	Renew Europe
DIE PARTEI	899 079	2.4	2	(see Table 3.6.3)
FREIE WÄHLER	806 703	2.2	2	Renew Europe
TIERSCHUTZPARTEI	542 226	1.4	1	GUE/NGL
ÖDP	369 869	1.0	1	Greens/EFA
FAMILIE	273 828	0.7	1	ECR
VOLT	249 098	0.7	1	Greens/EFA
PIRATEN	243 302	0.7	1	Greens/EFA
27 Others	1 435 693	–	0	
Sum	**37 396 889**	**[374 000]**	**96**	

District	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivStd)
CDU sub-apportionment of 23 seats among 15 districts			
1. Schleswig-Holstein	353 020	0.9	1
2. Hamburg	140 966	0.4	0
3. Niedersachsen	1 119 352	2.8	3
4. Bremen	64 078	0.2	0
5. Nordrhein-Westfalen	2 237 590	5.6	6
6. Hessen	657 886	1.6	2
7. Rheinland-Pfalz	613 470	1.53	2
8. Baden-Württemberg	1 499 962	3.7	4
9. Saarland	161 897	0.4	0
10. Berlin	229 352	0.6	1
11. Brandenburg	215 523	0.54	1
12. Mecklenburg-Vorpommern	184 894	0.46	0
13. Sachsen	474 730	1.2	1
14. Sachsen-Anhalt	226 438	0.6	1
15. Thüringen	259 817	0.6	1
Sum	**8 438 975**	**[400 000]**	**23**

The CDU sub-apportionment allots the overall CDU seats (23) among the fifteen CDU district-lists. In the CDU sub-apportionment, every 400 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Germany uses closed list systems. Seats are assigned to candidates in the rigid sequence given by party-lists. One MEP of DIE PARTEI is unattached, the other joins the Greens/EFA group.

Table 3.6.3: Germany, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019DE-3	3. Terry REINTKE	9. Gabriele BISCHOFF	DIE LINKE
CDU	4. Reinhard BÜTIKOFER	10. Ismail ERTUG	1. Martin SCHIRDEWAN
1.1. Niclas HERBST	5. Hannah NEUMANN	11. Constanze KREHL	2. Özlem DEMIREL
3.1. David MCALLISTER	6. Martin HÄUSLING	12. Tiemo WÖLKEN	3. Cornelia ERNST
3.2. Jens GIESEKE	7. Anna CAVAZZINI	13. Petra KAMMEREVERT	4. Helmut SCHOLZ
3.3. Lena DÜPONT	8. Erik MARQUARDT	14. Norbert NEUSER	5. Martina MICHELS
5.1. Peter LIESE	9. Katrin LANGENSIEPEN	15. Evelyne GEBHARDT	FDP
5.2. Markus PIEPER	10. Romeo FRANZ	16. Joachim SCHUSTER	1. Nicola BEER
5.3. Sabine VERHEYEN	11. Jutta PAULUS	AfD	2. Svenja HAHN
5.4. Axel VOSS	12. Sergey LAGODINSKY	1. Jörg MEUTHEN	3. Andreas GLÜCK
5.5. Dennis RADTKE	13. Henrike HAHN	2. Guido REIL	4. Moritz KÖRNER
5.6. Stefan BERGER	14. Michael BLOSS	3. Maximilian KRAH	5. Jan-Christoph OETJEN
6.1. Sven SIMON	15. Anna DEPARNAY-GRUNENBERG	4. Lars Patrick BERG	DIE PARTEI
6.2 Michael GAHLER	16. Rasmus ANDRESEN	5. Bernhard ZIMNIOK	1. Martin SONNEBORN NI
7.1. Christine SCHNEIDER	17. Alexandra GEESE	6. Nicolaus FEST	2. Nico SEMSROTT Greens/EFA
7.2. Ralf SEEKATZ	18. Niklas NIENASS	7. Markus BUCHHEIT	FREIE WÄHLER
8.1. Rainer WIELAND	19. Viola VON CRAMON-TAUBADEL	8. Christine ANDERSON	1. Ulrike MÜLLER
8.2 Daniel CASPARY	20. Daniel FREUND	9. Sylvia LIMMER	2. Engin EROGLU
8.3. Andreas SCHWAB	21. Pierrette HERZBERGER-FOFANA	10. Gunnar BECK	TIERSCHUTZPARTEI
8.4. Norbert LINS	SPD	11. Joachim KUHS	1. Martin BUSCHMANN
10.1. Hildegard BENTELE	1. Katarina BARLEY	CSU	ÖDP
11.1. Christian EHLER	2. Udo BULLMANN	1. Manfred WEBER	1. Klaus BUCHNER
13.1. Peter JAHR	3. Maria NOICHL	2. Angelika NIEBLER	FAMILIE
14.1. Sven SCHULZE	4. Jens GEIER	3. Markus FERBER	1. Helmut GEUKING
15.1. Marion WALSMANN	5. Delara BURKHARDT	4. Monika HOHLMEIER	VOLT
GRÜNE	6. Bernd LANGE	5. Christian DOLESCHAL	1. Damian BOESELAGER
1. Ska KELLER	7. Birgit SIPPEL	6. Marlene MORTLER	PIRATEN
2. Sven GIEGOLD	8. Dietmar KÖSTER		1. Patrick BREYER

3.7. DK – Kingdom of Denmark

Denmark has a contingent of thirteen seats which was raised by one seat after the UK left the EU. Faroe Islands and Greenland, although part of the kingdom, are not part of the EU, hence they are not included in the electorate. Lists of candidates must be submitted to the Minister for Economic Affairs and the Interior by noon four weeks prior to election day. A list has a maximum limit of twenty candidates. A total of ten parties with 135 candidates were admitted to the elections.

Just one party stood at the election on its own. The other nine parties registered four list alliances, also referred to as election coalitions. List alliances are not in any way indicated on the ballot paper. Voters have one vote with which they may mark a candidate (personal vote) or a party (list vote). There is no access for independent candidates to stand at the election.

Table 3.7.1: Denmark, base data.

EP2019DK-1	
Seat contingent	13 + 1
Electorate	4 237 550
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	1CV
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	10
Effective votes	2 758 855
List alliances	4
Apportionment method	DivDwn, DivDwn
Candidates admitted	50 female + 85 male = 135
MEPs gender	6 female + 7 male = 13

It is Danish customs that a party is designated by a letter with which it appears on the ballot paper. There are four alliances: Alliance-1 = A + F, Alliance-2 = B + Å, Alliance-3 = V + C + I, and Alliance-4 = Ø + N. Parties allying at the election may fork when looking for congenial Political Groups. In Alliance-1 the MEPs of A joined the S&D group, those of F joined the Greens/EFA group. In Alliance-3 the MEPs of V are in the Renew Europe group, while the C-MEP joins EPP.

The apportionment method used is the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn), both in the super-apportionment among party and alliances, as well as in the ensuing four sub-apportionments among the partners of an alliance. In the super-apportionment every 180 000 votes justify roughly one seat. The values of the interim quotients indicate that the next, additional seat will be apportioned to Alliance-3 (divisor 170 000) and, within Alliance-3, to party V (divisor 150 000).

Table 3.7.2: Denmark, from votes to seats.

EP2019DK-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
Alliance-1	957 540	5.3	5	
Alliance-3	879 440	4.9	4+1	
Alliance-2	370 893	2.1	2	
O	296 978	1.6	1	ID
Alliance-4	254 004	1.4	1	
Sum	**2 758 855**	**[180 000]**	**13+1**	

Party	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
Alliance-1 sub-apportionment				
A	592 645	3.5	3	S&D
F	364 895	2.1	2	Greens/EFA
Sum	**957 540**	**[180 000]**	**5**	
Alliance-2 sub-apportionment				
B	277 929	2.8	2	Renew Europe
Å	92 964	0.9	0	–
Sum	**370 893**	**[100 000]**	**2**	
Alliance-3 sub-apportionment				
V	648 203	3.8	3+1	Renew Europe
C	170 544	1.003	1	EPP
I	60 693	0.4	0	–
Sum	**879 440**	**[170 000]**	**4+1**	
Alliance-4 sub-apportionment				
Ø	151 903	1.2	1	GUE/NGL
N	102 101	**0.8**	**0**	–
Sum	**254 004**	**[130 000]**	**1**	

The presence of alliances causes a discordant seat apportionment. Party O garners twenty-thousand votes more than party B (296 978 versus 277 929), but is apportioned fewer seats (one versus two). Without alliances, B would have lost a seat to V.

The seats of a party are assigned to its candidates on the basis of their personal votes.

Table 3.7.3: Denmark, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019DK-3	Votes		
		2. Kira Marie PETER-HANSEN	15 765
V (Venstre, Danmarks Liberale Parti)		O (Dansk Folkeparti)	
1. Morten LØKKEGAARD	207 558	1. Peter KOFOD	119 408
2. Søren GADE	201 696	B (Radikale Venstre)	
3. Asger CHRISTENSEN	31 347	1. Morten PETERSEN	97 667
+4. Linea SØGAARD-LIDELL	24 153	2. Karen MELCHIOR	17 292
A (Socialdemokratiet)		C (Konservativt Folkeparti)	
1.ᵃ Marianne VIND	27 396	1. Pernille WEISS	80 140
2. Christel SCHALDEMOSE	65 179	Ø (Enhedslisten – De Rød-Grønne)	
3. Niels FUGLSANG	29 444	1. Nikolaj VILLUMSEN	50 567
F (SF – Socialistisk Folkeparti)			
1. Margrete AUKEN	199 522		

ᵃ) Marianne VIND incoming for Jeppe KOFOD (188 757 personal votes).
ᵇ) Kira Marie PETER-HANSEN incoming for Karsten HØNGE (19 687 personal votes).

At the 2019 election the practiced vote pattern was 1CV. However, legal provisions allow a party to register its list with the imposition to apply vote pattern LV1. In this latter case, the tallies of personal votes would need to satisfy a quorum bypass rule, with the Droop-quota as the quorum, to be placed ahead of the list. Otherwise, the list ranking would be decisive.

3.8. EE – Republic of Estonia

Estonia has a contingent of six seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. The nomination of candidates ends on the fiftieth day before election day at 6 p.m. Nine parties and five independent candidates contested the election. The total number of candidates was sixty-six.

Voters cast a vote for a specific candidate by writing the serial number of this candidate on the ballot sheet or by typing it into an electronic device. Sixty-one candidates are affiliated with one of the nine parties, their candidate votes are aggregated per party. Five candidates remain unattached and, in the end, are unsuccessful.

Table 3.8.1: Estonia, base data.

EP2019EE-1	
Seat contingent	6 + 1
Electorate	885 417
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	1CV
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	9, plus 5 independent candidates
Effective votes	332 104
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	21 female + 25 male = 66
MEPs gender	2 female + 4 male = 6

The seats are apportioned between parties and independent candidates using the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). With six seats, 36 000 votes justify roughly one seat. When contemplating the interim quotients' values it becomes visible that the next, seventh seat will be apportioned to the political party Isamaa Erakond (with divisor 30 000). Four parties gain parliamentary seats, five after the UK left the EU.

Table 3.8.2: Estonia: from votes to seats.

EP2019EE-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
Eesti Reformierakond	87 160	2.4	2	Renew Europe
Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond	77 375	2.1	2	S&D
Eesti Keskerakond	47 799	1.3	1	Renew Europe
Eesti Konservatiivne Rahvaerakond	42 265	1.2	1	ID
Isamaa Erakond	34 188	0.9	0+1	EPP
9 Others (4 parties, 5 indep.)	43 317	–	0	
Sum	**332 104**	**[36 000]**	**6+1**	

The seats of a party are assigned to its candidates in the sequence of candidates' vote tallies.

Table 3.8.3: Estonia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019EE-3	Votes	Eesti Keskerakond	
Eesti Reformierakond		1. Yana TOOM	26 990
1. Andrus ANSIP	41 017	Eesti Konservatiivne Rahvaerakond	
2. Urmas PAET	30 014	1. Jaak MADISON	22 819
Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond		Isamaa Erakond	
1. Marina KALJURAND	65 549	+1. Riho TERRAS	21 477
2. Sven MIKSER	2 886		

3.9. EL – Hellenic Republic

Greece is allocated a contingent of twenty-one seats. Registration of parties ends on the fiftieth day before election day. Forty parties registered at the election, altogether nominating 1 209 candidates. Every party or coalition has its own ballot paper. Voters select the ballot paper of the party of their choice and may express their preferences for up to four of the listed candidates. There is an electoral threshold of three per cent of the valid votes, setting aside thirty-four parties and leaving six apportionment parties.

Table 3.9.1: Greece, base data.

EP2019EL-1	
Seat contingent	21
Electorate	10 088 325
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	4CV
Valid votes	5 656 119
Parties admitted	40
Electoral threshold	169 684 (= 3% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	4 468 142
Apportionment method	HQ3-EL
Candidates admitted	513 female + 696 male = 1 209
MEPs gender	5 female + 16 male = 21

The apportionment of seats among parties is one-of-a-kind, by including the sum of the votes of the forty non-apportionment parties, 1 187 977, to concoct a peculiar fitting process. It is in two phases. Phase-1 relies on the Hare-quota variant-3, the integer part of the valid vote total divided by the seat total, 5 656 119 / 21 = 269 339. A party's vote total is divided by the quota, and the integer part of the resulting quotient (Quot.-1) signifies the number of seats to be apportioned in Phase-1. Every 269 339 votes justify roughly one seat. Phase-1 deals out thirteen seats, leaving eight to be looked after in Phase-2.

Phase-2 refers to the unused voting power (UVP) of the parties. For example, the six Phase-1 seats for ND use 6 x 269 339 = 1 616 034 votes, leaving 1 873 137 – 1 616 034 = 257 103 unused votes. The unused voting powers, including the ineffective votes, total 2 154 712. This total is divided by the number of residual seats (8) plus one. The integer part of the resulting quotient is 239 412 (DQ5, Droop-quota variant-5), it enters into Phase-2. For every party, its unused voting power is divided by 239 412 to obtain the second quotients Quot.-2. A party's Phase-1 seat number is augmented by the integer part of the second quotient (ND: 6 + 1 = 7, SYRIZA: 4 + 1 = 5). This leaves 8 – 2 = 6 residual seats to finalise the process. They are apportioned by greatest Quot.-2 remainders, first among the parties who so far did not receive any Phase-2 seats (EL, KINAL, KKE, XA), and then among the others (SYRIZA, ND).[11]

---

[11]   The same apportionment emerges when using the divisor method with upward rounding (with divisor 250 000).

Table 3.9.2: Greece, from votes to seats.

EP2019EL-2	Votes	Quot.-1 [HQ3]	Phase-1	UVP	Quot.-2 [DQ5]	Phase-2	Seats (HQ3-EL)	Political Group
ND	1 873 137	6.96	6	257 103	1.074	7+1	8	EPP
SYRIZA	1 343 595	4.99	4	266 239	1.112	5+1	6	GUE/NGL
KINAL	436 726	1.6	1	167 387	0.699	1+1	2	S&D
KKE	302 603	1.1	1	33 264	0.139	1+1	2	NI
XA	275 734	1.02	1	6 395	0.027	1+1	2	NI
EL	236 347	0.9	0	236 347	0.987	0+1	1	ECR
Ineffective votes	1 187 977	–	–	1 187 977	–	–	–	
Sum	**5 656 119**	**[269 339]**	**13**	**2 154 712**	**[239 412]**	**15+6**	**21**	

Within a party, the seats are assigned to the candidates who performed best in terms of their preference vote tallies.

Table 3.9.3: Greece, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019EL-3	Votes		
ND		4. Stelios KOULOGLOU	198 436
		5. Alexis GEORGOULIS	162 974
1. Stelios KYMPOUROPOULOS	577 114	6. Petros KOKKALIS	140 404
2. Vangelis MEIMARAKIS	496 600	KINAL	
3. Maria SPYRAKI	319 237	1. Nikos ANDROULAKIS	180 822
4. Elissavet VOZEMPERGK-VRIONIDI	288 427	2. Eva KAILI	145 650
5. Emmanouil KEFALOGIANNIS	257 819	KKE	
6. Anna-Michelle ASIMAKOPOULOU	225 211	1. Konstantinos PAPADAKIS	55 956
7. Georgios KYRTSOS	196 929	2.[a] Lefteris NIKOLAOU-ALAVANOS	34 457
8. Theodoros ZAGORAKIS	195 264	XA	
SYRIZA		1. Ioannis LAGOS	130 488
1. Dimitrios PAPADIMOULIS	272 835	2. Athanasios KONSTANTINOU	50 360
2. Elena KOUNTOURA	236 961	EL	
3. Konstantinos ARVANITIS	220 816	1.[b] Emmanouil FRAGKOS	27 665

[a] Lefteris NIKOLAOU-ALAVANOS incoming for Asimina DIGENI (36 170 candidate votes).

[b] Emmanouil FRAGKOS incoming for Kyriakos VELOPOULOS (159 319 candidate votes).

3.10. ES – Kingdom of Spain

Spain has a contingent of fifty-four seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by five seats. Candidate lists had to be submitted to the electoral authority at the latest ten days after the Royal Decree announcing the European elections and were published in the Official Journal on 30 April 2019. Thirty-two parties and coalitions contested the election, with a total of 1 917 candidates. Every party had its own ballot paper. Voters select the ballot sheet of the party of their choice, put it into an apposite envelope, and cast the envelope into the ballot box.

Table 3.10.1: Spain, base data.

EP2019ES-1	
Seat contingent	54 + 5
Electorate	37 248 888
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV0
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	32
Effective votes	22 209 330
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	901 female + 1016 male = 1 917
MEPs gender	24 female + 27 male = 51

The whole country is treated as a single constituency. There is no electoral threshold. The apportionment of seats among parties is carried out using the divisor method with downward rounding. Every 360 000 votes justify roughly one seat. Eight parties and coalitions obtain parliamentary seats, twenty-four parties are left empty-handed. With five added seats, because of the UK withdrawal from the EU, the electoral key drops to 337 000 votes. Of the additional seats, one each goes to PSOE, PP, Cs, Vox, and Junts.

Table 3.10.2: Spain, from votes to seats.

EP2019ES-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
PSOE	7 369 789	20.5	20+1	S&D
PP	4 519 205	12.6	12+1	EPP
Cs	2 731 825	7.6	7+1	Renew Europe
Podemos-IU	2 258 857	6.3	6	(see Table 3.10.3)
Vox	1 393 684	3.9	3+1	ECR
Ahora Repúblicas	1 252 139	3.5	3	(see Table 3.10.3)
Junts	1 018 435	2.8	2+1	(see Table 3.10.3)
CEUS	633 090	1.8	1	Renew Europe
24 Others	1 032 306	–	0	
Sum	**22 209 330**	**[360 000]**	**54+5**	

Spain uses a closed list system. Seats are assigned to candidates in the sequence of the printed party-lists.

Table 3.10.3: Spain, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019ES-3	PP	Podemos-IU
PSOE	1. Dolors MONTSERRAT	1. Eugenia RODRÍGUEZ PALOP GUE/NGL
21.ª Estrella DURÁ FERRANDIS	2. Esteban GONZÁLEZ PONS	2. Sira REGO GUE/NGL
2. Iratxe GARCÍA PÉREZ	3. Antonio LÓPEZ-ISTÚRIZ WHITE	3. Ernest URTASUN Greens/EFA
3. Lina GÁLVEZ MUÑOZ	4. Juan Ignacio ZOIDO ÁLVAREZ	4. Idoia VILLANUEVA RUIZ GUE/NGL
4. Javi LÓPEZ	5. Pilardel CASTILLO VERA	5. Miguel URBÁN CRESPO GUE/NGL
5. Inma RODRÍGUEZ-PIÑERO	6. Javier ZARZALEJOS	6. Manu PINEDA GUE/NGL
6. Ibán GARCÍA DEL BLANCO	7. José Manuel GARCÍA-MARGALLO	Vox
7. Eider GARDIAZABAL RUBIAL	8. Francisco José MILLÁN MON	1. Jorge BUXADÉ VILLALBA
8. Nicolás GONZÁLEZ CASARES	9. Rosa ESTARÀS FERRAGUT	2. Mazaly AGUILAR
9. Cristina MAESTRE MARTÍN DE ALMAGRO	10. Isabel BENJUMEA BENJUMEA	3. Hermann TERTSCH
10. César LUENA	11. Pablo ARIAS ECHEVERRÍA	+4. Margarita DE LA PISA CARRIÓN
11. Clara AGUILERA	12. Leopoldo LÓPEZ GIL	AHORA REPÚBLICAS
12. Nacho SÁNCHEZ AMOR	+13. Gabriel MATO ADROVER	1.ᵇ Oriol JUNQUERAS I VIES –
13. Mónica Silvana GONZÁLEZ	Cs	2. Pernando BARRENA ARZA GUE/NGL
14. Juan Fernando LÓPEZ AGUILAR	1. Luis GARICANO	3. Diana RIBA I GINER Greens/EFA
15. Adriana MALDONADO LÓPEZ	2. Maite PAGAZAURTUNDÚA	Junts
16. Jonás FERNÁNDEZ	3. María Soraya RODRÍGUEZ RAMOS	1.ᵇ Carles PUIGDEMONT CASAMAJ –
17. Alicia HOMS GINEL	4. Javier NART	2.ᵇ Antoni COMÍN OLIVERES –
18. Javier MORENO SÁNCHEZ	5. José Ramón BAUZÁ DÍAZ	+3. Clara PONSATÍ I OBIOLS NI
19. Isabel GARCÍA MUÑOZ	6. Jordi CAÑAS	CEUS
20. Domènec RUIZ DEVESA	7. Susana SOLÍS PÉREZ	1. Izaskun BILBAO BARANDICA
+22. Marcos ROS SEMPERE	+8. Adrián VÁZQUEZ LÁZARA	

ᵃ) Estrella DURÁ FERRANDES incoming for Josep BORRELL FONTELLES (list place 1).
ᵇ) Oriol JUNQUERAS I VIES, Carles PUIGDEMONT CASAMAJ, Antoni COMÍN OLIVERES barred from taking their seats due to pending litigation.

3.11. FI – Republic of Finland

Finland has a contingent of thirteen seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. Candidate lists had to be submitted by Thursday 18 April 2019. There are 269 candidates, listed alphabetically within their parties and identified by a serial number. Voters cast a vote for the candidate of their choice by writing his or her serial number onto the ballot sheet. The ballot sheet is frugal, just offering a circle where to jot down the candidate's number.

Table 3.11.1: Finland, base data.

EP2019FI-1	
Seat contingent	13 + 1
Electorate	4 504 480
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	1CV
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	18
Effective votes	1 830 045
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	106 female + 163 male = 269
MEPs gender	7 female + 6 male = 13

Finland is a single constituency. The votes for the candidates who are affiliated with the same party are aggregated. There is no electoral threshold. The seat apportionment uses the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 100 000 votes justify roughly one seat. After the UK leaves the EU, with fourteen seats, the electoral key drops to 96 000 votes. The fourteenth seat was apportioned to VIHR. Of the eighteen participating parties, eleven finish with no seat.

Table 3.11.2: Finland, from votes to seats.

EP2019FI-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
KOK	380 460	3.8	3	EPP
VIHR	292 892	2.9	2+1	Greens/EFA
SDP	267 603	2.7	2	S&D
PS	253 176	2.5	2	ID
KESK	247 477	2.5	2	Renew Europe
V	126 063	1.3	1	GUE/NGL
SFP	115 962	1.2	1	Renew Europe
11 Others	146 412	–	0	
Sum	**1 830 045**	**[100 000]**	**13+1**	

The assignment of seats to candidates is solely based on their personal vote tallies.

Table 3.11.3: Finland, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019FI-3	Votes		
		2. Miapetra KUMPULA-NATRI	68 542
KOK		PS	
1. Sirpa PIETIKÄINEN	77 588	1. Laura HUHTASAARI	92 760
2. Henna VIRKKUNEN	70 687	2. Teuvo HAKKARAINEN	29 083
3. Petri SARVAMAA	64 560	KESK	
VIHR		1. Mauri PEKKARINEN	68 487
1. Ville NIINISTÖ	111 714	2. Elsi KATAINEN	54 627
2. Heidi HAUTALA	89 769	V	
+3. Alviina ALAMETSÄ	13 687	1. Silvia MODIG	51 844
SDP		SFP	
1. Eero HEINÄLUOMA	128 234	1. Nils TORVALDS	46 473

3.12. FR – French Republic

France has a contingent of seventy-four seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by five seats. Thirty-four parties contested the election, nominating a total of 2 618 candidates. Candidacies had to be declared to the Electoral Bureau of the Ministry of the Interior between Monday 23 April, and Friday 3 May, during opening hours. By law every list must alternate between female and male candidates. This secures gender parity among elected MEPs since France uses fixed lists (vote pattern LV0). Indeed, of the seventy-four MEPs thirty-seven are female and thirty-seven are male.

Table 3.12.1: France, base data.

EP2019FR-1	
Seat contingent	74 + 5
Electorate	47 345 328
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV0
Valid votes	22 655 174
Parties admitted	34
Electoral threshold	1 132 759 (= 5% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	18 173 102
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	1 297 female + 1 321 male = 2 618
MEPs gender	37 female + 37 male = 74

Previously France established eight constituencies for separate evaluation of the election results. At the 2019 election France is taken to be a single constituency. There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of valid votes. With 22 655 174 valid votes, the threshold amounts to 1 132 759 votes. Twenty-eight parties stay below the threshold. Their votes accumulate to a remarkable share of twenty per cent of the valid votes (4 482 072 / 22 655 174 = 19.8%). That is, of five votes, just four become effective, and one is discarded as ineffective.

The divisor method with downward rounding determines the apportionment of seats among parties. Every 237 000 votes justify roughly one seat. With seventy-nine seats after the UK leaves the EU, the divisor becomes 220 600. The five additional seats will be handed out to RN (1), LREM (2), Les Verts (1), and PS (1).

Table 3.12.2: France, from votes to seats.

EP2019FR-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
Rassemblement national	5 286 939	22.3	22+1	ID
LREM, MoDem et al.	5 079 015	21.4	21+2	Renew Europe
EE Les Verts et al.	3 055 023	12.9	12+1	Greens/EFA
Les Républicains et al.	1 920 407	8.1	8	EPP
La France insoumise et al.	1 428 548	6.03	6	GUE/NGL
Parti socialiste et al.	1 403 170	5.9	5+1	S&D
Sum	**18 173 102**	**[237 000]**	**74+5**	

The assignment of seats to candidates strictly follows the sequencing how candidates are listed in the registered party-lists.

Table 3.12.3: France, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019FR-3	4. Jérémy DECERLE	9. François ALFONSI
Rassemblement national	5. Catherine CHABAUD	10. Salima YENBOU
1. Jordan BARDELLA	6. Stéphane SÉJOURNÉ	11. Benoît BITEAU
2. Hélène LAPORTE	7. Fabienne KELLER	12. Gwendoline DELBOS-CORFIELD
3. Thierry MARIANI	8. Bernard GUETTA	+13. Claude GRUFFAT
4. Dominique BILDE	9. Irène TOLLERET	Les Républicains
5. Hervé JUVIN	10. Stéphane BIJOUX	1. François-Xavier BELLAMI
6. Joëlle MELIN	11. Sylvie BRUNET	2. Agnès EVREN
7. Nicolas BAY	12. Gilles BOYER	3. Arnaud DANJEAN
8. Virginie JORON	13. Stéphanie YON-COURTIN	4. Nadine MORANO
9. Jean-Paul GARRAUD	14. Pierre KARLESKIND	5. Brice HORTEFEUX
10. Catherine GRISET	15. Laurence FARRENG	6. Nathalie COLIN-OESTERLÉ
11. Gilles LEBRETON	16. Dominique RIQUET	7. Geoffroy DIDIER
12. Maxette PIRBAKAS-GRISONI	17. Véronique TRILLET-LENOIR	8. Anne SANDER
13. Jean-François JALKH	18. Pascal DURAND	La France insoumise
14. Aurélia BEIGNEUX	19. Valérie HAYER	1. Manon AUBRY
15. Gilbert COLLARD	20. Christophe GRUDLER	2. Manuel BOMPARD
16. Julie LECHANTEUX	21. Chrysoula ZACHAROPOULOU	3. Leïla CHAIBI
17. Philippe OLIVIER	+22. Sandro GOZI	4. Younous OMARJEE
18. Annika BRUNA	+23. Ilana CICUREL	5. Anne-Sophie PELLETIER
19. Jérôme RIVIÈRE	EE Les Verts	6. Emmanuel MAUREL
20. France JAMET	1. Yannick JADOT	Parti socialist
21. André ROUGÉ	2. Michèle RIVASI	1. Raphaël GLUCKSMANN
22. Mathilde ANDROUËT	3. Damien CARÊME	2. Sylvie GUILLAUME
+23. Jean-Lin LACAPELLE	4. Marie TOUSSAINT	3. Éric ANDRIEU
LREM, MoDem	5. David CORMAND	4. Aurore LALUCQ
1. Nathalie LOISEAU	6. Karima DELLI	5. Pierre LARROUTUROU
2. Pascal CANFIN	7. Mounir SATOURI	+6. Nora MEBAREK
3. Marie-Pierre VEDRENNE	8. Caroline ROOSE	

3.13. HR – Republic of Croatia

Croatia has a contingent of eleven seats which, after the UK leaves the EU, will be raised by one seat. List proposals must be received by the State Electoral Commission at the latest within fourteen days of the day of calling the election. Domestic law requires the lists to contain at least forty per cent female candidates. Thirty-three parties contested the election, with a total of 404 candidates. On the ballot sheets voters mark a party (a list vote) and, optionally, a candidate (a preference vote). A pure preference vote is attributed to the candidate's party.

Table 3.13.1: Croatia, base data.

EP2019HR-1	
Seat contingent	11 + 1
Electorate	3 696 907
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Valid votes	1 073 954
Parties admitted	33
Electoral threshold	53 698 (= 5% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	738 039
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	10% bypass rule
Candidates admitted	162 female + 242 male = 404
MEPs gender	4 female + 7 male = 11

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of the valid votes total, 53 698. Twenty-seven parties miss the threshold, turning their aggregate 335 915 votes ineffective (which is almost a third of all valid votes). The divisor method with downward rounding is used. Every 53 000 votes justify roughly one seat. After the UK leaves the EU the key will be 50 000 votes, the twelfth seat being apportioned to SDP.

Table 3.13.2: Croatia, from votes to seats.

EP2019HR-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
HDZ	244 076	4.6	4	EPP
SDP	200 976	3.8	3+1	S&D
HKS	91 546	1.7	1	ECR
MK	84 765	1.6	1	NI
ŽZ	60 847	1.1	1	NI
A	55 829	1.1	1	Renew Europe
Sum	**738 039**	**[53 000]**	**11+1**	

The seat assignment to candidates takes account of the preference votes by means of a ten per cent bypass rule. That is candidates whose preference votes meet or exceed ten per cent of their party's vote total jump to the top of the party-list, in decreasing order of their preference vote tallies.

Table 3.13.3: Croatia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019HR-3	List Place	Preference Votes
HDZ (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 244 076 = 24 408)		
1. Karlo RESSLER	~~1~~	52 859
2. Dubravka ŠUICA	~~2~~	31 791
3. Tomislav SOKOL	3	~~4 573~~
4. Željana ZOVKO	4	~~9 861~~
SDP (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 200 976 = 20 098)		
1. Biljana BORZAN	~~2~~	64 736
2. Tonino PICULA	~~1~~	50 921
3. Predrag Fred MATIĆ	3	~~13 371~~
+4. Romana JERKOVIĆ	4	~~1 368~~
HKS (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 91 546 = 9 155)		
1. Ruža TOMAŠIĆ	~~1~~	69 989
MK (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 84 765 = 8 477)		
1. Mislav KOLAKUŠIĆ	~~1~~	68 883
ŽZ (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 60 847 = 6 085)		
1. Ivan Vilibor SINČIĆ	~~12~~	18 314
A (Bypass hurdle: 10% of 55 829 = 5 583)		
1. Valter FLEGO	~~1~~	21 228

3.14. HU – Hungary

Hungary is allocated a contingent of twenty-one seats. Party list nomination lasted from 19 April 2019 to 23 April 2019. 20 000 valid voter recommendations were needed for putting forward a party list. Nine parties and coalitions contested the election, with a total of 292 candidates. On the ballot sheets voters mark a party-list showing the first five nominees.

Table 3.14.1: Hungary, base data.

EP2019HU-1	
Seat contingent	21
Electorate	38 008 353
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV0
Valid votes	3 470 566
Parties admitted	9
Electoral threshold	173 528 (= 5% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	5
Effective votes	3 175 548
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	61 female + 231 male = 292
MEPs gender	8 female + 13 male = 21

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of valid votes which, quite unusually, is rounded downwards (173 528). Four parties miss the threshold, leaving five apportionment parties. The seat apportionment uses the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 135 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.14.2: Hungary, from votes to seats.

EP2019HU-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
Fidesz–KDNP	1 824 220	13.5	13	EPP
DK	557 081	4.1	4	S&D
Momentum	344 512	2.6	2	Renew Europe
MSZP–P	229 551	1.7	1	S&D
JobbikK	220 184	1.6	1	NI
Sum	**3 175 548**	**[135 000]**	**21**	

Hungary employs the fixed list system. Seats are assigned to candidates in the sequence presented on the party-list.

Table 3.14.3: Hungary, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019HU-3	5. András GYÜRK	11. Andor DELI	3. Sándor RÓNAI	MSZP–P
Fidesz–KDNP	6. Kinga GÁL	12. Balázs HIDVÉGHI	4. Attila ARA-KOVÁCS	2.ᵃ István UJHELYI
1. László TRÓCSÁNYI	7. György HÖLVÉNYI	13. Edina TÓTH	Momentum	Jobbik
2. József SZÁJER	8. Enikő GYŐRI	DK	1. Katalin CSEH	1. Márton GYÖNGYÖSI
3. Lívia JÁRÓKA	9. Ádám KÓSA	1. Klára DOBREV	2. Anna Júlia DONÁTH	
4. Tamás DEUTSCH	10. Andrea BOCSKOR	2. Csaba MOLNÁR		

ᵃ) István UJHELYI incoming for Bertalan TÓTH (list place 1).

3.15. IE – Ireland

Ireland has a contingent of eleven seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by two seats. The period for the nomination of candidates is set at constituency level, starts about six weeks before polling day and lasts one or two weeks, depending on the nationality of the candidate. Fifty-nine candidates contested the election, of whom twenty-six figured as non-party candidates, i.e. they were not affiliated with one of the twelve contesting parties.

On the ballot sheet voters mark their preferences by writing 1 next to the candidate of their first choice, 2 next to the candidate of their second choice, and so on.

Table 3.15.1: Ireland, base data.

EP2019IE-1	
Seat contingent	11 + 2
Electorate	3 526 023
Constituencies	3
Vote pattern	STV
Valid votes	1 678 003
Parties admitted	12 + 26 independent candidates
Apportionment method	STVran
Candidates admitted	24 female + 35 male = 59
MEPs gender	5 female + 6 male = 11

Domestic provisions establish three constituencies for separate evaluation:

1. Constituency of Dublin – 3 seats which, after the UK leaves the EU, will be raised to 4,
2. Constituency of Midlands–North-West – 4 seats,
3. Constituency of South – 4 seats which, after the UK leaves the EU, will be raised to 5.

Within each constituency ballots are evaluated using the single transferable vote scheme with random transfers (STVran). The applicable electoral key is the Droop-quota which, up to rounding, is the quotient of vote total and seat total plus one. However, in the constituencies of Dublin and South the seat totals differ for the periods before and after the UK leaves the EU, whence the induced Droop-quotas would differ too.

Unfortunately, STV schemes may fall victim to an awkward instance of opposing calculations, in that one or more of the MEPs elected under the supposition that a constituency commands three seats might fail to be among the MEPs elected under the supposition that the seat contingent is raised to four. In other words, the departure of the UK from the EU might entail the disruptive effect that an MEP from before would have to vacate his or her seat, for somebody else to take this seat afterwards.[12] Therefore domestic provisions decreed the use of just a single calculation and to base this calculation on the seat contingents after the UK has left the EU. Furthermore it was provided that the last candidate elected in the Dublin constituency and the last candidate elected in the South constituency would take up their seats only after the UK left the EU.

In the Dublin constituency the Droop-quota amounts to 363 947 / (4+1) = 72 790. Hence every 72 790 votes justify one seat. The count of first preferences reveals that no candidate reaches the quota. In a second count, the weakest candidate is eliminated and the ballots on which he is marked

---

[12] This behavior is called an Alabama paradox, see, e.g., Pukelsheim (2017): *Proportional Representation* (op. cit.), Section 9.12. In 1881, the reapportionment of the US Congress was considered. The application of the current system at the time would have resulted in the state of Alabama having 8 representatives in a House of 299 members but 7 representatives in a House of 300 Members.

first preference are transferred to the candidates marked second preference. The elimination process continues until the thirteenth count by which time Ciarán CUFFE has accumulated 73 028 votes of first and lower-order preferences and is assigned the first seat. In the fourteenth count Frances FITZGERALD passes the quota and is assigned the second seat. The sixteenth and last count finishes with four candidates, the previous two, Clare DALY with 87 770 accumulated votes, and Barry ANDREWS (68 952 votes). Hence Clare DALY is assigned the third seat, and Barry ANDREWS must wait to take the fourth seat until the UK leaves the EU.

In the Midlands–North-West constituency the Droop-quota equals 118 986. That is, every 118 986 votes justify one seat. Hence Mairead MCGUINNESS, with 134 630 first preference votes, is assigned the first seat. In the second count 15 644 surplus votes of Mairead McGuinness are transferred by second preferences to the other candidates. Thereafter the system starts eliminating lower ranked candidates. Nobody reaches the quota until the thirteenth count, though, when the process finishes with the four MEPs shown in Table 3.15.2.

In the South constituency the Droop-quota requires 119 855 votes. Hence every 119 855 votes justify one seat. In the ninth and seventeenth counts the first and second seats are assigned, and in the twentieth and last count the remaining three, in the order as exhibited in Table 3.15.2.

Table 3.15.2: Ireland, from votes to MEPs.

EP2019IE-2	Party	1st Preference Votes (STVran)	Political Group
1. Constituency of Dublin			
1. Ciarán CUFFE	G.P.	63 849	Greens/EFA
2. Frances FITZGERALD	F.G.	59 067	EPP
3. Clare DALY	I.4.C.	42 305	GUE/NGL
+4. Barry ANDREWS	F.F.	51 420	Renew Europe
Lynn BOYLAN	S.F.	39 387	
Gary GANNON	S.D.	20 331	
Alex WHITE	Lab.	18 293	
Mark DURKAN	F.G.	16 473	
Gillian BRIEN	S.P.B.P.	10 864	
Rita HARROLD	S.P.B.P.	4 967	
Éllis RYAN	W.P.	3 701	
8 further candidates	Non-P.	33 290	
Sum		**363 947**	
2. Constituency of Midlands–North-West			
1. Mairead MCGUINNESS	F.G.	134 630	EPP
2. Luke Ming FLANAGHAN	Non-P.	85 034	GUE/NGL
3. Maria WALSH	F.G.	64 500	EPP
4. Matt CARTHY	S.F.	77 619	GUE/NGL
Peter CASEY	Non-P.	56 650	
Saoirse MCHUGH	G.P.	51 019	
Brendan MITH	F.F.	42 814	
Anne RABBITTE	F.F.	30 220	
Dominic HANNIGAN	Lab.	12 378	
Cyril BRENNAN	S.P.B.P	8 130	
Michael O'DOWD	R.I.	6 897	
Patrick GREENE	D.D.I.	1 352	
5 further candidates	Non-P.	23 684	
Sum		**594 927**	

3. Constituency of South			
1. Seán KELLY	F.G.	118 446	EPP
2. Billy KELLEHER	F.F.	84 084	Renew Europe
3. Mick WALLACE	I.4.C.	81 780	GUE/NGL
4. Grace O'SULLIVAN	G.P.	75 887	Greens/EFA
+5. Deirdre CLUNE	F.G.	64 605	EPP
Liadh Ní RIADA	S.F.	78 995	
Malcolm BYRNE	F.F.	69 167	
Andrew DOYLE	F.G.	38 738	
Sheila NUNAN	Lab.	22 082	
Adrienne WALLACE	S.P.B.P.	14 810	
Peter O'LOUGHLIN	I.I.	3 685	
Jan VAN DE VEN	D.D.I.	1 421	
11 further candidates	Non-P.	65 429	
Sum		**719 129**	

STV schemes generally qualify as proportional representation systems. The argument relies on the hypothetical assumption that we would be allowed to reinterpret first preference votes in terms of a 1CV vote pattern, i.e. a voter casts one vote (namely the first preference vote) for the candidate of her or his choice, and then all candidate votes are aggregated by party. The apportionment of thirteen seats among parties, using the divisor method with standard rounding (divisor 120 000), would result in four seats (now five) for Fine Gael (F.G.), two seats (as is) for Fianna Fáil (F.F.), two seats (now one) for non-party candidates, two seats (now one) for Sinn Féin (S.F.), two seats (as is) for Green Party/Comhaontas Glas (G.P.), and one seat (now two) for Independents 4 Change (I.4.C.). The agreement of results is persuasive, even though the argument needs to be viewed with care. For example, pooling all non-party candidates into a fictitious Non-P.-party is unlikely to be a reliable predictor of how voters really behave if the vote pattern were 1CV.

3.16. IT – Italian Republic

Italy has a seat contingent of seventy-three seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by three seats. Parties and candidates must register by the thirty-ninth day prior to election day. Lists of nominees have to be balanced by gender, also the first two candidates must be of different gender.[13]

Domestic provisions subdivide Italy into five districts and allocate the seventy-six seats after the UK leaves the EU between the districts by population figure:

1. Italia nord-occidentale – 20 seats,
2. Italia nord-orientale – 15 seats,
3. Italia centrale – 15 seats,
4. Italia meridionale – 18 seats,
5. Italia insulare – 8 seats.

Parties of linguistic minorities may establish an alliance with a party campaigning in all five districts. In Italia nord-occidentale, the Autonomie per l'Europa party (ApE) of the French speaking minority in the Aosta Valley is allied with the Partito Democratico (PD). In Italia nord-orientale, the Südtiroler Volkspartei (SVP) of the German-speaking minority in South Tyrol is allied with Forza Italia (FD).

Parties present lists of candidates separately by district. A candidate may be nominated on several lists. Ballot papers in different districts have different colours (grey, brown, red, orange, pink). Voters stamp a mark next to the symbol of the party of their choice. They may add up to three preference votes by writing the candidates' names next to the party symbol. In case of three preferences at least one has to be male and one female, in the absence of gender diversity the second and third preferences are deemed null and void.

Table 3.16.1: Italy, base data.

EP2019IT-1	
Seat contingent	73 + 3
Electorate	50 952 719
Electoral districts	5
Vote pattern	3CV
Valid votes	26 783 732
Lists admitted	per district: 16, 17, 15, 15, 15
Electoral threshold	1 071 350 (= 4% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	5
Effective votes	24 071 889
Apportionment method	HQ1grR, HQ1grR
Preference vote hurdle	none
Candidates admitted	468 female + 497 male = 965
MEPs gender	30 female+ 43 male = 73

There is an electoral threshold of four per cent of the valid votes (1 071 350 votes). The threshold eliminates eleven parties. The seat apportionment calculations use the Hare-quota variant-1 method with fit by greatest remainders (HQ1grR). Variant-1 of the Hare-quota is the integer part of the ratio of effective votes to available seats. For the state-wide super-apportionment the quota

---

[13] Legge 22 aprile 2014, n. 65. – The dossier of the Italian Ministry of Interior includes calculations for the 76 seats after the UK leaves the EU, but it is silent on the handling of the seats before this event , see Elezioni dei Membri del Parlamento Europeo Spettanti all'Italia 26 maggio 2019, Il Dossier. Dipartimento per gli Affari Interni e Territoriali, Ministero dell'Interno. Maggio 2019 rev.1.1, 259 pages [www.interno.gov.it].

amounts to 316 735. That is, every 316 735 votes justify roughly one seat. For the sub-apportionments in the five districts the electoral key is, respectively, 353 461, 345 575, 330 054, 276 045, and 237 424 votes.

The super-apportionment produces state-wide seat numbers for the parties. Domestic provisions decree that these state-wide results take precedence. This enforcement of the state-wide view distinguishes electoral systems with a subdivision into several districts (DE, IT, PL) from systems that establish several constituencies (BE, IE, UK).

Generally, since candidates are nominated at the district level, the law provides for a break-down of state-wide party seats to districts. The break-down is in two steps. The first step apportions, separately within every district, the preordained district seats among parties. This step is self-sufficient; it entirely disregards the available super-apportionment. The second step aggregates, for every party, the district results of the first step and only then checks for discrepancies with the super-apportionment. If a discrepancy is encountered, the party's district results are adjusted until the discrepancy vanishes, in order to achieve conformity with the super-apportionment.

Specifically, Lega, Salvini Premier and PD+ApE finish with district results that are in agreement with the super-apportionment, no further action is needed. In contrast, Movimento 5 Stelle (M5S) is apportioned two seats too much. The party has four quotients whose remainders are rounded upwards (.47, .73, .67, .81 in districts 1, 2, 3, 4). In order to adjust M5S to its state-wide due the two smallest of these four remainders are rounded downwards (.47, .67 in districts 1, 3). This adjustment reduces the party's seat number in Italia nord-occidentale from three to two, and also in Italia centrale. To restore the balance in these districts, the seat numbers of FI+SVP and Fratelli d'Italia, whose discrepancies oppose the discrepancy of M5S, are increased appropriately. The process has a somewhat makeshift character; it works out fine with the 2019 data.

Table 3.16.2: Italy, from votes to seats.

EP2019IT-2	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HQ1grR)	Political Group
Super-apportionment				
Lega	9 175 208	28.97	29	ID
PD+ApE	6 107 545	19.38	19	S&D
M5S	4 569 089	14.43	14	NI
FI+SVP	2 493 858	7.87	8	EPP
FdI	1 726 189	5.45	6	ECR
Sum	**24 071 889**	**[.44]**	**76**	

Party	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HQ1grR)
1. Italia nord-occidentale			
Lega	3 193 908	9.04	9
PD+ApE	1 866 777	5.28	5
M5S	873 749	2.47	3−1=2
FI	691 037	1.96	2
FdI	443 763	1.26	1+1=2
Sum	**7 069 234**	**[.4]**	**20**
3. Italia centrale			
Lega	1 848 005	5.60	6
PD	1 488 260	4.51	4
M5S	882 802	2.67	3-1=2
FI	345 788	1.05	1+1=2
FdI	385 962	1.17	1
Sum	**4 950 817**	**[.55]**	**15**
5. Italia insulare			
Lega	460 194	1.94	2
PD	379 511	1.60	2
M5S	610 040	2.57	2
FI	301 343	1.27	1
FdI	148 307	0.63	1
Sum	**1 899 395**	**[.58]**	**8**

Party	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HQ1grR)
2. Italia nord-orientale			
Lega	2 381 555	6.89	7
PD	1 388 378	4.02	4
M5S	599 106	1.73	2
FI+SVP	481 201	1.39	1
FdI	333 390	0.96	1
Sum	**5 183 630**	**[.5]**	**15**
4. Italia meridionale			
Lega	1 291 546	4.68	5
PD	984 619	3.57	4
M5S	1 603 392	5.81	6
FI	674 489	2.44	2
FdI	414 767	1.50	1
Sum	**4 968 813**	**[.53]**	**18**
Aggregation	**Super-app.**	**Addition**	**Discrepancy**
Lega	29	29	0
PD+ApE	19	19	0
M5S	14	16	−2
FI+SVP	8	7	+1
FdI	6	5	+1
Sum	**76**	**76**	**±2**

The assignment of seats to candidates is based on the personal votes for the candidates. A candidate who is elected in several districts may choose where to accept the mandate.

Table 3.16.3: Italy, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019IT-3	Votes				
Lega		+4.6. Vincenzo SOFO	32 095	3.1. Fabio Massimo CASTALDO	43 601
		5.3.[e] Francesca DONATO	28 071	3.2. Daniela RONDINELLI	41 200
1.10.[a] Marco CAMPOMENOSI	17 768	5.2. Annalisa TARDINO	32 884	4.1. Chiara GEMMA	86 417
1.2. Angelo CIOCCA	89 767	PD		4.2. Laura FERRARA	78 265
1.3. Silvia SARDONE	44 971	1.1. Giuliano PISAPIA	269 657	4.3. Piernicola PEDICINI	58 901
1.4. Isabella TOVAGLIERI	32 395	1.2. Irene TINAGLI	106 710	4.4. Rosa D'AMATO	38 621
1.5. Danilo Oscar LANCINI	21 957	1.3. Pierfrancesco MAJORINO	93 538	4.5. Isabella ADINOLFI	37 838
1.6. Gianna GANCIA	19 194	1.4. Patrizia TOIA	79 795	4.6. Mario FURORE	32 046
1.7. Stefania ZAMBELLI	18 803	1.5. Brando BENIFEI	51 730	5.1. Dino GIARRUSSO	117 211
1.8. Alessandro PANZA	18 207	2.1. Carlo CALENDA	276 413	5.1. Ignazio CORRAO	115 820
1.9. Marco ZANNI	18 019	2.2. Elisabetta GUALMINI	77 577	FI	
2.8.[b] Rosanna CONTE	19 411	2.3. Paolo DE CASTRO	52 254	1.1. Silvio BERLUSCONI	187 601
2.2. Mara BIZZOTTO	94 812	2.4. Alessandra MORETTI	51 234	1.2. Massimiliano SALINI	37 231
2.3. Gianantonio DA RE	43 418	3.1. Simona BONAFÈ	169 408	3.1. Antonio TAJANI	69 009
2.4. Paolo BORCHIA	37 406	3.6.[f] Nicola DANTI	53 286	+3.2. Salvatore DE MEO	22 813
2.5. Alessandra BASSO	25 377	3.3. David Maria SASSOLI	128 533	4.3.[g] Fulvio MARTUSCIELLO	47 528
2.6. Elena LIZZI	25 295	3.4. Massimiliano SMERIGLIO	73 059	4.2. Aldo PATRICIELLO	83 532
2.7. Marco DREOSTO	23 179	4.1. Franco ROBERTI	149 553	5.2.[h] Giuseppe MILAZZO	74 727
3.7.[c] Matteo ADINOLFI	32 578	4.2. Giuseppe FERRANDINO	83 321	FdI	
3.2. Susanna CECCARDI	48 294	4.3. Andrea COZZOLINO	81 328	1.3.[i] Pietro FIOCCHI	9 335
3.3. Antonio Maria RINALDI	48 178	4.4. Pina PICIERNO	79 248	1.2. Carlo FIDANZA	10 919
3.4. Anna BONFRISCO	39 336	5.1. Pietro BARTOLO	135 907	+2.2.[k] Sergio Antonio BERLATO	19 494
3.5. Simona BALDASSARRE	35 380	5.2. Caterina CHINNICI	113 248	3.2.[l] Nicola PROCACCINI	45 312
3.6. Luisa REGIMENTI	34 962	M5S		4.2.[m] Raffaele FITTO	87 743
4.5.[d] Valentino GRANT	36 803	1.1. Eleonora EVI	17 067	5.2.[n] Raffaele STANCANELLI	30 299
4.2. Massimo CASANOVA	65 262	1.2. Tiziana BEGHIN	15 039	SVP	
4.3. Andrea CAROPPO	50 671	2.1. Marco ZULLO	16 046	2.1. Herbert DORFMANN	100 441
4.4. Lucia VUOLO	41 715	2.2. Sabrina PIGNEDOLI	13 768		

[a]) Marco CAMPOMENOSI incoming for 1.1 Matteo SALVINI (696 027 votes).

[b]) Rosanna CONTE incoming for 2.1 Matteo SALVINI (551 315 votes).

[c]) Matteo ADINOLFI incoming for 3.1 Matteo SALVINI (517 966 votes).

[d]) Valentino GRANT incoming for 4.1 Matteo SALVINI (357 444 votes).

[e]) Francesca DONATO incoming for 5.1 Matteo SALVINI (241 632 votes).

[f]) Nicola DANTI incoming for 3.5 Roberto GUALTIERI (67 389 votes) who had been incoming for 3.2 Pietro BARTOLO (140 000 votes).

[g]) Fulvio MARTUSCIELLO incoming for 4.1 Silvio BERLUSCONI (187 856 votes).

[h]) Giuseppe MILAZZO incoming for 5.1 Silvio BERLUSCONI (90 770 votes).

[i]) Pietro FIOCCHI incoming for 1.1 Giorgia MELONI (92 857 votes).

[k]) Sergio Antonio BERLATO incoming for 2.1 Giorgia MELONI (74 976 votes).

[l]) Nicola PROCACCINI incoming for 3.1 Giorgia MELONI (130 143 votes).

[m]) Raffaele FITTO incoming for 4.1 Giorgia MELONI (128 616 votes).

[n]) Raffaele STANCANELLI incoming for 5.1 Giorgia MELONI (63 564 votes).

The three candidates who assumed office after the UK left the EU are Vincenzo SOFO (Italia meridionale, Lega), Salvatore DE MEO (Italia centrale, Forza Italia) and Sergio Antonio BERLATO (Italia orientale, Fratelli d'Italia).

3.17. LT – Republic of Lithuania

Lithuania is allocated a contingent of eleven seats. The Central Electoral Commission accepts application documents 85 days before elections. Registration ends 65 days prior to the elections. Sixteen parties and coalitions and 302 candidates contested the election. The ballot sheet shows the names of all parties and of all candidates. Voters mark a party and may add up to five candidate votes by writing the serial numbers of their preferred candidates into designated boxes.

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of votes cast. With a total of 1 332 020 ballots, the threshold requires 66 601 votes. Seven parties pass the threshold and their 954 709 votes become effective. If fewer than sixty per cent of votes cast (799 212) had become effective, the threshold would have had to be lowered. This is not the case, whence the five per cent threshold persists.

Table 3.17.1: Lithuania, base data.

EP2019LT-1	
Seat contingent	11
Electorate	2 490 542
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	5CV
Votes cast	1 332 020
Parties admitted	16
Electoral threshold	66 601 (= 5% of votes cast)
Apportionment parties	7
Effective votes	954 709
Apportionment method	HQ2grR
Candidates admitted	101 female + 201 male = 302
MEPs gender	3 female + 8 male = 11

The apportionment of seats among parties uses the Hare-quota variant-2 method with fit by greatest remainders (HQ2grR). To obtain variant-2 of the Hare-quota, the ratio of effective votes to seats is rounded upwards to yield 86 792. That is, every 86 792 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.17.2: Lithuania, from votes to seats.

EP2019LT-2	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HQ2grR)	Political Group
TS-LKD	248 736	2.9	3	EPP
LSDP	200 105	2.3	2	S&D
LVŽS	158 190	1.8	2	Greens/EFA
DP	113 243	1.3	1	Renew Europe
LRLS	83 083	1.0	1	Renew Europe
VKM-AMT	82 005	0.9	1	EPP
KKŠS	69 347	0.8	1	ECR
Sum	**954 709**	**[.5]**	**11**	

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

Table 3.17.3: Lithuania, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019LT-3	Votes				
		2. Juozas OLEKAS	62 418	LRLS	
TS-LKD		LVŽS		1. Petras AUŠTREVIČIUS	46 815
1. Andrius KUBILIUS	112 375	1. Bronis ROPĖ	56 649	VKM-AMT	
2. Liudas MAŽYLIS	111 100	2.ª Stasys JAKELIŪNAS	30 760	1. Aušra MALDEIKIENĖ	47 714
3. Rasa JUKNEVIČIENĖ	100 994	DP		KKŠS	
LSDP		1. Viktor USPASKICH	37 676	1. Valdemar TOMAŠEVSKI	29 142
1. Vilija BLINKEVIČIŪTĖ	104 501				

ª) Stasys JAKELIŪNAS incoming for Raimondas Šarūnas MARČIULIONIS (33 377 candidate votes).

3.18. LU – Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

Luxembourg is allocated a contingent of six seats. Candidate lists are definitively adopted 72 days before election day. Every party nominates a list of six candidates. Voters have up to six votes which they may allocate to candidates of different lists (panachage), with at most two votes per candidate (cumulation). Alternatively a voter may mark a party; then the mark is expanded into six votes, one for each of the party's six candidates. The number of valid votes is 1 256 624, originating from a total of 218 177 valid ballots. Thus a ballot features 1 256 624 / 218 177 = 5.8 votes on average.

Table 3.18.1: Luxembourg, base data.

EP2019LU-1	
Seat contingent	6
Electorate	285 435
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	6CV
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	10
Effective votes	1 256 624
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	30 female + 36 male = 66
MEPs gender	3 female + 3 male = 6

The apportionment of seats among the ten parties is proportional to the sum of the votes for the parties' candidates. There is no electoral threshold. The divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn) is applied. Every 130 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.18.2: Luxembourg, from votes to seats.

EP2019LU-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
DP	269 259	2.1	2	Renew Europe
CSV	265 105	2.04	2	EPP
Déi gréng	237 615	1.8	1	Greens/EFA
LSAP	153 396	1.2	1	S&D
6 Others	331 349	–	0	
Sum	1 256 624	[130 000]	6	

The assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates follows the ranking by the candidates' vote tallies.

Table 3.18.3: Luxembourg, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019LU-3	Votes
DP	
1. Charles GOERENS	97 548
2. Monica SEMEDO	50 954
CSV	
1. Christophe HANSEN	62 732
2. Isabel WISELER-LIMA	49 582
Déi gréng	
1. Tilly METZ	55 465
LSAP	
1. Nicolas SCHMIT	39 152

3.19. LV – Republic of Latvia

Latvia is allocated a contingent of eight seats. The last day for the submission of lists of candidates is the sixty-fifth day before election day. The election was contested by 255 candidates from sixteen parties. Every party or coalition has its own ballot paper. Voters cast one party vote. For every candidate of the party of their choice, voters may express a preference (a 'plus') if they wish to endorse the candidate, or a non-preference (a 'crossing-out') if they object to the candidate. Altogether voters dealt out 7 736 112 pluses and crossings-out.

Table 3.19.1: Latvia, base data.

EP2019LV-1	
Seat contingent	8
Electorate	1 414 712
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	mCV
Votes cast	473 260
Parties admitted	16
Electoral threshold	23 663 (= 5% of votes cast)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	397 949
Apportionment method	DivStd
Candidates admitted	74 female + 181 male = 255
MEPs gender	4 female + 4 male = 8

There is a five per cent threshold relative to votes cast, 22 663, which is passed by six parties. The seat apportionment among the six parties is carried out using the divisor method with standard rounding (DivStd). Every 51 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.19.2: Latvia, from votes to seats.

EP2019LV-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivStd)	Political Group
New Unity	124 193	2.4	2	EPP
Harmony	82 604	1.6	2	S&D
National Alliance	77 591	1.52	2	ECR
Development+For!	58 763	1.2	1	Renew Europe
Latvian Russion Union	29 546	0.6	1	Greens/EFA
Union of Greens and Farmers	25 252	0.495	0	
Sum	**397 949**	**[51 000]**	**8**	

The assignment of seats within a party follows the candidates' ranking that is induced by their vote balances. The vote balance of a candidate is the number of votes of the candidate's party plus the number of the candidate's pluses minus the number of the candidate's crossings-out.

Table 3.19.3: Latvia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019LV-3	Vote Balance	National Alliance	
New Unity		1. Roberts ZĪLE	130 604
1.[a] Inese VAIDERE	33 817	2. Dace MELBĀRDE	85 364
2. Sandra KALNIETE	177 538	Development+For!	
Harmony		1. Ivars IJABS	90 716
1. Nils UŠAKOVS	149 931	Latvian Russion Union	
2. Andris AMERIKS	98 022	1. Tatjana ŽDANOKA	46 905

[a]) Inese VAIDERE incoming for Valdis DOMBROVSKIS (vote balance 210 582).

3.20. MT – Republic of Malta

Malta is allocated a contingent of six seats. The nomination dates for the 2019 elections were 16, 17, 18, 20 and 22 April 2019. Of the forty-one candidates, thirty-six were affiliated with the eight contesting parties, and five stood as independent candidates.

Table 3.20.1: Malta, base data.

EP2019MT-1	
Seat contingent	6
Electorate	371 643
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	STV
Valid votes	260 212
Parties admitted	8, plus 5 independent candidate
Apportionment method	STVran
Candidates admitted	10 female + 31 male = 41
MEPs gender	3 female + 3 male = 6

On the ballot sheet voters mark their preferences by writing 1 next to the candidate of their first choice, 2 next to the candidate of their second choice, and so on. The ballots are evaluated using the single transferable vote scheme with random transfers (STVran). The electoral key is given by the Droop-quota which, up to rounding, is the quotient of vote total and seat total plus one, 37 174. That is, every 37 174 votes justify one seat.

Two candidates win more first preferences than the quota demands, whence they are assigned the first two seats. Their surplus votes are transferred to the remaining field and then lower ranked candidates are eliminated, one by one. On counts 14 and 38 the next two candidates reach the quota and are declared elected, on count 39 the last two. Four MEPs belong to the Partit Laburista (PL), and the other two to Partit Nazzjonalista (PN).

Table 3.20.2: Malta, from votes to MEPs.

EP2019MT-2	Party	1st Preference Votes (STVran)	Political Group
1. Miriam DALLI	PL	63 438	S&D
2. Roberta METSOLA	PN	38 206	EPP
3. Alfred SANT	PL	26 592	S&D
4. David CASA	PN	20 493	EPP
5. Alex AGIUS SALIBA	PL	18 808	S&D
6. Josianne CUTAJAR	PL	15 603	S&D
35 further candidates		77 072	
Sum		**260 212**	

As in Section 3.15 proportionality may be appraised by assuming that a first preference vote for a candidate can be taken to be a vote for the candidate's party. The first preferences for all candidates of PL sum to 141 267, the corresponding sum for PN is 98 611. The proportional share of six seats justifies four seats for PL and two seats for PN, just as is. If seats had been assigned to candidates according to the rank-order that results from their first preference tallies, the same six candidates would have been elected.

3.21. NL – Kingdom of the Netherlands

The Netherlands have twenty-six seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by three seats. Nominations of candidates must be filed by the forty-third day before polling day. Sixteen parties contested the election, with a total of 316 candidates. The ballot sheet shows all parties with all of their candidates. Every voter marks one candidate of the party of his or her choice. Other than in 2009 and 2014, the 2019 election did not feature any list alliances.

Table 3.21.1: Netherlands, base data.

EP2019NL-1	
Seat contingent	26 + 3
Electorate	13 164 688
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Valid votes	5 497 813
Parties admitted	16
Electoral threshold	(= 5% of votes cast)
Apportionment parties	9
Effective votes	4 923 208
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	Quorum bypass rule
Candidates admitted	122 female + 194 male = 316
MEPs gender	13 female + 13 male = 26

An electoral threshold is looming in the depth of the provisions. For a party to be awarded at least one seat, its vote count must exceed a number which the provisions refer to as the electoral divisor. The electoral divisor is the quotient of valid votes and seats: 5 497 813 / 26 = 211 455. Relative to the 5 519 776 votes cast the threshold amounts to 211 455 / 5 519 776 = 3.8 per cent and stays below the five per cent ceiling. Nine parties pass the threshold and enter the apportionment stage, as far as the 26 seats are concerned before the UK leaves the EU. The divisor method with downward rounding is used (DivDwn). Every 164 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.21.2: Netherlands, from votes to seats.

EP2019NL-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
P.v.d.A.	1 045 274	6.4	6	S&D
VVD	805 100	4.9	4+1	Renew Europe
CDA	669 555	4.1	4	EPP
Forum voor Democratie	602 507	3.7	3+1	ECR
GroenLinks	599 283	3.7	3	Greens/EFA
D66	389 692	2.4	2	Renew Europe
ChristenUnie – SGP	375 660	2.3	2	(see Table 3.21.3)
Partij voor de Dieren	220 938	1.3	1	GUE/NGL
50Plus	215 199	1.3	1	EPP
PVV	194 178	–	0+1	
Sum	**4 923 208**	**[164 000]**	**26+3**	

With 29 seats after the UK left the EU, the threshold drops to 5 497 813 / 29 = 189 580. A tenth party would be admitted into the seat apportionment calculations (PVV). Every 150 000 votes would justify roughly one seat. The three added seats benefit PVV, VVD, and FvD.

However, the official Proces-verbaal of final results was restricted to the apportionment of the 26 seats while the UK was a member of the EU. If the apportionment of the 29 seats after resignation of the UK were limited to the initial nine parties, the PVV seat would be allotted to GroenLinks.

The assignment of seats to candidates makes use of a quorum bypass rule. A candidate whose preference votes tally meets or exceeds one tenth of the electoral divisor is exempt from the preordained rank-order on the submitted list and moves to the top. Hence all candidates are subject to the uniform bypass hurdle 21 146, no matter whether their party is stronger or weaker.

Table 3.21.3: Netherlands, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019NL-3		List Place	Candidate Votes
P.v.d.A.	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1.ᵃ Lara WOLTERS		7	~~4 888~~
2. Agnes JONGERIUS		~~2~~	109 987
3. Kati PIRI		4	29 475
4. Paul TANG		3	~~8 497~~
5. Vera TAX		5	~~12 760~~
6. Mohammed CHAHIM		6	~~2 825~~
VVD	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Malik AZMANI		~~1~~	365 155
2. Caroline NAGTEGAAL		~~3~~	163 279
3. Jan HUITEMA		~~2~~	115 738
4. Liesje SCHREINEMACHER		~~5~~	37 519
+5. Bart GROOTHUIS		4	21 353
CDA	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Esther de LANGE		~~1~~	402 975
2. Annie SCHREIJER-PIERIK		4	113 914
3. Jeroen LENAERS		~~2~~	50 121
4. Tom BERENDSEN		~~3~~	28 579
Forum voor Democratie	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Derk Jan EPPINK		~~1~~	339 988
2.ᵇ Rob ROOKEN		3	~~10 143~~
3. Robert ROOS		~~2~~	41 323
+4. Dorien ROOKMAKER		4	~~15 403~~
GroenLinks	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Bas EICKHOUT		~~1~~	263 034
2. Tineke STRIK		~~2~~	149 628
3. Kim VAN SPARRENTAK		~~7~~	32 505
D66	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Sophie in 't VELD		~~1~~	248 383
2. Samira RAFAELA		~~3~~	32 510
ChristenUnie-SGP	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Peter van DALEN EPP		~~1~~	240 459
2. Bert-Jan RUISSEN ECR		~~2~~	44 416
Partij voor de Dieren	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Anja HAZEKAMP		~~1~~	136 224
50Plus	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
1. Antonius MANDERS		~~1~~	127 228
Partij voor de Vrijheid	(Bypass hurdle: 21 146)		
+1. Geert WILDERS		~~10~~	83 448

ᵃ) Lara WOLTERS incoming for Frans TIMMERMANNS (839 240 candidate votes).
ᵇ) Rob ROOKEN incoming for Thierry BAUDET (164 711 candidate votes).

3.22. PL – Republic of Poland

Poland has a contingent of fifty-one seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. Candidate lists in a given region had to be submitted to the constituency electoral commission no later than 16 April 2019. Nine parties contested the election, with a total of 868 candidates. Thirty-five per cent of the candidates of a party must be female. Every party has its own ballot paper exhibiting all nominees. The ballot papers are collated into a booklet, one within each of the thirteen electoral districts into which the country is subdivided. Voters have a single vote to mark a candidate of the party of their choice. The votes of a party are obtained by aggregating the votes for the party's candidates.

Table 3.22.1: Poland, base data.

EP2019PL-1	
Seat contingent	51 + 1
Electorate	30 118 852
Electoral districts	13
Vote pattern	1CV
Valid votes	13 647 311
Parties admitted	9
Electoral threshold	682 366 (= 5% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	3
Effective votes	12 269 690
Apportionment method	DivDwn, HaQgrR
Candidates admitted	406 female + 462 male = 868
MEPs gender	18 female + 33 male = 51

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of the valid votes (682 366). It leaves but three lists. We refer to the state-wide apportionment of seats among parties as the super-apportionment. The super-apportionment uses the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 230 000 votes justify roughly one seat. After the UK leaves the EU the key drops to 229 000 votes, with the additional seat going to PiS.

Since parties nominate their candidates separately by district, the overall seats of a party must be sub-apportioned among the thirteen districts. This calls for three sub-apportionment calculations, one for each party. They are carried out using the Hare-quota method with fit by greatest remainders (HaQgrR).[14]

Repeated applications of the method may exhibit strange effects. When more seats become available, such as when the overall seats of PiS grow from 26 to 27, possibly some seats are retracted.[15] To avoid this problem the method is applied just once during the PiS sub-apportionment, to the 27 seats after the UK leaves the EU. Of these 27 MEPs the one with the fewest candidate votes had to wait for the UK to leave the EU before assuming office.

---

[14] The apportionment method HaQgrR is unbiased, i.e. on average no participant is favored nor disadvantaged. Unbiased methods (HaQgrR, DivStd) are preferred for the apportionment of seats among several district-lists of a party. The method DivDwn is biased, in that on average it favors stronger participants at the expense of weaker participants. This direction of bias is attractive to many experts as far as the apportionment of seats among political parties is concerned. For more on the concept of bias see Pukelsheim (2017): *Proportional Representation* (op.cit.), Chap. 7.

[15] These effects are paraphrased to be an instance of the Alabama paradox. Quota methods are susceptible to the paradox, divisor methods are immune against it. See also the note in Section 3.15.

Table 3.22.2: Poland, from votes to seats.

EP2019PL-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
PiS	6 192 780	26.9	26+1	ECR
Coal. KE	5 249 935	22.8	22	(see Table 3.22.3.)
Wiosna	826 975	3.6	3	S&D
Sum	**12 269 690**	**[230 000]**	**51+1**	

District	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HaQgrR)	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HaQgrR)	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (HaQgrR)
	PiS sub-apportionment			Coal. KE sub-apportionment			Wiosna sub-apportionment		
1. Gdańsk	285 740	1.25	1	419 182	1.8	2	50 862	0.2	0
2. Bydgoszcz	260 408	1.1	1	305 362	1.3	1	39 412	0.1	0
3. Olsztyn	375 001	1.6	2	293 677	1.2	1	45 424	0.2	0
4. Warszawa 1	447 770	1.95	2	625 719	2.6	3	142 443	0.5	1
5. Warszawa 2	512 158	2.2	2	227 106	1.0	1	33 302	0.1	0
6. Łódź	426 046	1.9	2	347 620	1.46	1	50 696	0.2	0
7. Poznań	460 432	2.007	2	518 706	2.2	2	93 504	0.34	1
8. Lublin	436 139	1.9	2	208 392	0.9	1	22 692	0.1	0
9. Rzeszów	485 779	2.1	2	160 988	0.7	1	22 881	0.1	0
10. Kraków	980 816	4.28	4	505 400	2.1	2	78 568	0.3	0
11. Katowice	691 641	3.02	3	643 567	2.7	3	93 120	0.34	1
12. Wrocław	506 921	2.2	2	574 397	2.4	2	88 515	0.32	0
13. Gorzów Wielkopolskim	323 929	1.4	2	419 819	1.8	2	65 556	0.2	0
Sum	**6 192 780**	**[.3]**	**27**	**5 249 935**	**[.5]**	**22**	**826 975**	**[.33]**	**3**

Within a party and district, the assignment of seats follows the candidates' vote tallies.

Table 3.22.3: Poland, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019PL-3	Votes
PiS	
1.1. Anna FOTYGA	160 517
2.1. Kosma ZŁOTOWSK	107 113
3.1. Karol KARSKI	184 054
3.2. Krzysztof JURGIEL	104 592
4.1. Jacek SARYUSZ-WOLSKI	186 851
4.2. Ryszard CZARNECKI	134 629
5.1. Adam BIELAN	207 845
5.2. Zbigniew KUŹMIUK	134 405
6.1. Witold Jan WASZCZYKOWSKI	168 021
6.2. Joanna KOPCIŃSKA	130 358
7.1. Zdzisław KRASNODĘBSKI	164 034
7.2. Andżelika Anna MOŻDŻANOWSKA	76 953
8.1. Beata MAZUREK	204 693
8.2. Elżbieta KRUK	164 108
9.1. Tomasz Piotr PORĘBA	276 014
9.2. Bogdan RZOŃCA	64 113
10.1. Beata SZYDŁO	525 811
10.2. Patryk JAKI	258 366
10.3. Ryszard Antoni LEGUTKO	65 710
+10.4. Dominik TARCZYŃSKI	41 912
11.1. Jadwiga WIŚNIEWSKA	409 373
11.2. Izabela-Helena KLOC	78 352
11.3. Grzegorz TOBISZOWSKI	65 007
12.1. Beata KEMPA	209 305
12.2. Anna ZALEWSKA	168 337
13.1. Joachim Stanisław BRUDZIŃSKI	185 168

Candidate	Group	Votes
13.2. Elżbieta RAFALSKA		70 916
Coalition KE		
1.1. Magdalena ADAMOWICZ EPP		199 591
1.2. Janusz LEWANDOWSKI	EPP	120 990
2.1. Radosław SIKORSKI	EPP	129 339
3.1. Tomasz FRANKOWSKI	EPP	125 845
4.1. Włodzimierz CIMOSZEWICZ	S&D	219 677
4.2. Danuta Maria HÜBNER	EPP	146 746
4.3. Andrzej HALICKI EPP		87 422
5.1. Jarosław KALINOWSKI	EPP	104 216
6.1. Marek BELKA	S&D	182 517
7.1. Ewa KOPACZ EPP		252 032
7.2. Leszek MILLER S&D		79 380
8.1. Krzysztof HETMAN	EPP	105 908
9.1. Elżbieta Katarzyna ŁUKACIJEWSKA	EPP	40 737
10.1. Róża THUN UND HOHENSTEIN	EPP	221 279
10.2. Adam JARUBAS EPP		138 854
11.1. Jerzy BUZEK EPP		422 445
11.2. Jan OLBRYCHT EPP		69 009
11.3. Marek Paweł BALT S&D		45 043
12.1. Janina OCHOJSKA EPP		307 227
12.2. Jarosław DUDA EPP		77 611
13.1. Bartosz ARŁUKOWICZ	EPP	239 893
13.2. Bogusław LIBERADZKI	S&D	99 897
Wiosna		
4.1. Robert BIEDROŃ		96 388
7.1. Sylwia SPUREK		55 306
11.1. Łukasz KOHUT		48 783

3.23. PT – Portuguese Republic

Portugal is allocated a contingent of twenty-one seats. Political parties had to register their lists of nominees with the Constitutional Court until 41 days before election day. Voters cast a single vote for a closed list of a party. Ballot sheets impress by their heavy party emphasis. For every party they give the full name, plus the party acronym, plus the party emblem. Names of candidates do not appear on the ballot sheet.

Table 3.23.1: Portugal, base data.

EP2019PT-1	
Seat contingent	21
Electorate	10 757 192
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV0
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	17
Effective votes	3 078 901
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	218 female + 272 male = 490
MEPs gender	10 female + 11 male = 21

There is no electoral threshold. The apportionment of seats among parties uses the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 112 000 votes justify roughly one seat. Of the seventeen parties eleven fail to win a seat.

Table 3.23.2: Portugal, from votes to seats.

EP2019PT-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
PS	1 104 694	9.9	9	S&D
PSD	725 399	6.5	6	EPP
B.E.	325 093	2.9	2	GUE/NGL
CDU (PCP + PEV)	228 045	2.04	2	GUE/NGL
CDS-PP	204 792	1.8	1	EPP
PAN	168 015	1.5	1	Greens/EFA
11 Others	322 863	–	0	
Sum	**3 078 901**	**[112 000]**	**21**	

The assignment of seats to candidates follows the list order, as is characteristic of closed list systems.

Table 3.23.3: Portugal, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019PT-3	6. Sara CERDAS	3. José Manuel FERNANDES	CDU (PCP + PEV)
PS	7. Carlos ZORRINHO	4. Maria Da Graça CARVALHO	1. João FERREIRA
1. Pedro MARQUES	8. Isabel SANTOS	5. Álvaro AMARO	2. Sandra PEREIRA
2. Maria Manuel LEITÃO MARQUES	9. Manuel PIZARRO	6. Cláudia MONTEIRO DE AGUIAR	CDS-PP
3. Pedro SILVA PEREIRA	PSD	B.E.	1. Nuno MELO
4. Margarida MARQUES	1. Paulo RANGEL	1. Marisa MATIAS	PAN
10.ª Isabel CARVALHAIS	2. Lidia PEREIRA	2. José GUSMÃO	1. Francisco GUERREIRO

a) Isabel CARVALHAIS incoming for André BRADFORD (list place 5).

3.24. RO – Romania

Romania has a seat contingent of thirty-two seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. The law stipulates that no list of nominees of a party may consist of male candidates only. Candidates' proposals had to be submitted to the constituency offices at the latest 40 days before the election date. Every voter receives a stamp and a ballot booklet with the lists of candidates of all parties. Voters print the stamp next to the party of their choice.

Table 3.24.1: Romania, base data.

EP2019RO-1	
Seat contingent	32 + 1
Electorate	18 267 256
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV0
Valid votes	9 352 472
Parties admitted	13, plus 3 independent candidates
Electoral threshold	467 624 (= 5% of valid votes for parties only)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	8 100 866
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Candidates admitted	150 female + 334 male = 484
MEPs gender	7 female + 25 male = 32

For parties there is a threshold of five per cent of the valid votes: 5% of 9 352 472 = 467 624. For independent candidates the threshold is equal to the ratio of valid votes to seats: 9 352 472 / 32 = 292 265. Seven parties and all independent candidates fail their threshold. This leaves six parties to participate in the seat apportionment process. The divisor method with downward rounding is used (DivDwn). After the UK left the EU the thirty-third seat is allotted to PSD (divisor 226 000).

Table 3.24.2: Romania, from votes to seats.

EP2019RO-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
PNL	2 449 068	10.6	10	EPP
PSD	2 040 765	8.9	8+1	S&D
2020 USR Plus	2 028 236	8.8	8	Renew Europe
PPR	583 916	2.5	2	S&D
PMP	522 104	2.3	2	EPP
UDMR	476 777	2.1	2	EPP
Sum	**8 100 866**	**[230 000]**	**32+1**	

The assignment of seats to candidates follows the prespecified rank-order of the party-lists.

Table 3.24.3: Romania, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019RO-3	9. Cristian-Silviu Bușoi	8. Adrian-Dragoș Benea	8. Ramona Strugariu
PNL	10. Marian-Jean Marinescu	+9. Victor Negrescu	PPR
1. Ioan-Rareș Bogdan	PSD	2020 USR PLUS	3.ᵃ Mihai Tudose
2. Mircea-Gheorghe Hava	1. Rovana Plumb	1. Dacian Cioloș	2. Corina Crețu
3. Siegfried Mureșan	2. Carmen Avram	2. Cristian Ghinea	PMP
4. Vasile Blaga	3. Claudiu Manda	3. Dragoș Pîslaru	1. Traian Băsescu
5. Adina-Ioana Vălean	4. Cristian Terheș	4. Clotilde Armand	2. Eugen Tomac
6. Daniel Buda	5. Dan Nica	5. Dragoș Tudorache	UDMR
7. Dan-Ștefan Motreanu	6. Maria Grapini	6. Nicolae Ștefănuță	1. Iuliu Winkler
8. Gheorghe Falcă	7. Tudor Ciuhodaru	7. Vlad-Marius Botos	2. Loránt Vincze

ᵃ) Mihai Tudose incoming for Victor Ponta (list place 1).

3.25. SE – Kingdom of Sweden

Sweden has a seat contingent of twenty seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. The Election Authority must have received parties' notification no later than 30 days before election day. Eleven parties contested the election, with a total of 574 candidates. Every party has its own ballot paper. Voters cast a party vote, and may adjoin one preference vote for one of the party's candidate.

Table 3.25.1: Sweden, base data.

EP2019SE-1	
Seat contingent	20 + 1
Electorate	7 576 917
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Valid votes	4 151 470
Parties admitted	11
Electoral threshold	166 059 (= 4% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	8
Effective votes	4 047 710
Apportionment method	Div0.6
Preference vote hurdle	5% bypass rule
Candidates admitted	237 female + 337 male = 574
MEPs gender	11 female + 9 male = 20

The electoral threshold is four per cent of the valid votes (166 059), it was passed by eight parties. The apportionment of seats among parties uses Div0.6, the Swedish modification of the divisor method with standard rounding (DivStd). The modification differs from DivStd for a quotient smaller than one, by rounding it upwards only when larger than 0.6 (not just larger than 0.5 as with DivStd). With the 2019 data the party with the fewest votes has quotient 0.9, which is rounded upwards by both methods, Div0.6 and DivStd. Every 195 000 votes justify roughly one seat. After the UK leaves the EU, with key 190 000, the additional seat is allotted to MP.

Table 3.25.2: Sweden, from votes to seats.

EP2019SE-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (Div0.6)	Political Group
S	974 589	5.0	5	S&D
M	698 770	3.6	4	EPP
SD	636 877	3.3	3	ECR
MP	478 258	2.45	2+1	Greens/EFA
C	447 641	2.3	2	Renew Europe
KD	357 856	1.8	2	EPP
V	282 300	1.4	1	GUE/NGL
L(FP)	171 419	0.9	1	Renew Europe
Sum	**4 047 710**	**[195 000]**	**20+1**	

Preference votes are incorporated through a five per cent bypass rule. That is, when the preference vote tally of a candidate meets or exceeds five per cent of the number of votes for his or her party, the candidate takes precedence in the seat assignment stage. These candidates are elected in order of their personal vote tallies, while their list places are ignored.

For candidates below the bypass hurdle, preference votes are ignored; they are elected in the rank-order of their list places.[16] With the data at hand candidates who overcome the bypass hurdle finish

---

[16] Domestic provisions assign seats to candidates below the bypass hurdle in a more elaborate way, see, e.g., Svante Janson (2016): Phragmén's and Thiele's election methods, arxiv.org/abs/1611.08826, or Rosa Camps, Xavier Mora and

in a sequence identical to their list places. Hence, retrospectively, incorporation of preference votes is concordant with the preordained rank-order of the party-lists; party-lists prevail as is.

Table 3.25.3: Sweden, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019SE-3	List Place	Preference Votes
S (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 974 589 = 48 730)		
1. Heléne FRITZON	~~1~~	73 929
2. Johan DANIELSSON	2	~~40 136~~
3. Jytte GUTELAND	3	~~42 617~~
4. Erik BERGKVIST	4	~~17 117~~
5. Evin INCIR	5	~~9 479~~
M (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 698 770 = 34 939)		
1. Tomas TOBÉ	~~1~~	150 726
2. Jessica POLFJÄRD	2	~~17 945~~
3. Jörgen WARBORN	3	~~13 503~~
4. Arba KOKALARI	4	~~10 284~~
SD (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 636 877 = 31 844)		
1. Peter LUNDGREN	~~1~~	87 384
2. Jessica STEGRUD	~~2~~	41 202
3. Charlie WEIMERS	3	~~30 668~~
MP (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 478 258 = 23 913)		
1. Alice Bah KUHNKE	~~1~~	141 106
2. Pär HOLMGREN	~~2~~	73 120
+3. Jakop DALUNDE	3	~~12 098~~
C (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 447 641 = 22 383)		
1. Fredrick FEDERLEY	~~1~~	108 240
2. Abir AL-SAHLANI	2	~~6 352~~
KD (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 357 856 = 17 893)		
1. Sara SKYTTEDAL	~~1~~	74 325
2. David LEGA	~~2~~	27 862
V (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 282 300 = 14 115)		
1. Malin BJÖRK	~~1~~	63 264
L(FP) (Bypass hurdle: 5% of 171 419 = 8 571)		
1. Karin KARLSBRO	~~1~~	15 826

Laia Saumell (2019): The method of Eneström and Phragmén for parliamentary elections by means of approval voting, arxiv.org/abs/1907.10590. For the present data the results agree with the rank-orders of the party-lists.

3.26. SI – Republic of Slovenia

Slovenia is allocated a contingent of eight seats. Lists of candidates had to be submitted to the National Electoral Commission no later than thirty days before election day. Fourteen parties contested the election, with a total of 103 candidates. Every party-list is obliged to include at least forty per cent female candidates. There is a single ballot paper showing all parties and all candidates. Voters circle a party's serial number, and may add one preference vote for a specific candidate. In 2019 the ballot paper had grown to A2 size.

Table 3.26.1: Slovenia, base data.

EP2019SI-1	
Seat contingent	8
Electorate	1 704 866
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV1
Valid votes	482 075
Parties admitted	14
Electoral threshold	19 283 (= 4% of valid votes)
Apportionment parties	8
Effective votes	441 550
Apportionment method	DivDwn
Preference vote hurdle	Quorum bypass rule
Candidates admitted	51 female + 52 male = 103
MEPs gender	4 female + 4 male = 8

There is an electoral threshold of four per cent of valid votes, 19 283. The threshold removes six parties, leaving eight apportionment parties. The apportionment of seats among parties uses the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn). Every 34 000 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.26.2: Slovenia, from votes to seats.

EP2019SI-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)	Political Group
SDS+SLS	126 534	3.7	3	EPP
SD	89 936	2.6	2	S&D
LMŠ	74 431	2.2	2	Renew Europe
NSi	53 621	1.6	1	EPP
4 Others	97 028	–	0	
Sum	**441 550**	**[34 000]**	**8**	

For assigning seats to candidates, preference votes may overrule the rank-order of the corresponding party-list by way of a quorum bypass rule. The quorum is one half of the quotient of the party's vote count and the number of its list candidates. All four parties that are apportioned one or more seats nominate eight candidates. Hence the quorum requires one half of one eighth of the party's vote count, $1/16 = 6.25\%$, which constitutes a rather low hurdle. Indeed, all MEPs are elected through their preference vote tallies.

Table 3.26.3: Slovenia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019SI-3	List Place	Preference Votes
SDS+SLS (Bypass hurdle: ½·126 534/8 = 7 908)		
1. Romana TOMC	~~2~~	40 668
2. Milan ZVER	~~1~~	26 674
3. Franc BOGOVIČ	~~4~~	13 743
SD (Bypass hurdle: ½·89 936/8 = 5 621)		
1. Tanja FAJON	~~1~~	54 651
2. Milan BRGLEZ	~~4~~	7 152
LMŠ (Bypass hurdle: ½·74 431/8 = 4 652)		
1. Irena JOVEVA	~~1~~	42 190
2. Klemen GROŠELJ	~~2~~	6 494
NSi (Bypass hurdle: ½·53 621/8 = 3 351)		
1. Ljudmila NOVAK	~~1~~	19 558

3.27. SK – Slovak Republic

Slovakia has a seat contingent of thirteen seats which, after the UK left the EU, was raised by one seat. Candidates must register not later than 45 days before polling day. Every party has its own ballot paper. Voters cast a list vote for a party, and may circle the serial number of up to two candidates to express their preferences for specific candidates.

Table 3.27.1: Slovakia, base data.

EP2019SK-1	
Seat contingent	13 + 1
Electorate	4 429 801
Constituencies	1
Vote pattern	LV2
Votes cast	1 006 351
Parties admitted	31
Electoral threshold	50 318 (= 5% of valid cast)
Apportionment parties	6
Effective votes	714 507
Apportionment method	DQ3grR
Preference vote hurdle	Quorum bypass rule
Candidates admitted	74 female + 275 male = 349
MEPs gender	2 female + 11 male = 13

There is an electoral threshold of five per cent of the valid votes (50 318). Six parties pass the threshold, with a total of 714 507 effective votes. The apportionment of the fourteen seats after the UK leaves the EU uses the Droop-quota variant-3 method with fit by greatest remainders. Variant-3 of the Droop-quota is the standard rounding of the quotient of effective votes and seat total plus one, 714 507 / 15 = 47 634. That is, every 47 634 votes justify roughly one seat.

Table 3.27.2: Slovakia, from votes to seats.

EP2019SK-2	Votes	Quotient [Split]	Seats (DQ3grR)	Political Group
Coal. PS + SPOLU	198 255	4.2	4	(see Table 3.27.3)
SMER-SD	154 996	3.3	3	S&D
SNS	118 995	2.498	2	NI
KDH	95 588	2.007	2	EPP
SaS	94 839	1.991	2	ECR
OL'ANO	51 834	1.1	1	EPP
Sum	**714 507**	**[.5]**	**14**	

The assignment of seats to candidates is dominated by preference votes. A quorum bypass rule is employed, where the quorum is three per cent of the party's vote total.

Table 3.27.3: Slovakia, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019SK-3		List Place	Candidate Votes
Coal. PS + SPOLU	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 198 255 = 5 948)		
1. Michal ŠIMEČKA	Renew Europe	~~1~~	81 735
2. Michal WIEZIK EPP		~~7~~	29 998
3. Martin HOJSÍK	Renew Europe	~~6~~	27 549
4. Vladimír BILČÍK EPP		~~2~~	26 202
SMER-SD	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 154 996 = 4 650)		
1. Monika BEŇOVÁ		~~1~~	89 472
2. Miroslav ČÍŽ		~~2~~	51 362
3. Robert HAJŠEL		~~3~~	13 773
SNS	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 118 995 = 3 570)		
1. Milan UHRÍK		~~14~~	42 779
2. Miroslav RADAČOVSKÝ		~~3~~	42 276
KDH	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 95 588 = 2 868)		
1. Ivan ŠTEFANEC		~~1~~	33 128
+2. Miriam LEXMANN		~~2~~	27 833
SaS	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 94 839 = 2 846)		
1. Lucia ĎURIŠ NICHOLSONOVÁ		~~3~~	52 331
2. Eugen JURZYCA		~~1~~	33 540
OL'ANO	(Bypas hurdle: 3% of 51 834 = 1 556)		
1. Peter POLLÁK		~~3~~	23 815

According to domestic provisions the party whose quotient has the smallest remainder (KDH, with remainder .007) had to wait until after the UK left the EU before seating its last candidate (Miriam Lexmann).

The provision caused a discordant apportionment of the thirteen seats while the UK was in the EU. KDH attracts more votes than SaS (95 588 versus 94 839), but is allotted fewer seats (one versus two). The discordance would have been avoided if the domestic provisions had targeted the party with the smallest remainder not of *all* quotients, but only of those that are rounded upwards (SaS, with remainder .991).

3.28. UK – United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The United Kingdom was allocated a contingent of seventy-three seats which, after the UK left the EU, were vacated. Registration of parties and candidates had to be submitted by the nineteenth working day before election day.

Table 3.28.1: United Kingdom, base data.

EP2019UK-1	
Seat contingent	73
Electorate	46 534 897
Constituencies	12
Vote pattern	LV0, STV
Electoral threshold	none
Apportionment parties	23, plus 24 independent candidates
Effective votes	17 190 12
Apportionment method	DivDwn, STVfra
Candidates admitted	239 + 364 = 603
MEPs gender	34 female, 39 male = 73

Domestic provisions establish twelve constituencies to which the seats are passed on as follows:

1. East Midlands – 5 seats,
2. East of England – 7 seats,
3. London – 8 seats,
4. North East England – 3 seats,
5. North West England – 8 seats,
6. South East England – 10 seats,
7. South West England and Gibraltar – 6 seats,
8. West Midlands – 7 seats,
9. Yorkshire and the Humber – 6 seats,
10. Wales – 4 seats,
11. Scotland – 6 seats,
12. Northern Ireland – 3 seats.

In all constituencies except the last, Northern Ireland, parties register closed lists, and voters cast a single list vote. The results are evaluated using the divisor method with downward rounding (DivDwn), separately in every constituency. Therefore the electoral key varies from constituency to constituency. In Constituency 3, London, every 200 000 votes justify roughly one seat, in Constituency 4, North East England, it is every 110 000 votes.

The Northern Ireland constituency employs a single transferable vote scheme with fractional vote transfers (STVfra). Voters express their preferences by writing 1 next to the candidate of their first choice, 2 next to the candidate of their second choice, and so on. The quorum that is needed to be assigned a seat is the Droop-quota, 572 447 / 4 = 143 112 votes. No candidate reaches the quorum with their first preferences. Hence lower ranked candidates are successively eliminated and their votes are transferred to the remaining candidates. In count 3, Diane DODDS is first to be assigned a seat, followed in count 5 by Naomi LONG and Martina ANDERSON.

Table 3.28.2: United Kingdom, from votes to seats.

EP2019UK-2	Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)		Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Seats (DivDwn)
1. East Midlands				**2. East of England**			
Brexit	452 321	3.2	3	Brexit	604 715	3.8	3
LibDem	203 989	1.5	1	LibDem	361 563	2.3	2
Labour	164 682	1.2	1	Labour	139 490	0.9	0
Green	124 630	0.9	0	Green	202 460	1.3	1
Conservative	126 138	0.9	0	Conservative	163 830	1.02	1
4 Others	111 467	–	0	4 Others	116 808	–	0
Sum	**1 183 227**	**[140 000]**	**5**	**Sum**	**1 588 866**	**[160 000]**	**7**
3. London				**4. North East England**			
Brexit	400 257	2.001	2	Brexit	240 056	2.2	2
LibDem	608 725	3.04	3	LibDem	104 330	0.9	0
Labour	536 810	2.7	2	Labour	119 931	1.1	1
Green	278 957	1.4	1	Green	49 905	0.5	0
Conservative	177 964	0.9	0	Conservative	42 395	0.4	0
11 Others	238 968	–	0	2 Others	63 237	–	0
Sum	**2 241 681**	**[200 000]**	**8**	**Sum**	**619 854**	**[110 000]**	**3**
5. North West England				**6. South East England**			
Brexit	541 843	3.9	3	Brexit	915 686	4.98	4
LibDem	297 507	2.1	2	LibDem	653 743	3.6	3
Labour	380 193	2.7	2	Labour	184 678	1.004	1
Green	216 581	1.5	1	Green	343 249	1.9	1
Conservative	131 002	0.9	0	Conservative	260 277	1.4	1
9 Others	167 781	–	0	7 Others	181 312	–	0
Sum	**1 734 907**	**[140 000]**	**8**	**Sum**	**2 538 945**	**[184 000]**	**10**
7. South West England and Gibraltar				**8: West Midlands**			
Brexit	611 742	3.6	3	Brexit	507 152	3.9	3
LibDem	385 095	2.3	2	LibDem	219 982	1.7	1
Labour	108 100	0.6	0	Labour	228 298	1.8	1
Green	302 364	1.8	1	Green	143 520	1.1	1
Conservative	144 674	0.9	0	Conservative	135 279	1.04	1
6 Others	114 654	–	0	2 Others	112 607	–	0
Sum	**1 666 629**	**[170 000]**	**6**	**Sum**	**1 346 838**	**[130 000]**	**7**
9. Yorkshire and the Humber				**10. Wales**			
Brexit	470 351	3.4	3	Brexit	271 404	2.3	2
LibDem	200 180	1.4	1	LibDem	113 885	0.9	0
Labour	210 516	1.5	1	Labour	127 833	1.1	1
Green	166 980	1.2	1	Green	52 660	0.4	0
Conservative	92 863	0.7	0	Conservative	54 587	0.5	0
4 Others	148 387	–	0	Plaid Cymru	163 928	1.4	1
				2 Others	51 898	–	0
Sum	**1 289 277**	**[140 000]**	**6**	**Sum**	**836 195**	**[120 000]**	**4**
11. Scotland				**12. Northern Ireland (1st preference votes, STVfra)**			
Brexit	233 006	1.4	1	1. Diane DODDS	DUP		124 991
LibDem	218 285	1.3	1	2. Naomi LONG	APNI		105 928
Labour	146 724	0.9	0	3. Martina ANDERSON	SF		126 951
SNP	594 553	3.5	3	Colum EASTWOOD	SDLP		78 589
Conservative	182 476	1.1	1	Jim ALLISTER	TUV		62 021
Scottish Grn	129 603	0.8	0	Danny KENNEDY	UUP		53 052
4 Others	66 599			5 Others			20 915
Sum	**1 571 246**	**[170 000]**	**6**	**Sum**			**572 447**

All in all, the Brexit Party (Political Group NI) finishes with twenty-nine seats, the Liberal Democrats (Renew Europe) with sixteen, the Labour Party (S&D) with ten, the Green Party of England and Wales

(Greens/EFA) with seven, the Conservative Party (ECR) with four, the Scottish National Party (Greens/EFA) with three, and Plaid Cymru (Greens/EFA), Sinn Féin (GUE/NGL), the Democratic Unionist Party (NI) and the Alliance Party of Northern Ireland (Renew Europe) with one seat each.

Seats are assigned to candidates in the rank-order of the party-lists of their constituencies, with the exception of Northern Ireland where seats are assigned according to the STV scheme.

Table 3.28.3: United Kingdom, from seats to MEPs.

EP2019UK-3			
Brexit Party	7.3. Christina Jordan	6.3. Judith Bunting	6.1. Alexandra Phillips
1.1. Annunziata Rees-Mogg	8.1. Rupert Lowe	7.1. Caroline Voaden	7.1. Molly Scott Cato
1.2. Jonathan Bullock	8.2. Martin Daubney	7.2. Martin Horwood	8.1. Ellie Chowns
1.3. Matthew Patten	8.3. Andrew England Kerr	8.1. Phil Bennion	9.1. Magid Magid
2.1. Richard Tice	9.1. John Longworth	9.1. Shaffaq Mohammed	Conservative
2.2. Michael Heaver	9.2. Lucy Harris	12.1. Sheila Ritchie	2.1. Geoffrey Van Orden
2.3. June Alison Mummery	9.3. Jake Pugh	Labour	6.1. Daniel Hannan
3.1. Ben Habib	10.1. Nathan Gill	1.1. Rory Palmer	8.1. Anthea McIntyre
3.2. Lance Forman	10.2. James Wells	3.1. Claude Moraes	12.1. Nosheena Mobarik
4.1. Brian Monteith	12.1. Louis Stedman-Bryce	3.2. Seb Dance	SNP
4.2. John Tennant	LibDem	4.1. Jude Kirton-Darling	11.1. Alyn Smith
5.1. Claire Fox	1.1. Bill Newton Dunn	5.1. Theresa Griffin	11.2. Christian Allard
5.2. Henrik Nielsen	2.1. Barbara Gibson	5.2. Julie Ward	11.3. Aileen McLeod
5.3. David Bull	2.2. Lucy Nethsingha	6.1. John Howarth	Plaid Cymru
6.1. Nigel Farage	3.1. Irina Von Wiese	8.1. Neena Gill	10.1. Jill Evans
6.2. Alexandra Phillips	3.2. Dinesh Dhamija	9.1. Richard Corbett	Sinn Féin
6.3. Robert Rowland	3.3. Luisa Porritt	10.1. Jackie Jones	12. Martina Anderson
6.4. Belinda De Lucy	5.1. Chris Davies	Greens	DUP
7.1. Ann Widdecombe	5.2. Jane Brophy	2.1. Catherine Rowett	12. Diane Dodds
7.2. James Glancy	6.1. Catherine Bearder	3.1. Scott Ainslie	APNI
	6.2. Antony Hook	5.1. Gina Dowding	12. Naomi Long

4. Citizens and representatives from a Union-wide viewpoint

Ever since its inception the EP has expressed its intention to unify the procedures which the Member States employ at EP elections. The present paper focusses on counting ballots, evaluating vote counts, and assigning seats to candidates. Electoral systems comprise more than these procedural rules. They determine who stands at the election, how they register, if they are given access to the media, whether they are reimbursed for their expenses, which ballot design is submitted to the voters and much more. Yet, even when the view is narrowed down to how votes are translated into seats, the electoral provisions in the twenty-eight Member States constitute a perplexing multitude.

The 2019 European elections are not readily amenable to a Union-wide re-evaluation. The reason is the lack of visibility of political parties at the European level. European parties which are visibly functioning at the Union level would give rise to a political system in which the many domestic parties would be able to find their place. Such a scenario does not apply to the 2019 elections.

Even so, it is tempting to view the European elections 2019 from a unified standpoint. To this end we replace the almost invisible European parties by the visible Political Groups in the EP. In DE, ES, NL, PL and SI some parties split their seats between several Political Groups; we split their votes accordingly. In IE, MT, and the Northern Ireland region of the UK, where STV schemes are used, we aggregate only first preferences. Domestic parties not affiliated to a Political Group nor obtaining a seat, labelled in our tables as 'Others', are omitted. By adding the vote counts for the domestic parties who joined a Political Group 'hypothetical votes' are generated. The hypothetical votes provide the basis to apportion the 748 EP seats among the Political Groups. Every 236 000 votes justify roughly one seat, see Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Political Groups in the EP, actual size versus hypothetical seats.

Political Group	Actual Size	Hypothetical Votes	Quotient [Divisor]	Hypothetical Seats (DivStd)	Discrepancy
EPP	182	39 665 362	168.1	168	14
S&D	154	36 585 197	155.0	155	−1
RenewEurope	108	23 466 081	99.4	99	9
Greens/EFA	74	19 804 837	83.9	84	−10
ID	73	20 837 020	88.3	88	−15
ECR	62	14 537 613	61.6	62	0
GUE/NGL	41	10 134 340	42.9	43	−2
NI	54	11 455 280	48.54	49	5
Sum	**748**	**17 6485 730**	**[236 000]**	**748**	**0**

While a single Union-wide apportionment would faithfully reflect the political division of the Union's electorate, it would miss out on the geographical dimension of the Union being composed of 28 Member States. Therefore, it is important to realise that divisor methods allow a double proportional variant that honours both dimensions simultaneously: the geographical distribution of the Union's citizens across Member States, and the political division of the electorate as expressed by their votes for parties and candidates. Double proportionality is a powerful concept that would allow the EP to improve the design of the European elections according to the political objectives set by parliament, e.g. by maintaining degressive representation of Member States, or by introducing transnational lists, or by incorporating other desirable features.[17]

---

[17] Friedrich Pukelsheim (2018): Compositional proportionality among European political parties at European Parliament elections, *Středoevropské politické studie – Central European Political Studies Review* 20, 1–15.

5. Conclusion

The normative link between a common electoral system in all Member States and the democratic legitimacy of the EU was made from the early days of European integration. Both from a legal and a political perspective, alignment between national electoral laws, or their replacement through common provisions based on EU law, was seen as a prerequisite for making the ECSC, the EEC, the EC and then the EU a political community directly involving their citizens. In fact, the Electoral Act of 1976 was seen by contemporaries as a transitional arrangement to organise the first direct elections.[18]

Electoral law is notoriously difficult to amend, at all levels of governance. The 1976 Act has been modified only once, in 2002. A second amendment introducing an electoral threshold at the European level, adopted in July 2018, will enter into force once the approval of all Member States according to their constitutional requirements has been notified to the Council Secretariat. As of 16 October 2019, Germany, Spain and Cyprus still had to notify their agreement.[19]

This study demonstrates yet again, for the 2019 European elections, that the variations between the 28 national laws governing the European elections are important: we observe the existence of electoral thresholds in some Member States but not in others; if they are applied the percentages also differ; we observe nine different apportionment methods to transform votes into seats; we also observe different rules concerning candidates' gender balance, the deadlines for party or candidate registration, and the options for preference votes.

Such variations may seem innocuous. The differences of outcome of the different apportionment methods, for instance, may appear negligible to non-specialists of electoral procedure. However, electoral thresholds or different list systems have profound effects on the number of effective votes and the success rate for individual candidates in a given Member State. Moreover, one reason for introducing direct elections to the EP was to enable a proportional Europe-wide reflection of different political ideologies and to allow citizens to have an impact on the basic direction the EU (or its predecessors) should take. Academic literature on the Europeanisation of EP elections has been growing for a long time and there is also an important body of case law rendered by different constitutional courts. Both are generally rather sceptical of the democratic weight of the EP, particularly in comparison to national parliaments. Academics have provided numerous analyses of the second-order nature of European elections, concluding that their objective is only partially to determine EU-wide policies or to hold EU leaders to account. They are often an interim assessment of the performance of the national government of the day, thus weakening the link between citizens and the institutions of the EU, and in particular, the link between voters and the EP.

Some courts, particularly the German Federal Constitutional Court, have on several occasions critically analysed weaknesses of the European electoral system and arrived at the general appraisal that the EP has little chance ever to provide democratic legitimation at the same level as domestic chambers. Hence the importance of a close look at the current state of affairs, including the technical aspects of the European electoral system. On a positive note, one could consider the different approaches that can be observed in the 28 countries as an opportunity for mutual learning and

---

[18] See Sergio Alonso de León (2017): Four decades of the European Electoral Act: a look back and a look ahead to an unfulfilled ambition, *European Law Review* 42, 353–368.

[19] Council Decision (EU, Euratom) 2018/994 of 13 July 2018 amending the Act concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, annexed to Council Decision 76/787/ECSC, EEC, Euratom of 20 September 1976, *Official Journal of the European Union* L 178 (16.7.2018) 1–3.

emulation. It is interesting, for instance, that the majority of Member States, to varying degrees, offer their citizens the possibility to personalise their voting preferences. Providing this option should increase the average citizen's interest in the European elections. Perhaps even more importantly, personalisation of the vote could contribute to a reduction of the overweening influence of national political parties on the selection of candidates, both when they are initially elected to the EP and when they wish to stand for re-election. It is an obstacle to creating common political awareness at the EU level if electoral campaigns, from posters to TV debates or party manifestos, are dominated by the preferences and calculations of national political leaderships. Having 28 (or 27) national electoral systems, with only some important guidelines being determined at the EU level, also contributes to maintaining among voters narrow national views on EU policies and EU leaders' actions, for instance by minimising the visibility of European party families.

But some political leaders and constitutional scholars are convinced that a higher degree of harmonisation or Europeanisation of the EP elections is a crucial element to improve EU governance and to create political allegiance of European voters to the EU institutions. In earlier pronouncements – for example, in its Maastricht decision of 1993 – the German Federal Constitutional Court had indicated that a common electoral law in all Member States could strengthen the democratic credibility of the EP.[20] The Conference on the Future of Europe that is currently being prepared will, on the one hand, deal with a host of policy-related issues, such as migration management, future budgetary resources and the fight against global climate change. However, questions such as electoral reform or more effective European political parties are also likely to be prominent on the agenda.[21] This study aims to provide an informative contribution to these debates, which should come to a preliminary conclusion in 2021, if they are to be considered for application in the 2024 elections.

---

[20] BVerfGE 89, 155 (185) *Maastricht*. For critical comments of the Court´s more recent assessment of the European Parliament´s democratic legitimacy see, among many others, Martin Selmayr (2009): Endstation Lissabon? Zehn Thesen zum "Niemals"-Urteil des Bundesverfassungsgerichts vom 30. Juni 2009, *Zeitschrift für europarechtliche Studien* 12, 647–656.

[21] See, e.g., Andrew Duff (2019): The European Union makes a new push for democracy, Discussion paper, European Politics and Institutions Programme, European Policy Centre, 28 November 2019.

6. References

Alonso de León, Sergio (2017): Four decades of the European Electoral Act: a look back and a look ahead to an unfulfilled ambition. *European Law Review* 42, 353–368.

Bardi, Luciano and Lorenzo Cicchi (2015): Electoral rules and electoral participation in the European elections: the ballot format and structure. Study for the AFCO Committee, European Parliament, PE 536.464.

Camps, Rosa, Xavier Mora and Laia Saumell (2019): The method of Eneström and Phragmén for parliamentary elections by means of approval voting. arxiv.org/abs/1907.10590.

Costa, Olivier (2016): The history of European electoral reform and the Electoral Act 1976, Issues of democratisation and political legitimacy. Study, European Parliamentary Research Service Historical Archive Unit, PE 563.516.

Duff, Andrew (2011): Report (A7-0176/2011, 28.7.2011) on a Proposal for a Modification of the Act Concerning the Election of the Members of the European Parliament by Direct Universal Suffrage of 20 September 1976 (2009/2134(INI)). Committee on Constitutional Affairs of the European Parliament, PE 440.210v04-00.

Duff, Andrew (2019): The European Union makes a new push for democracy. Discussion paper, European Politics and Institutions Programme, European Policy Centre, 28 November 2019.

Grimmett, Geoffrey, Jean-François Laslier, Friedrich Pukelsheim, Victoriano Ramírez González, Richard Rose, Wojciech Słomczyński, Martin Zachariasen and Karol Życzkowski (2011): The Allocation Between the EU Member States of the Seats in the European Parliament – Cambridge Compromise. Note, European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, PE 432.760.

Grimmett, Geoffrey, Friedrich Pukelsheim, Victoriano Ramírez González, Wojciech Słomczyński and Karol Życzkowski (2017): The Composition of the European Parliament. Workshop 30 January 2017. Compilation: Two briefings and one in-depth analysis. European Parliament, Directorate-General for Internal Policies, Policy Department C: Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs, PE 583.117.

Hrbek, Rudolf (2019): Europawahl 2019: neue politische Konstellationen für die Wahlperiode 2019–2024. *Integration – Vierteljahreszeitschrift des Instituts für Europäische Politik in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration* 42, 167–186.

Janson, Svante (2016): Phragmén's and Thiele's election methods. arxiv.org/abs/1611.08826.

Kotanidis, Silvia (2019): European Union electoral law. Current situation and historical background. European Parliamentary Research Service, PE 642.250.

Lehmann, Wilhelm (2014): The European elections: EU legislation, national provisions and civic participation. Study for the AFCO Committee, Revised edition, European Parliament, PE 493.047.

Oelbermann, Kai-Friederike, Antonio Palomares and Friedrich Pukelsheim (2010): The 2009 European Parliament elections: From votes to seats in 27 ways. *Evropská volební studia – European Electoral Studies* 5, 148–182. Erratum, *ibidem* 6 (2011) 85.

Oelbermann, Kai-Friederike and Friedrich Pukelsheim (2015): European elections 2014: From voters to representatives, in twenty-eight ways. *Evropská volební studia – European Electoral Studies* 10*,* 91–124.

Pukelsheim, Friedrich (2017): *Proportional Representation – Apportionment Methods and Their Applications, With a Foreword by Andrew Duff MEP, Second Edition.* Springer International Publishing AG, Cham (CH).

Pukelsheim, Friedrich (2018): Compositional proportionality among European political parties at European Parliament elections. *Středoevropské politické studie – Central European Political Studies Review* 20, 1–15.

Pukelsheim, Friedrich and Geoffrey Grimmett (2018): Degressive representation of Member States in the European Parliament 2019–2024. *Representation – Journal of Representative Democracy* 54, 147–158.

Sabbati, Giulio, Gianluca Sgueo and Alina Dobreva (2019): 2019 European elections: National rules. At a Glance Infographic. European Parliamentary Research Service, PE 623.556.

Selmayr, Martin (2009): Endstation Lissabon? Zehn Thesen zum "Niemals"-Urteil des Bundesverfassungsgerichts vom 30. Juni 2009. *Zeitschrift für europarechtliche Studien* 12, 637–679.

Viola, Donatella M. (Editor) (2016): *Routledge Handbook of European Elections, With a foreword by J.H.H. Weiler.* Routledge, London.

Whitfield, Edward (2015): 40th Anniversary of the 1976 Act on Direct Elections to the European Parliament. European Parliamentary Research Service Historical Archive Unit, PE 563.513.

7. Appendix: Acronyms, country codes, party tabs, links

Acronym	Expansion	Page
EP	European Parliament	1
	Political Groups in the EP, see Table 2.4.1	9
MEP	Member of the European Parliament	1
ECSC	European Community of Steal and Coal	63
EEC	European Economic Community	63
EC	European Community	63
EU	European Union	1
LVx	List vote with one or more ('x') preference votes	7
xCV	One or more ('x') candidate votes	8
STV	Vote pattern of single transferable vote schemes	
STVfra	Single transferable vote scheme with fractional transfers	6
STVran	Single transferable vote scheme with random transfers	6
UVP	Unused voting power	25
DivStd	Divisor method with standard rounding	5
Div0.6	Swedish modification of the divisor method with standard rounding	5
DivDwn	Divisor method with downward rounding	5
HaQgrR	Hare-quota method with fit by greatest remainders	5
HQ3-EL	Hare-quota variant-3 method with Greek fit	6
HQxgrR	Hare-quota variant-'x' method with fit by greatest remainders	5
DQxgrR	Droop-quota variant-'x' method with fit by greatest remainders	6

Country Code	Short Name	Official Name
AT	Austria	Republic of Austria
BE	Belgium	Kingdom of Belgium
BG	Bulgaria	Republic of Bulgaria
CY	Cyprus	Republic of Cyprus
CZ	Czechia	Czech Republic
DE	Germany	Federal Republic of Germany
DK	Denmark	Kingdom of Denmark
EE	Estonia	Republic of Estonia
EL	Greece	Hellenic Republic
ES	Spain	Kingdom of Spain
FI	Finland	Republic of Finland
FR	France	French Republic
HR	Croatia	Republic of Croatia
HU	Hungary	Hungary
IE	Ireland	Ireland
IT	Italy	Italian Republic
LT	Lithuania	Republic of Lithuania
LU	Luxembourg	Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
LV	Latvia	Republic of Latvia
MT	Malta	Republic of Malta
NL	Netherlands	Kingdom of the Netherlands
PL	Poland	Republic of Poland
PT	Portugal	Portuguese Republic
RO	Romania	Romania
SE	Sweden	Kingdom of Sweden
SI	Slovenia	Republic of Slovenia
SK	Slovakia	Slovak Republic
UK	United Kingdom	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Source: http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-370100.htm (Interinstitutional Style Guide)

	Party Tab	Party Name
AT	ÖVP	Österreichische Volkspartei
	SPÖ	Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreich
	FPÖ	Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs
	GRÜNE	Die Grünen – Die Grüne Alternative
	NEOS	NEOS – Das neue Österreich
BE	N-VA	Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie
	Vl.Belang	Vlaams Belang
	Open VLD	Open Vlaamse Liberalen en Democraten
	CD&V	Christen-Democratisch & Vlaams
	Groen	Groen
	sp.a	Socialistische Partij – Anders
	PS	Parti Socialiste
	ECOLO	Ecologistes Confédérés pour l'Organisation de Luttes Originales
	MR	Mouvement Réformateur
	PTB-PVDA	Parti du Travail de Belgique
	PVDA-PTB	Partij van de Arbeid van België
	cdH	Centre Démocrate Humaniste
	CSP	Christlich Soziale Partei
BG	GERB	Coalition Grazhdani za evropeysko razvitie na Balgariya + Sayuz na demokratichnite sili
	BSP	Bulgarska sotsialisticheska partiya
	DPS	Dvizhenie za prava i svobodi
	VMRO	VMRO – Bulgarsko Natsionalno Dvizhenie
	Demokratichna Bulgaria	Demokratichna Bulgaria
CY	DISY	Democratic Rally
	AKEL	Progressive Party of Working People
	DIKO	Democratic Party
	EDEK	Movement for Social Democrats EDEK
CZ	ANO 2011	ANO 2011
	ODS	Občanská demokratická strana
	Piráti	Česká pirátská strana
	TOP 09 + STAN	STAROSTOVÉ (STAN) s regionálními partnery a TOP 09
	SPD	Svoboda a přímá demokracie
	KDU-ČSL	Křesťanská a demokratická unie – Československá strana lidová
	KSČM	Komunistická strana Čech a Moravy
DE	CDU	Christlich Demokratische Union Deutschlands
	GRÜNE	Bündnis 90/Die Grünen
	SPD	Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands
	AfD	Alternative für Deutschland
	CSU	Christlich-Soziale Union in Bayern e.V.
	DIE LINKE	DIE LINKE
	FDP	Freie Demokratische Partei
	Die PARTEI	Partei für Arbeit, Rechtsstaat, Tierschutz, Elitenförderung und basisdemokratische Initiative
	FREIE WÄHLER	FREIE WÄHLER
	Tierschutzpartei	PARTEI MENSCH UMWELT TIERSCHUTZ
	ÖDP	Ökologisch-Demokratische Partei
	FAMILIE	Familien-Partei Deutschlands
	VOLT	VOLT
	PIRATEN	Piratenpartei Deutschland

DK	V	V – Venstre, Danmarks Liberale Parti
	A	S – Socialdemokratiet
	F	SF – Socialistisk Folkeparti
	O	DF – Dansk Folkeparti
	B	RV – Det Radikale Venstre
	C	KF – Det Konservative Folkeparti
	Ø	EL – 'Enhedslisten, de Rød – Grønne'
	N	Folkebevægelsen mod EU
	Å	Alternativet
	I	LA – Liberal Alliance
EE	RE	Eesti Reformierakond
	SDE	Sotsiaaldemokraatlik Erakond
	KE	Eesti Keskerakond
	EKRE	Eesti Konservatiivne Rahvaerakond
	Isamaa	Isamaa Erakond
EL	N.D.	New Democracy
	SY.RI.ZA.	Coalition of the Radical Left
	Coal. KINAL	Coalition Movement for Change (Panhellenic Socialist Movement + Democratic Alignment + Movement of Democratic Socialists)
	KKE	Communist Party of Greece
	X.A.	Golden Dawn
	EL	Greek Solution
ES	PSOE/PSC	Partido Socialista Obrero Español + Partido de los Socialistas de Cataluña
	PP	Partido Popular
	C's	Ciudadanos – Partido de la Ciudadanía
	Podemos-IU	Coalition Unidas Podemos Cambiar Europa (Unidas Podemos + Izquierda Unida + Catalunya en Comú + Barcelona en Comú)
	VOX	VOX
	Ahora Repúblicas	Coalition Ahora Repúblicas (Esquerra Republicana de Catalunya + Euskal Herria Bildu + El Bloque Nacionalista Galego)
	JUNTS	Coalition LLIURES PER EUROPA (Partit Demòcrata Europeu Català + Junts per Catalunya)
	CEUS	Coalition por una Europa Solidaria (Partido Nacionalista Vasco + Coalición Canaria + Compromiso por Galicia + Atarrabia Taldea + Proposta per les Illes Balears y Demòcrates Valencians)
FI	KOK	Kansallinen Kokoomus
	VIHR	Vihreä liitto
	SDP	Finlands Socialdemokratiska Parti
	PS	Perussuomalaiset
	KESK	Suomen Keskusta
	VAS	Vasemmistoliitto
	SFP (RKP)	Svenska folkpartiet (Ruotsalainen kansanpuolue)
FR	RN	Rassemblement national
	Coal. Renaissance	La Republique En marche! + MoDem + Agir + Mouvement radical, social et libéral
	EELV	Europe écologie – Les verts
	LR	Les Républicains – Union de la droite et du centre
	FI	France insoumise
	Coal. EEES	Coalition Envie d'Europe écologique et sociale (Parti Socialiste + Radicaux de Gauche + Place publique + Nouvelle Donne)

HR	HDZ	Hrvatska demokratska zajednica
	SDP	Socijaldemokratska partija Hrvatske
	Coal. Hrv. Suverenisti	Coalition Hrvatski suverenisti (HRAST – Pokret za uspješnu Hrvatsku + Hrvatska konzervativna stranka – HKS + Hrvatska stranka prava de Ante Starrčević – HSP AS + Ujedinjeni hrvatski domoljubi – UHD)
	Mislav Kolakušić	Independent Mislav Kolakušić
	ŽIVI ZID	Živi zid
	Coal. AMS	Coalition Amsterdamska koalicija (Hrvatski laburisti + Primorsko goranski savez + Hrvatska stranka umirovljenika + Istarski demokratski sabor + Hrvatska seljačka stranka + Građansko-liberalni savez + Demokrati)
HU	FIDESZ + KDNP	Coalition (FIDESZ – Magyar Polgári Szövetség + Kereszténydemokrata Néppárt)
	DK	Demokratikus Koalíció
	Momentum	Momentum Mozgalom
	MSZP-P	Coalition (Magyar Szocialista Párt + Párbeszéd Magyarországért)
	JOBBIK	Jobbik Magyarországért Mozgalom
IE	FG	Fine Gael Party
	FF	Fianna Fáil Party
	SF	Sinn Féin
	GP	Green Party
	I4C	Independents 4 Change
IT	LN	Lega Salvini Premier
	PD	Partito Democratico (con Siamo Europei)
	M5S	Movimento Cinque Stelle
	FI	Forza Italia
	FDI	Fratelli d'Italia
LT	TS-LKD	Homeland Union – Lithuanian Christian Democrats
	LSDP	Lithuanian Social Democratic Party
	LVŽS	Lithuanian Peasant Popular Union
	DP	Labour Party
	LRLS	Liberals Movement of the Republic of Lithuania
	VKM-AMT	Visuomeninis rinkimų komitetas 'Aušros Maldeikienės traukinys'
	KKŠS	'Valdemaro Tomaševskio blokas' Christian Families Union and Russians Alliance Coalition
LU	DP/PD	Demokratesch Partei/Parti démocratique
	CSV/PCS	Chrëschtlech-Sozial Volkspartei/Parti populaire chrétien-social
	Déi Gréng/Les Verts	Déi Gréng/Les Verts
	LSAP/POSL	Lëtzebuerger Sozialistesch Aarbechterpartei/Parti ouvrier socialiste luxembourgeois
LV	JV	Jaunā Vienotība
	Saskaņa SDP	Saskaņa Sociāldemokrātiskā partija
	Coal. NA	Coalition Nacionālā apvienība (Tēvzemei un Brīvībai/LNNK + Visu Latvijai!)
	Coal. AP!	Coalition AP! (Latvijas attīstībai + Kustība Par!)
	LKS	Latvijas Krievu savienībā
	Coal. ZZS	Coalition Zaļo un Zemnieku Savienība (Latvijas Zemnieku Savienība + Latvijas Zaļā Partija)
MT	PL/MLP	Partit Laburista/Malta Labour Party
	PN/NP	Partit Nazzjonalista/Nationalist Party
NL	PvdA	Partij van de Arbeid
	VVD	Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie
	CDA	Christen-Democratisch Appèl
	FvD	Forum voor Democratie
	GroenLinks	GroenLinks
	D66	Democraten 66
	Coal. CU + SGP	ChristenUnie + Staatkundig Gereformeerde Partij
	PvdD	Partij voor de Dieren
	50+	50Plus
	PVV	Partij voor de Vrijheid

PL	PiS	Prawo i Sprawiedliwość
	Coal. KE	Coalition Koalicja Europejska (Platforma Obywatelska + Polskie Stronnictwo Ludowe + Sojusz Lewicy Demokratycznej + Nowoczesna + Partia Zieloni)
	Wiosna	Wiosna Roberta Biedronia
PT	PS	Partido Socialista
	PSD	Partido Social Democrata
	B.E.	Bloco de Esquerda
	CDU (PCP + PEV)	Coligação Democrática Unitária (Partido Comunista Português + Partido Ecologista os Verdes)
	CDS-PP	CDS + Partido Popular
	PAN	Pessoas–Animais–Natureza
RO	PNL	Partidul Național Liberal
	PSD	Partidul Social Democrat
	Coal. Alliance 2020	Coalition 2020 USR + PLUS Alliance (Uniunea Salvați România + Partidul Libertății, Unității și Solidarității)
	Pro Romania	Partidul Pro Romania
	PMP	Partidul Mișcarea Populară
	UDMR	Romániai Magyar Demokrata Szövetség/Uniunea Democrată Maghiară din România
SE	S	Socialdemokraterna
	M	Moderaterna
	SD	Sverigedemokraterna
	MP	Miljöpartiet de Gröna
	C	Centerpartiet
	KD	Kristdemokraterna
	V	Vänsterpartiet
	L	Liberalerna
SI	Coal. SDS + SLS	Coalition (Slovenska demokratska stranka + Slovenska ljudska stranka)
	SD	Socialni demokrati
	LMŠ	Lista Marjana Šarca
	N.Si	Nova Slovenija
SK	Coal. PS + SPOLU	Coalition (Progresívne Slovensko + SPOLU – občianska demokracia)
	SMER-SD	SMER – Sociálna demokracia
	ĽSNS	Kotleba – Ľudová strana Naše Slovensko
	KDH	Kresťanskodemokratické hnutie
	SaS	Sloboda a Solidarita
	Coal. OL'aNO + NOVA	Coalition (Obyčajní Ľudia a nezávislé osobnosti + Nová väčšina – Dohoda)
UK	Brexit Party	Brexit Party
	LibDem	Liberal Democrats
	Lab.	Labour Party
	GP	Green Party
	Cons.	Conservative and Unionist Party
	SNP	Scottish National Party
	PL-PW	Plaid Cymru – Party of Wales
	SF	Sinn Féin
	DUP	Democratic Unionist Party
	APNI	Alliance Party

Source: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/election-results-2019/en

	Link to Electoral Authority of the Member States (as of June 2020)
AT	https://www.bmi.gv.at/412/Europawahlen/Europawahl_2019/start.aspx
BE	https://wahlen2019.belgium.be/en/election?el=EU
BG	https://results.cik.bg/ep2019/rezultati/index.html
CY	http://live.elections.moi.gov.cy/English/EUROPEAN_ELECTIONS_2019/Islandwide
CZ	https://volby.cz/pls/ep2019/ep?xjazyk=EN
DE	https://www.bundeswahlleiter.de/en/europawahlen/2019/ergebnisse/bund-99.html
DK	https://elections.sim.dk/ep-elections/results-of-the-european-parliament-elections-in-denmark-in-2019/
EE	https://ep2019.valimised.ee/en/voting-result/index.html
EL	https://ekloges.ypes.gr/current/e/home/
ES	http://www.juntaelectoralcentral.es/cs/jec/elecciones/Europeas-mayo2019 https://eleccioneslocaleseuropeas19.es/calendario-electoral.html
FI	https://tulospalvelu.vaalit.fi/EPV-2019/en/index.html
FR	https://www.interieur.gouv.fr/Elections/Les-resultats/Europeennes/elecresult__europeennes-2019/
HR	https://www.izbori.hr/site/izbori-referendumi/izbori-clanova-u-europski-parlament-iz-republike-hrvatske/izbori-clanova-u-europski-parlament-iz-republike-hrvatske-2019-1759/1759
HU	https://www.valasztas.hu/ep2019
IE	https://www.housing.gov.ie/sites/default/files/publications/files/a4_european_results_2019_0.pdf
IT	https://dait.interno.gov.it/elezioni/speciale-europee
LT	https://www.vrk.lt/en/2019-europos-parlamento/rezultatai https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/5153/file/Lithuania_law_elections_european_parliament_2012_en.pdf
LU	https://elections.public.lu/dam-assets/fr/elections-europeennes/2019/RECENSEMENT-GENERAL-2019.pdf
LV	https://epv2019.cvk.lv/pub/en/election-results https://www.cvk.lv/en/elections/ep-elections/elections-to-the-european-parliament-2019
MT	https://electoral.gov.mt/ElectionResults/MEP?year=245&v=null
NL	https://www.kiesraad.nl/verkiezingen/europees-parlement
PL	https://pe2019.pkw.gov.pl/pe2019/en
PT	http://www.cne.pt/sites/default/files/dl/2019_pe_mapa_resultados.pdf
RO	http://europarlamentare2019.bec.ro/rezultate/ http://legislatie.just.ro/Public/DetaliiDocumentAfis/90301
SE	https://www.val.se/valresultat/europaparlamentet/2019/valresultat.html
SI	https://www.volitve.gov.si/ep2019/en/index.html#/rezultati
SK	http://volby.statistics.sk/ep/ep2019/en/ https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/7767/file/Slovakia_Act_European_Parliamentary_Elections_2003_am2008_en.pdf
UK	http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/CBP-8600/CBP-8600.pdf https://www.eoni.org.uk/Elections/

This EPRS study provides an overview of the electoral systems and outcomes in the May 2019 elections to the European Parliament. It analyses the procedural details of how parties and candidates register their participation, how votes are cast, how valid votes are converted into seats, and how seats are assigned to candidates. For each Member State the paper describes the ballot structure and vote pattern used, the apportionment of seats among the Member State's domestic parties, and the assignment of the seats of a party to its candidates. It highlights aspects that are common to all Member States and captures peculiarities that are specific to some domestic provisions.

QA-04-20-445-EN-N