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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

This report addresses the issue of a possible harmonisation and Europeanisation of the ballots used in the 28 EU Member States (MS) for the elections of the European Parliament (EP). The reason for this exercise is that the ballots represent a veritable interface between the electors and the candidates in the election, and, ultimately, between the electors and their representatives. The ballots used in EP elections differ rather dramatically across the MS. Harmonising their shapes, sizes, contents, et cetera, would be an important step in the direction of favouring the harmonisation of the mechanisms of representation at EU level, and possibly of making EP elections more clearly European.

Aim

- To identify, through a review of the relevant literature, and to present the theoretical arguments that need to be taken into account in the light of a possible reform of EP election ballot regulation;
- To collect data on the 28 MS’ electoral laws and ballot papers’ facsimiles and create a codebook for the analysis of the relative data-sets;
- To assess, through an analysis of the data, the degree of fragmentation and potential resistance to harmonisation of the 28 ballot models currently adopted in the EP elections;
- To assess the general feasibility of harmonisation and Europeanisation of the ballots used in the EP elections;
- To identify the technical solutions that appear to have the greatest potential to produce significant advances in the harmonisation of the EP election ballots;
- To single out the solutions that can be adopted without causing unnecessary disruption to the existing regulatory systems at MS level and at European level.
GENERAL INFORMATION

**KEY FINDINGS**

- The layout and structure of MS’ ballots show, at present, a rather low degree of homogeneity, even if all the ballots are structured in their main components by the criteria dictated by the commonly adopted proportional principles of seat apportionment and representation;

- The most common ballot type is multiple list/multiple candidate;

- The multiple list/multiple candidate ballot type is associated with higher citizen awareness;

- The adoption of the multiple list/multiple ballot type would allow significant harmonisation of the EP elections ballots and would require changes in fewer countries with no change at all in other elements of the electoral law;

- Resistance might emerge in MS that, as a result, would have radically different ballots for national and European elections;

- Few major legislative obstacles to the Europeanisation of the EP election ballots, such as the inclusion of Europarty affiliation and *spitzencandidat*, exist.
1. INTRODUCTION

As is well known, the election of the European Parliament (EP) consists of 28 separate elections in as many Member States (MS). Differences in polling days, seat-apportionment mechanisms, number and size of the constituencies, threshold levels, *et cetera* are evident across the MS; such differences are often blamed for contributing to the difficult European characterisation of EP elections. This study aims to assess the feasibility of a harmonisation and "Europeanisation" of the ballots used in the 28 Member States for the election of the European Parliament. The reason for this exercise is that ballots are crucial elements in any election, not only because they are the actual means through which the popular will is expressed at election time, but also because they represent a veritable interface between the electors and the candidates in the election and, ultimately, between the electors and their representatives. However, the ballots used in EP elections differ rather dramatically across the MS. Harmonising their shapes, sizes, contents, *et cetera*, could certainly be a step in the direction of making the EP elections more clearly European. More homogenous ballots would most likely make for more homogeneous presentations of candidates and campaign styles. Moreover, the possible inclusion in the ballots across the 28 MS of Euro-specific information, such as the name of the affiliated European party, its logo, and a reference to the leading candidate for the Presidency of the European Commission (EC) could enhance both the European and transnational character of the EP elections.

Scholars have long studied various elements of electoral ballots, from how names are listed on the ballot (Walker, 1966; Hamilton and Ladd, 1996; Miller and Krosnick, 1998; Krosnick et al., 2003) to the design of the ballot itself (Walker, 1966; Niemi and Herrnson, 2003; Kimball and Kropf, 2008). Variations in ballot format and structure have been linked to a variety of issues ranging from accurate vote-counting (Ansolabehere and Stewart, 2005) to the willingness of citizens to accept the legitimacy of election results (Saltman, 2006), and to the legislative behaviour of politicians (Norris 2002, 2004). But in the specific case of the EP elections, little attention has been devoted to electoral ballots. This is probably due to the fact that the dominant view characterises these elections as second-order elections (Reif and Schmitt, 1980; Schmitt, 2005; Marsh, 2008). As such, the characteristics of what is generally considered to be a secondary element, a mere instrument in the elections, such as the ballot, do not seem to be of particular relevance or interest. As is often the case with aspects of second-order elections, whatever is already in existence and used in first-order elections is adopted in or adapted to the second-order ones as well. However, some recent developments such as the already mentioned explicit linking of the result of EP elections to that of the President of the European Commission may contribute to alter the second-order interpretation, and to create conditions that may lead to the formation of a genuine European party system (Bardi et al. 2010, 2014). This could change the perceptions about ballot structure in European elections in a positive direction.

However, even if this should be the case, differences in ballot format and regulation would remain across MS. This study compares the actual ballot structure of each Member State according to some key variables, analyses what information is currently provided in the ballots, describes the provisions that regulate all aspects related to its format and appearance in the 28 MS, and investigates the legal and political constraints that have an impact on amending such legislation.
2. RESEARCH DESIGN, SOURCES AND DATA

In presenting the results of our research (EuroBallot), this report is divided into three main parts. The first one is a brief review of the literature on the main theoretical contributions to the study of electoral ballots, and a first presentation of the main elements to be considered in the analysis of electoral ballots. The second part is composed of a) an analysis of the current provisions of each of the national Electoral Acts or relevant legislative measures of the 28 MS, with specific reference to what information can be provided on the ballot (and specifically prohibited); b) an analysis of the current format and structure of the ballots used in the 2014 EP elections. Finally, the third part is a comparative analysis of party-ballots and preference-ballots, from which we draw some conclusions about the possible harmonisation of the EP ballots in the 28 MS.

The first part is mainly theoretical, but also presents some basic data about the electoral systems and electoral ballots in the MS. It specifically provides some arguments linking specific types of electoral ballots and certain strategic forms of behaviour by the parties and the candidates; moreover, a small part is devoted to the link between electoral ballot types and citizens' awareness of candidates. The second part of the analysis is primarily descriptive, and relies on primary sources. It aims to give a comparative description of the "degrees of freedom" of all the 28 Member States' European Electoral ballots, with a specific focus on the key characteristics and limitations that the ballots can have in terms of their structure and in terms of the information that they can provide. It also describes and comparatively classifies the actual ballot structure and format in the 28 European MS. The ballot facsimiles are analysed here with a number of variables that can be divided into two groups. The first group of variables is not drawn from the characteristics of the electoral systems but from the EP election ballot design of the regulatory regimes in the 28 MS. To wit: the shape and size of the ballot paper; whether the ballot paper is printed in colour or in black and white; the order in which parties/candidates are presented on the ballot; and, finally, the possibility of absentee voting that can result in electronic online voting (e.g., Estonia), postal voting and proxy voting.

Electoral system-related variables, on the other hand, depend on the electoral law that is used at national level to elect MEPs: a) the method for expressing preferences varies according to list type (closed vs. open list or variations thereof); b) the degree of information provided on the ballot, which can be completely blank or, at the opposite extreme, provide not only party name and symbol, but also include the name, address, profession, affiliation and even a photograph of the candidate (as, for instance, is the case of Ireland).

In the third part, through a comparative analysis of the variables identified, we will specifically address the feasibility of the harmonisation of EP election ballots and also of the inclusion in of Euro-specific information (the Europarty affiliation of parties and candidates, the Europarty logo, and the Spitzenkandidaten). Some conclusions will also be drawn on the legislative cost and the practical cost of harmonisation. The legislative cost refers to the possibility of modifying (if necessary) the relevant Electoral Act or legislation that regulates the ballot. In some countries, the Europeanisation of ballots may already be possible under the existing legislation; in others, Constitutional provisions may prohibit any reference to a supranational level, making change extremely difficult. The practical cost of ballot harmonisation is more technical in nature and its assessment will be based upon the second part of the analysis concerning the actual structure and format of the ballot.

Finally, our research relies on two main types of sources: 1) the 28 MS EP election electoral laws; and 2) the actual ballots used in the European Parliament elections of May 2014. In order to be certain of the electoral laws and obtain samples of the ballots, our research team contacted EP information...
offices for each of the 28 MS, and, in some cases, also National Electoral Offices. All 28 MS European election ballot facsimiles were collected; they can be found in Annex III. In most cases, English versions of the respective electoral laws were provided by either MS EP Information Offices or National Electoral Offices. In some cases, however, only the original language was available. As the research team competences covered four languages (English, Italian, French, Spanish), translations were commissioned to mother-tongue researchers in only 8 cases. See Table 1 for a summary.

### Table 1. Electoral Laws language availability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Electoral law</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Electoral law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>ITALIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>CZECH</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>DUTCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>DANISH</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>PORTUGUESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>SLOVAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>SLOVENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>GREEK</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>SPANISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Authors’ own compilation.
3. ELECTORAL SYSTEM, BALLOT TYPES AND FORMAT

There seems to be sufficient consensus in the literature that the type of electoral system chosen in a given polity has a bearing on the structure of the ballot used for elections (Norris 2002, 2004: The ACE Encyclopaedia 1998/2013). Pippa Norris has developed a typology of ballot types that are linked to specific types of electoral systems. The biggest differences in ballot structure appear to be determined by differences in seat-allocation principles; that is, by whether seats are allocated in a given electoral system according to proportional representation (PR) or according to any variation of majority/plurality representation. Fortunately, in EP elections, the adoption of PR electoral systems in all 28 MS already eliminates the most relevant potential discrepancies. As a result, only two of the four ballot structure types listed by Norris appear to be relevant. Table 2 illustrates a number of electoral system characteristics and ballot structure types. The major differences lie in whether the candidate lists are open or closed, or, in other words, whether voters are allowed to cast preference votes for individual candidates as well as for the parties, thus influencing the allocation of seats to given candidates on a given party list or not. In the latter case, who is actually elected depends on the number of seats a party obtains in the election and by the candidates’ positions on the list. In the former case, ballots are - according to Norris - of the “preference” type; in the latter, of the “party” type. Building on the basic idea that formal rules determine political behaviour, a popular approach to understanding electoral laws within the framework of rational-choice institutionalism, Norris assumes that formal rules generate important incentives that are capable of shaping and constraining political behaviour. And, therefore, that “electoral engineering” - changing the electoral rules and thus the ballot structure – has the capacity to generate major consequences by altering the strategic behaviour of politicians, parties, and citizens. Norris also develops a set of hypotheses concerning the relationship between formal rules and strategic behaviour. One hypothesis concerns the presence of electoral thresholds, an aspect that is not relevant for the purpose of this study and therefore will not be treated here. Two other hypotheses, however, focus specifically on the ballot structure as the independent variable: a) according to the ballot structure, politicians calculate whether to offer particularistic or programmatic benefits; and b) according to the ballot structure, parties choose whether to select socially homogeneous or socially diverse legislative candidates. Considering only the two types of ballots that are relevant for the European elections (thus excluding typically majoritarian candidate-ballots and mixed systems dual-ballots), the findings show that preference-ballots usually correspond to particularistic benefits and socially-diverse candidates; on the other hand, party ballots tend to be associated with programmatic benefits and socially-homogeneous candidates. These findings imply a need to take such differences in strategic behaviour into account in the event of ballot harmonisation at European level.

As already mentioned, Table 2 reports the data concerning these two dimensions. It also lists entries for two other types of electoral-system differences that we consider relevant for our analysis: a) electoral district type (one single national district vs. a number of sub-national ones); b) homogeneity of the electoral system chosen for EP elections in any given MS in terms of its main characteristics, with that adopted for the election of the respective national parliament. In our study, we will take the different structural characteristics of these two types into account in order to assess the potential problems of ballot-structure harmonisation.

Electoral district type is important, as it influences the number of candidates and, in some cases, also the number and identity of parties on the ballot. In the case of one single district, there are no within-country differences, but, in the case of multiple sub-national districts, candidatures on the ballots may vary not only in terms of the number of candidates listed (determined by the size of each sub-national district), but also in terms of the actual parties that present candidates (as certain regional parties may do so only in certain specific

\[1\] Norris (2002, 2004) developed a four type classification of electoral ballots: Candidate-ballots, Preference-ballots, Dual-ballots, and Party-ballots. Candidate-ballots pertain to plurality/majority single-member-district systems, whereas Dual-ballots are used in mixed systems (where both PR and plurality are used); neither is relevant for an analysis of EP elections.
geographical districts). Finally, electoral system (dis)-homogeneity between EP and national elections is important, as it might suggest different levels of potential resistance to attempts at further harmonisation in given Member States, with the more homogenous pairs being potentially more resistant.

Table 2. MS electoral systems and ballot types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Electoral System</th>
<th>Ballot type*</th>
<th>Subnational Constituencies</th>
<th>Homogeneity with national electoral system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>STV</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Panachage</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>STV</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>PR - open list</td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>PR - closed list</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PR - closed list</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>Party</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PR - open list</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Panachage</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Preference</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Generally, and quite intuitively, “preference ballots” are more complex than “party” ballots, as, in most cases, they must allow for the expression of votes for specific candidates (sometimes in multiple numbers, as in Italy), and not only for parties. There are exceptions, for example, when one vote automatically determines the other, as is the case for Ireland’s and Malta’s STV system, whereby votes for individual candidates count for the respective parties as well. As Table 1 indicates, the 28 MS EP elections ballots are evenly divided between the “preference” and the “party” type. This first finding, albeit general and apparently very rough, already gives a very important indication of the difficulties that are implicit in any attempt to harmonise EP election electoral ballots. Homogenising them could, in fact, require the harmonisation of some crucial elements of the 28 EP electoral laws, such as the form and structure of candidate presentation and election. At a political level, this could be a very difficult endeavour, as both sets of MS that have adopted one or the other solution are equally strong, at least in terms of numbers, if not in terms of total population (only Italy among the more populated MS adopts “preference” ballots, whereas France, Germany, Poland, Spain, and the UK adopt “party” ones).

Of the other two variables considered in Table 3, the existence of sub-national constituencies appears to be less relevant. This is not only because there is a more clear orientation amongst MS, with only six of them allowing for an internal partition of the national territory for EP election purposes. But also because ballots used in different internal constituencies do not need to be structurally different. They may, in fact, include different candidates and even parties but this can be done with identical ballot layouts and structures. On the other hand, electoral law homogeneity can be a more problematic variable. It has been noted that lack of homogeneity in the main characteristics of electoral laws can have a significant impact on the different structuring of party systems at national and European levels (Bardi 2002). It can be surmised that MS that present homogeneity at the two levels may show significant resistance towards the changes in EP laws that might be necessary to allow for the harmonisation of EP ballots, especially if such changes should be so significant as to introduce or to eliminate preference voting and reveal discrepancies with their respective national level laws. The number of MS that would fall into this category is quite significant: 19 out of 28, roughly two-thirds of the total.

One final element has to be considered at this point. So far, the ballot structure (and other electoral formal aspects, such as the presence of sub-national constituencies and the homogeneity with national electoral law) have been analysed in relation to the strategic behaviour of political parties and the structure of the party system. However, as argued by previous studies (Norris 2004), a relationship between the presence of a certain ballot type and the level of the citizens’ awareness of the candidates can also be ascertained. Table 3 shows the result of a survey that asked electors whether they recalled any candidate in their district in the last parliamentary elections, and, if so, they were asked to identify their names. Again, what interests us here is the comparison between party-ballots and preference-ballots, since no candidate-ballots or dual-ballots are present in proportional representation European elections. What the data clearly show is that party-ballots tend to be associated with the less-informed citizens, with over 66% of the respondents unable to identify even one candidate in the previous elections and only 18% capable of giving more than one correct answer. By contrast, the levels of citizen awareness associated with preference-ballots are considerably higher (with “only” 45% of the sample giving no correct answer, and almost one out of three respondents – 31% - being able to identify more than one name correctly). This is, indeed, valuable information that should be taken into account in the event that a future harmonisation of electoral laws in all MS will necessitate the choosing of one or the other ballot type.
Table 3. Knowledge of candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% None Correct</th>
<th>% One Correct</th>
<th>% More than One Correct</th>
<th>Electoral System</th>
<th>Type of Ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All party-ballots</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Party List PR</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All preference-ballots</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Q: “Do you happen to remember the name of any candidates who ran/stood in your [lower house primary electoral district] in the last [parliamentary/congressional] elections? [IF YES] What were their names?”*


In conclusion, the analytical framework that is implicit in and emerges from the data presented so far is the product of what can be extracted from the comparative literature on electoral systems and ballot formats. However, our research will also have to take into account the specific provisions of all 28 MS’ laws regulating EP elections. On this, comparative analyses are not available and we will have to explore uncharted territories.
4. ANALYSIS

As is customary with research projects of this kind, a codebook has been created with EuroBallot’s significant variables (see Table 4). As can be seen from the table, some variables overlap, as they represent information that can be found both in the electoral laws/by-laws and on the ballots themselves (e.g., ballot colour, shape or size). However, it is still necessary to look at both sets of data, as some information is reported only by one of the two sources. For instance, some electoral laws do not specifically define if the ballot has to be in black and white or in colour, but, from the ballot facsimile, this information can be clearly seen; in other cases (e.g., UK) the electoral law also defines the ballot colour.

Table 4. EuroBallot codebook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electoral law</td>
<td>Electoral law</td>
<td>Electoral system</td>
<td>1 Closed list; 2 Semi-open; 3 Open list; 4 Panachage; 5 STV</td>
<td>Electoral law or bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation of ballot in law</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate identification Information</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot</td>
<td>1 Pre-printed; 2 Electronically produced; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic voting regulation</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot type</td>
<td>1 Single-party; 2 Multi-party; 3 Blank ballot; 4 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot colour indication</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot shape indication</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ballot size indication</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No; 3 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order of lists</td>
<td>1 Alphabetical; 2 Registration; 3 Draw; 4 Other criteria; 5 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>indication in law; 6 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order of candidates</td>
<td>1 Alphabetical; 2 Draw; 3 Other criteria; 4 Decided by lists; 5 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>indication in law; 6 No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European party symbol</td>
<td>1 Provided for; 2 Permitted; 3 Prohibited; 4 No indication in law; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual ballot paper</td>
<td>Order of lists</td>
<td>1 Single-party; 2 Multi-party; 3 Blank</td>
<td>1 BW; 2 Colour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ballot</td>
<td>1 Rectangular; 2 Squared; 3 Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Actual size in mm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order of lists</td>
<td>1 Alphabetical; 2 Other criteria; 3 No lists printed on ballot; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order of candidates</td>
<td>1 Alphabetical; 2 Other criteria; 3 No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate identification Information</td>
<td>1 Yes (extensive); 2 Yes (qualification only); 3 No; 4 No candidates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>printed on ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National party symbol</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European party symbol</td>
<td>1 Yes; 2 Inside national party logo; 2 No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own compilation.

Besides the variables already examined in Table 2, more specific aspects of the electoral systems are listed here, such as the various types of preference-oriented laws like panachage and STV, as well as electronic voting. Most variables, however, refer to characteristics and structural elements of electoral ballots.
Tables 5 and 6 present the frequencies of all of these variables. As we have already mentioned, there is a good deal of overlap between what is found in electoral laws (Table 5) and through observation of electoral ballots (Table 6). Our analysis will therefore take this into consideration and look systematically at variables across both sources. As can be seen from the tables, all 28 MS are covered by this study, both in terms of electoral law and actual ballot analysis.

Table 5. Variables frequency (MS electoral law).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral System</th>
<th>Ballot type</th>
<th>Order of lists</th>
<th>Order of candidates</th>
<th>European party symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>Provided for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panachage</td>
<td>No ballot</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STV</td>
<td>regulation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No indication in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate ballot for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>each list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No lists printed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No ballot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 28</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation of ballot in law</th>
<th>Candidate identification information</th>
<th>Ballot colour indication</th>
<th>Ballot shape</th>
<th>Ballot size</th>
<th>Voting by post</th>
<th>Embass y voting</th>
<th>Proxy voting</th>
<th>E-voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6. Variables frequency (MS actual ballot).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot type</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Order of lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20 Rectangular</td>
<td>28 Alphabetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8 Squared</td>
<td>0 Other criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 Other</td>
<td>0 No lists printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 Total</td>
<td>28 Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of candidates</th>
<th>Candidate identification</th>
<th>National party symbol</th>
<th>European party symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (qualification only)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Inside national party logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No candidates</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printed on ballot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 5 and 6 afford a comprehensive birds-eye view of most of the data that we have collected and compiled. Variable analysis, however, will be based upon a number of variable-specific pie charts. There are three variables that can only be analysed with data obtained from the electoral laws. A comprehensive list of variables and data can be found at the end of this text, in Tables 7 and 8.

As mentioned, the electoral system is one such variable. Figure 1 confirms that open lists are the most common ones, accounting for almost two-thirds of all MS. Closed lists come second, with 29% of MS. The additional information provided here concerns the existence of STV, which is present in only two countries (Ireland and Malta) and therefore represents a minimum fraction of the total. Panachage is a peculiarity of Luxembourg. It is worth noting within the preference ballot group there is a difference between electoral laws that provide for open or semi-open lists\(^2\). However, this may be of little

\(^2\) See Annex IV, Glossary of Basic Terms Used.
relevance in terms of ballot harmonisation, as, in most cases, the candidates are listed anyway. Consequently, this division is not taken into account in our analysis.

**Figure 1. Electoral system: types of lists**

![Chart showing electoral system types](chart1.png)

Source: Authors' own compilation.

The second variable the analysis of which relies exclusively on data drawn from electoral law is “regulation of ballot in law”. Here, in the overwhelming majority of the cases, we can observe that electoral laws do have specific provisions for the definition of electoral ballot structures and characteristics (see Figure 2). Only a few countries delegate the definition of the ballot structure and layout to a law applicable to all elections held at various levels in a given country, usually a regulation of the National Electoral Office. Clearly, in these cases, all the other variables (shape, colour, lists order, etc.) have been coded with the same value: “no regulation of ballot in law”. In any event, the fact that so many MS regulate ballots by law might be an obstacle to ballot structure harmonisation.

**Figure 2. Regulation of ballot in law**

![Chart showing regulation of ballot in law](chart2.png)

Source: Authors' own compilation.
The second group of variables the analysis of which relies exclusively on data drawn from electoral laws concerns the possibility of absentee voting. The normal ways of producing ballots is by printing them ahead of the election and then distributing them (upon the basis of projected voter participation) in polling stations across the national territory. Voters indicate, usually by marking specific boxes or spaces, their preference(s) on the ballot paper itself and place it in the ballot box, to be counted at the end of the proceedings. However, alternative means of voting exist. One such alternative is voting by electronic means using special machines located in the polling stations. Ordinarily, as in the case of the United States, this is all that voters are required to do; alternatively, they can be asked to print a paper ballot which records the vote that they cast by means of the said machine, and then to insert the ballot in the ballot box. The advantage of this system is that it allows for a physical/material record of the vote, and of its counting, while, at the same time, eliminating organisational and logistical problems linked to the production, storage and distribution of the ballots, as well as pre-empting possible fraud potentially caused by unauthorised access to blank ballots before the vote. Be it as it may, most of the electoral laws examined do not provide for electronic voting, as can be seen from Figure 3. This variable, although it presents almost no variance, is potentially relevant given the prospect of a future adoption of electronic means of voting in the MS, a possibility which, to date, is only reflected in the Estonian electoral law.

Other alternatives include the means to allow citizens who reside abroad or who are temporarily abroad to vote. Embassy voting is most popular with 57% of all the MS allowing for this possibility (Figure 4). Voting by post comes next with 50% (Figure 5) with only 11% of the member states allowing for proxy voting (Figure 6). Some countries (Estonia, France, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the UK) allow for more than one of such alternatives. In any event, none of these, other than universal electronic voting, have a serious relevance for ballot paper harmonisation. It goes without saying, however, that it is of fundamental importance that all EU citizens have at least similar opportunities to vote while they are abroad, especially if they are within the EU zone. But this, however, falls outside the remit of this report.

![Figure 3. E-voting](source)

Source: Authors’ own compilation.
Figure 4. Embassy voting

Source: Authors’ own compilation.

Figure 5. Voting by post

Source: Authors’ own compilation.

Figure 6. Proxy voting

Source: Authors’ own compilation.

Figure 7 shows the distribution of ballot types as reported in the electoral laws and observed in the actual ballots. Both sources converge on EP electoral ballots being prevalently of the multi-party type, accounting for roughly two-thirds of the cases. With this type of ballot, voters have all the lists that
run for the election reported in a single, usually big, ballot paper. The vote is expressed by placing a cross on either the symbol of the party or a dedicated empty box/circle next to it (and eventually expressing a preference for one or more candidates). The remaining one-third shows a number of MS in which voters cast ballots using either single-party ballots or blank ballots. The number of MS that adopt the former is approximately double that of those that use the latter type of ballot. In the case of single-party ballots, each single list has its own ballot, in which the name of the list, its symbol and the list of candidates are usually included. The vote is expressed by taking the ballot of the preferred list, placing it inside an envelope (after having eventually expressed a preference for one or more candidates) and then putting the closed envelope in the ballot box. The remaining minority of blank ballots (only in use in Estonia, Finland, and Slovenia) consists – as the name suggests – of ballots with no lists or candidate names printed on them. The voters are instead asked to write the name of their preferred list and/or candidate. However, the finding of this substantial prevalence of multi-party ballots is important because it describes an already high level of homogeneity across the MS, and, consequently, potentially fewer harmonisation problems. Finally, it has to be noted that blank ballots would clearly be problematical in terms of “Europeanisation”, as they cannot show any information on lists or candidates. In the case of Slovenia, however, this problem was addressed by making a list of all the parties and candidates running for the elections, where both Europarty affiliation and spitzencandidat was clearly indicated, available to citizens. Such a list is reported in Annex II together with the Slovenian ballot paper.

![Figure 7. Ballot type](image)

Not all variables, however, are homogenous and unproblematic. The criteria through which party lists are placed on electoral ballots varies considerably across the MS. In this case, the data observed on the actual ballots is more detailed than that provided by the electoral laws. Although there is a prevalence of alphabetical criteria for the ordering of party lists on ballots, the incidence of “other” criteria and the possibility of a total absence of parties on the ballot makes for highly fragmented sets of possibilities, and therefore for a problematic harmonisation on this dimension (see Figure 8). Naturally, the actual ballots indicate less fragmentation as “the other criteria” category cannot be divided into its possible sub-categories as they are only visible in the actual laws.
Similarly, the way and order in which candidates are listed on ballots varies considerably across the MS (see Figure 9). The size of the “other” category in both pie charts testifies to the extreme variance displayed by this variable. The only other values of any relevance concern alphabetical ordering (22% and 15% respectively in the electoral laws and in the ballot papers), and the absence of candidates (about 30% as reported in the actual ballot chart). Again, this high degree of variation makes for a rather problematic harmonisation of EP electoral laws.

Still concerning candidates, ballot design can present significant differences in terms of the additional information that can be included to help voters identify and, in some cases, even evaluate individual candidates. Electoral laws usually limit themselves to providing for the inclusion or exclusion of additional information other than candidates’ names and party affiliation. As Figure 10 illustrates, most electoral laws allow for the inclusion of additional information, usually date and place of birth or
residence. However, the ballots that we have examined to date report additional information only in 36% of the cases. Interestingly, more than one-fifth (21%) of the ballots report no candidates at all, either because the ballot is a multi-party type with only list names (Austria, Portugal, Italy) or is a blank ballot type (Slovenia, Estonia, Finland). Again, although this variable may not imply particularly sensitive issues, it does indicate a propensity for problematic harmonisation.

Figure 10. Candidate identification information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral law</th>
<th>Actual ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Electoral law Pie Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Actual ballot Pie Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: 36%</td>
<td>Yes (extensive): 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No: 46%</td>
<td>Yes (qualification only): 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ballot regulation: 18%</td>
<td>No: 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot: 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ own compilation.

The next two variables, shown in Figures 11 and 12, are also rather unproblematic (at least potentially), as they concern aspects that do not seem to have particular relevance for the political aspects linked to elections (contrary to the presentation of lists and candidates, which can be highly sensitive). Such variables concern ballot colour and shape. The fact that electoral laws normally ignore these aspects (80% of the time in both cases) reveals their potential political irrelevance. In the case of ballot shape, actual ballots reveal no variance at all, as all those examined are rectangular. However, multi-party and blank ballots are all printed as rectangles with a horizontal long side (“landscape” format), while single-party ballots have a vertical long side (“portrait” format). Naturally, depending on country size, and, consequently, on the number of parties and candidates listed, the actual size of ballots can vary, but this would appear not to be a potential obstacle to harmonisation if a single size should be eventually recommended for all 28 MS ballots to be used in EP elections. The question of ballot colour might be slightly more relevant and problematic. For one, we have observed that there is a 40-60 division in ballots, with prevalence of black and white ballots. Again, there is no apparent theoretical reason why this variable should produce harmonisation issues. The only real functional need for coloured ballots concerns a particular case, that of Malta, where different colours are used for voting for different parties; in this case, the issue is not linked to a need to harmonise ballot colours, but rather to a very specific aspect of the electoral procedure in this country. As such, it could be potentially problematic.
So far, the analysis of the variables has focused on issues pertaining to the harmonisation of the 28 MS EP ballot structures and formats. The next variable, in contrast, focuses on the second objective of this report, namely, the possible inclusion of European-related information (European party symbols, Spitzenkandidaten names) in the ballot papers. Our data, as can be seen in Figure 13, are rather interesting. Concerning the electoral law, in the vast majority of cases (68%) there is no provision for the inclusion of such information. The only problematic case could be that of the United Kingdom, where the part of the electoral law that regulates the ballot structure explicitly forbids the addition of any information that is not specifically included in this law, thus excluding the possibility of any “Europeanisation” of the ballot without changing the electoral law itself. Denmark provides a similar case, in which this explicit prohibition is not in the electoral law, but in an executive order, instead, so no change of the law would be necessary. Finally, only Greece’s electoral law (3%) explicitly mentions the possibility of including European symbols. However, as the actual ballot shows, despite this almost complete absence of regulation concerning European information in the ballot, a positive element can be spotted. Despite the lack of regulation in this regard, only in one case can some European information be found in the EP elections ballots. In the Italian case, some of the political parties decided to include a more or less specific reference to the European arena inside their national party symbol: in some cases (the Democratic Party, the Green Party, the New Centre-Right), the acronym of the European party’s affiliation (EPP, PES), while, in other cases, the name of the Spitzenkandidaten (Alexis Tsipras, Guy Verhofstadt) is also included.
Figure 13. Presence of European party symbols.

Electoral law

- Provided for: 68%
- Permitted: 18%
- Prohibited: 7%
- No indication in law: 3%
- No lists printed on ballot: 0%
- No ballot regulation: 4%

Actual ballot

- Yes: 0%
- Inside national party logo: 4%
- No: 96%

Source: Authors' own compilation.
5. CONCLUSIONS

As is well known, processes of harmonisation - and even more so of Europeanisation - of norms and regulations with rooted traditions in the EU’s 28 MS are not simple, and they require an in-depth knowledge of the characteristics and potential compatibilities of all the relevant national regulatory frameworks. This is even more true in cases of politically-delicte matters such as those relating to elections. Resistance to change is bound to be much greater than in most other cases, especially if innovations introduced at European level were perceived in a given MS as potentially interfering with the existing norms at national level. Especially at times of growing voter disinterest, as indicated by current trends, any change and possible complication in voting procedures would most likely prove to be unwelcome.

Even an apparently simple process, such as the harmonisation and possible Europeanisation of electoral ballots could, indeed, reveal itself to be rather complicated, especially if certain ballot characteristics were linked to other, more politically-sensitive, aspects of electoral laws. Naturally, the more regulated the relevant aspects of the matter to be harmonised are at MS level, the greater the potential resistance to change. On this point, our observations indicate a rather sparse consideration of electoral laws with regard to ballot structure and format. This is certainly to be welcomed by anyone who has an interest in producing harmonised ballots across the 28 MS. It is rather intuitive that what is not provided for in the law does not have to be changed in the law, and any new norm aimed at harmonisation is more likely to be accepted if it does not conflict with existing national legislation or established national traditions. This consideration can be extended almost unconditionally to solutions aimed at creating more “European” ballot papers. In this case, there is almost no legislative obstacle to be overcome. Unfortunately, the two obstacles that we have encountered could be rather serious, as they concern the explicit prohibition, which is present in the UK and Danish electoral law, of the inclusion of any additional information to what already provided for by the law in the ballot. However, the nature of the potential change to the UK law that would be necessary to include some Euro-relevant information in the ballot does not appear to pose exceptionally complex technical difficulties, and might be relatively easy to introduce. In the case of Denmark, things would be even easier, as the source regulating the layout and structure of the ballot papers is an executive order of the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Interior, and not the electoral law itself (which would require the standard legislative procedure in order to be modified).

Some of the other aspects that would require attention are of a material, practical nature, essentially dictated by the general ballot type (preference or party) that exists in the given MS, which is, in turn, determined by the openness, or lack thereof, of the lists. Ballot shape is universally rectangular and is the one element that does not require further harmonisation, although some indication of the recommended/tolerated dimensions would be highly desirable. Ballot colour harmonisation, on the other hand, presents more politically-sensitive implications, as colour differences can be used to express party preferences. In this case, however, the issue would be superseded if agreement were to emerge on adopting ballot papers with printed multiple party lists with multiple candidates. In this case, ballot colour would be politically irrelevant and any solution adopted should be acceptable to all MS. This being the case, ballot colour, through the adoption of European Union Blue, might be a good means of “Europeanising” the ballots. The EU logo could be printed on the back so that it would be prominent when the ballot is folded.
The most serious problems to be potentially encountered in the harmonisation of EP election ballots do not have to do with norms or practices concerning the ballots themselves, but rather with aspects of the electoral laws that touch upon very important political questions and have implications for how ballots must be structured. The main distinction is between preference- and party-type ballots. In this case, too, ballots could be harmonised by adopting the aforementioned printed multiple party-list/multiple candidate option (already the most “popular” type of ballot, adopted in the majority of MS: 18 out of 28), without necessarily forcing open or closed lists on any of the MS. In open list MS, the only difference would be a space/box next to each candidate’s name, which would allow voters to indicate their preferences or candidate ranking. This solution is, in fact, also applicable to MS which adopt SVT and Panachage. Maltese and Luxembourgeois ballots are already compatible with this possible choice. The Irish case is somewhat more problematic due to the long-established tradition of listing individual candidates on the ballot. Finally, an additional compromise or technical solution may be necessary to harmonise the amount of candidate information to be included in the ballot. It might, in fact, be difficult to include extensive information in the ballots of the MS that present greater numbers of candidates.

Ultimately, this solution seems to have the potential to defuse even the most serious issues that could emerge in MS that have homogenous systems at both national and European level, and might be unwilling to introduce disruptive differences between the two. Also in this case, the fact that no changes would be necessary to fundamental aspects of the electoral law would certainly facilitate the adoption of this solution. Resistance might, however, emerge, especially when EP and other national elections coincide at a given time in a given MS. Radically different ballot papers would be likely to generate confusion, and modifications to the national format might be considered necessary. Overall, this seems to be the most serious potential political obstacle to EP election ballot harmonisation along the lines that emerge from our analysis. Last, but not least, the multiple party-list, multiple candidate ballot might help increase voter awareness even in those MS that opt to maintain closed lists.
### ANNEX I: ADDITIONAL TABLES

#### Table 7. MS electoral system variables details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electoral system</th>
<th>Voting by post</th>
<th>Embassy voting</th>
<th>Proxy voting</th>
<th>E-voting</th>
<th>Regulation of ballot in law</th>
<th>Candidate identification Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>STV</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Open list*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Panachage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>STV*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballot type</td>
<td>Ballot colour indication</td>
<td>Ballot shape indication</td>
<td>Ballot size indication</td>
<td>Order of lists</td>
<td>Order of candidates</td>
<td>European party symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Other criteria**** **</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other criteria**** ****</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No lists printed on ballot</td>
<td>No lists printed on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other criteria*</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other criteria**</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other criteria**</td>
<td>Draw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot type</th>
<th>Ballot colour indication</th>
<th>Ballot shape indication</th>
<th>Ballot size indication</th>
<th>Order of lists</th>
<th>Order of candidates</th>
<th>European party symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Alphabetical*</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No lists printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>Yes****</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Separate ballot for each list</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to the number of votes received by parties in each individual land in the previous elections.

** Candidates are not grouped by political party; they appear in the ballot as a single list of names.

*** Different colour for each party. However, a party may refuse the colour it has been assigned to.

**** The ballot must be printed on white paper. If other elections are concurrent, then it must be light blue paper.

***** Voters can use, in addition to preference voting (placing a "+") next to its preferred candidate(s) from the list of names), a "negative preference" by striking out the name(s) of the candidate they dislike from the list of printed names.
***** Voters must order the three preferred candidates by placing different symbols on the ballot, next to the printed names.

***** Parties already represented in the Parliament are listed according to the number of seats (then votes) received in the last elections; new parties are listed afterwards, according to the order of registration.

***** In some municipalities, though, voting is fully automatic without a printed receipt, while in others only paper ballots are available.

****** parties entitled to participate in the European Parliamentary election, for printing identification of the parties in the ballot papers. In assigning the letters every possible effort must be made to ensure that the parties keep the letters attributed to them in previous elections.
### Table 8. MS actual ballot variables details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot type</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Order of lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>A4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>640 x 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>148 x 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>148 x 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>105 x 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>A6 - 105 x 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Order of candidates</td>
<td>Candidate identification Information provided</td>
<td>National party symbol</td>
<td>European party symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (qualification only)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (qualification only)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Inside national party logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>Yes (qualification only)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No logo is present on the ballot; however, each party has a different and peculiar font

** However, in some districts only name and surname is printed on the ballot.

***Depending on the number of lists, the ballot can be larger. A4 is the minimum size allowed.
Table 9. Party-ballot and preference-ballot comparative variables frequency (MS actual ballot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ballot type</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>BW</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of candidates</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>Candidate identification Information provided</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes (extensive)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes (qualification only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>Order of lists</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No lists printed on ballot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate ballot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for each list</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National party symbol</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>European party symbol</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inside national party logo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors’ own compilation.*
Table 10. Party-ballot and preference-ballot comparative variables frequency (MS electoral laws)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed list</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Single-party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open list</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Multi-party</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panachage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blank ballot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European party symbol</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>Order of candidates</th>
<th>Party-ballot</th>
<th>Preference-ballot</th>
<th>E-voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided for</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Alphabetical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Party-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Draw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Preference-ballot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Other criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No indication in law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Decided by parties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>E-voting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lists printed on ballot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No indication in law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No candidates printed on ballot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate identification information</td>
<td>Ballot colour indication</td>
<td>Ballot shape</td>
<td>Ballot size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ballot regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation of ballot in law</th>
<th>Embassy voting</th>
<th>Proxy voting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Authors' own compilation.*
ANNEX II: ELECTORAL LAWS’ LEGAL BASIS AND KEY FEATURES

AUSTRIA
Legal basis

Electoral system
Representations: At national level. Voters must vote for a list and may also vote for individual candidates on that list (preference voting). Each voter may vote only once.
Number of MEPs: 18
Allocation of seats: Proportional representation, D’Hondt method. Any list which has not obtained at least 4% of the total is excluded from the allocation of seats. Seats are allocated according to the number of votes per list. Those individual candidates who obtained more than 7% of the preference votes of their respective lists are ranked according to the number of votes and given a preferential treatment in the allocation of seats.
Constituencies: 1

BELGIUM
Legal basis
Federal law of 23 March 1989. The law imposes parity between men and women on candidate lists: the difference between the number of candidates of each sex among either main candidates or substitutes cannot be more than one, and the first two candidates (both main candidates and substitutes) cannot be of the same sex.

Electoral system
Preference voting: Proportional representation on the basis of four constituencies (Flanders, Wallonia, the German-speaking region and the Brussels region) and three electoral colleges.
- 12 Members will be elected by the Dutch-speaking electoral college (Flanders and Brussels)
- 8 Members by the French-speaking college (Wallonia + Brussels),
- 1 Member by the German-speaking college.

BULGARIA
Legal basis
Electoral code
Promulgated, State Gazette No. 05/03/2014

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional system through preferential voting for national lists of political parties, of coalitions of political parties and of independent candidates. Preferential votes cast for separate candidates will be taken into consideration where the number of votes obtained by a candidate amounts at least to the national quota (the total number of valid votes cast for the respective candidate list divided by the number of members of European Parliament from Bulgaria)
Number of MEPs: 17
Allocation of seats: To be adopted by Central Election Commission 65 days before the elections
Constituencies: The territory of the country, including voting stations outside the limits of the Republic of Bulgaria, is a single multi-member constituency.
CROATIA

**Legal basis**
The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia (Official Gazette 56/90, 135/97, 8/98, 113/00, 124/00, 28/01, 41/01, 55/01, 76/10 and 85/10)
Act on Election of Members of the European Parliament from the Republic of Croatia (Official Gazette 92/10, 23/13)
Voters’ Register Act (Official Gazette, 144/12)
Act on Financing of Political Activities and Electoral Promotion (Official Gazette, number 24/11, 61/11, 27/13 and 48/13 - refined text)
Rules of electronic media conduct towards national concessions in the Republic of Croatia during electoral promotion (Official Gazette 165/03 and 105/07)
code of Conduct for Elections

**Electoral system**

**Electoral system:** Proportional electoral system with preferential voting

**Number of representatives in the European Parliament:** 11 (eleven)

**Allocation of number of places:** Members of the European Parliament are elected according to proportional representation and preferential voting. The right to be chosen as members of the European Parliament belongs to persons on those lists with at least 5% of votes won at MEP elections.

**Electoral units:** Elections are carried out in electoral locations on the territory of the Republic of Croatia and in diplomatic/consular representative offices of the Republic of Croatia, which together constitute one electoral unit.

CYPRUS

**Legal basis**
All references to the legal text ruling 2009 European elections.
- Law of 2004 on the Election of the Members of the European Parliament
- Law on the Election of the Members of the House of Representatives
- Civil Registry Law

**Electoral system**

**Representations:** Proportional Representation

**Number of MEPs:** 6

**Allocation of seats:** The whole territory of the Republic of Cyprus shall constitute a single constituency.

**Constituencies:** One single constituency representing the whole territory of the Republic of Cyprus.

CZECH REPUBLIC

**Legal basis**
Portál veřejné správy: zákon č. 62/2003 Sb., o volbách do Evropského parlamentu a o změně některých zákonů
Ministerstvo vnitra ČR: Informace o podmínkách kandidatury ve volbách do Evropského parlamentu na území České republiky

**Electoral system**

**Representations:** proportional representation, universal suffrage, for elections to the European Parliament the Czech Republic is treated as a single constituency

**Number of MEPs:** 21
Allocation of seats: lists gaining less than 5% of the total votes cast are not entitled to parliamentary representation.

Constituencies: single one.

DENMARK

Legal basis
LBK nr. 126 af 11/02/2013 Gældende (Europa-Parlamentsvalgloven) Offentliggørelsedsdato: 13-02-2013 Økonomi- og Indenrigsministeriet

Electoral system
Proportional representation with one nationwide constituency (the Faroe Islands and Greenland are not part of the EU). Voters may either vote for an entire list or indicate their preference for individual candidates from the lists. Some parties inform voters which candidates on the list are supported by them. Each voter may vote only once. Allocation of seats: d'Hondt method. All votes cast in the various constituencies, both for lists and for individual candidates, are added together. The candidates thus obtaining the highest number of votes are elected. 13 MEPs elected in 2014.

ESTONIA

Legal basis

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional representation with open party list system.
Number of MEPs: In Estonia, six Members of the European Parliament shall be elected.
Allocation of seats: Election results are determined based on the principle of proportionality. Mandates are distributed using the d'Hondt distribution method with the distribution series 1,2,3,4 etc. Candidates can be nominated as candidate lists of political parties or as independent candidates.
Constituencies: The whole country forms a single constituency.

FINLAND

Electoral system
Number of MEPs: 13
Allocation of seats: d'Hondt method. After each party, electoral alliance and joint list has been allocated the number of seats to which it is entitled, the candidates on the lists are ranked according to the number of preference votes they have received.
Constituencies: The whole country forms a single constituency. Candidates stand at national level and votes are counted on a national basis.

FRANCE

Legal basis
Law No 77-729 of 7 July 1977.
Decree No 79-160 of 28 February 1979.

**Electoral system**

**Representations**

**Until now:**
The law has stipulated eight constituencies for the European election:

- 7 for metropolitan France, complete regions have been grouped into constituencies. According to the law of 26 May 2011 on the elections of representatives at the European Parliament, the French citizens residing outside France, can also vote and their votes are added to the results in the constituency of Ile-de-France.
- 1 for the Overseas Territories, one constituency covers all the departments, territories and communities.

**Number of MEPs:**
France will have 74 seats

**Constituencies:** 8

**North-West:**
- Basse-Normandie
- Haute-Normandie
- Nord-Pas-de-Calais
- Picardie

**West:**
- Bretagne
- Pays de la Loire
- Poitou-Charentes

**East:**
- Alsace
- Bourgogne
- Champagne-Ardenne
- Franche-Comté
- Lorraine

**South-West:**
- Aquitaine
- Languedoc-Roussillon
- Midi-Pyrénées

**South-East:**
- Corse
- Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur
- Rhône-Alpes

**Massif central - Centre:**
- Auvergne
- Centre
- Limousin

**Ile-de-France:**
- Ile de France and French citizens residing outside France

**Overseas territories:**
- Section Atlantique: Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane, Saint-Barthélemy, Saint-Martin, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon
- Section Océan Indien: La Réunion, Mayotte
• Section Pacifique: Nouvelle-Calédonie, Polynésie française, Wallis-et-Futuna.

**Allocation of seats:** Rule of the highest average. The seats are allocated to the candidates according to the order of names on each list. Lists which do not obtain 5% of the votes cast in the constituency will not be allocated any seats.

**GERMANY**

**Legal basis**

**European Elections Act (EuWG)** The German Europawahlgesetz (EuWG) consists of several directives regulating the proceedings for the European elections, in particular the voting system, electoral committees, electoral law and eligibility, the voting process and the publication of the election results. According to Section 4 of the European Elections Act, certain provisions of the Federal Elections Act apply to the European Elections.

**European Electoral Regulations (EuWO)** For the implementation of the European Elections Act (EuWG) the Federal Ministry of the Interior issued the Europawahlordnung (EuWO) on basis of the authorisation in § 25 paragraph 2 EuWG to substantiate the specifications of the European Elections Act. In particular, the European Electoral Regulations (EuWO) consist of rules for the appointment and function of the electoral committees, the requirements for inclusion in the electoral register, the proposing of candidates and postal vote.

**Act concerning the election of the representatives of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage (Direct Elections Act)** The Direktwahlakt or Direct Elections Act is - where European law is concerned - the legal foundation for the European elections. It contains directives on the legislative period, the legal status of the Members of Parliament and the election date.

**The Treaty on the European Union (TEU)** The treaty includes regulations the number of Member of the European Parliament for each member state. Article 14 of TEU offers the legal basis for the composition of the European Parliament.

**Law on Electoral Statistics (WStatG)** The Law on Electoral Statistics (Wahlstatistikgesetz) is the legal basis for the execution of general and representative statistics for general elections and the European elections in Germany. It stipulates the existing and further measures for the protection of electoral and statistical secrecy.

**Electoral system**

**Main principles** Elections are carried out under the principles of proportional representation with electoral lists. List proposals can be registered for a single federal state (Bundesland) or as a collective list for all states.

**Number of MEPs** 96 Members of the European Parliament will be elected in Germany.

**Allocation of seats** The MEPs are elected in general, direct, free, equal and secret elections for five years. Every citizen has one vote. The seats are allocated on national level using the divisor method with standard truncation Sainte-Lagué/Scheipers.

**Constituencies** The Federal Republic of Germany is not divided into constituencies for European elections. The territory of the Federal Republic of Germany is the electoral area, which shall be divided into polling districts for the casting of votes.

**GREECE**

**Legal basis**

Law 1180/81 on election of representatives to the European Parliament

Law 1427/84 on the exercise of the electoral rights of Greek nationals living in the EU.

Law 1443/1984 "Economic reinforcement of political parties and other provisions" (Official Government Gazette 73 Α) for voting etc.
Law 2196/94: Ratification of Council Directives 93/81 and 93/109
Law 3023/02: Financing of political parties by the government. Revenues and expenditures, promotion, publicity and financial audits of political parties and of parliamentary candidates (Official Government Gazette 146 Ä)
Law 3216/03 Ratification of the Council Decision amending the election of Members of the European Parliament
Law 3671/2008 "Ratification of the Lisbon Treaty that modifies the Treaty for the European Union, the Treaty concerning the establishment of the European Community and certain related acts" (Official Government Gazette 129 Ä)
Law 4090/2012 "... relevant to the accession of the Republic of Croatia to the European Union..." (Official Government Gazette 218 Ä)
DP 96/2012 "Codification to a single text of the provisions of the legislation for the election of MEPs" (Official Government Gazette 57 Ä)
DP 133/1997 "Exercise of the right to vote and to be elected... by citizens of the European Union..." (Official Government Gazette 121Ä) for the incorporation of the Directive 94/80/EK into the National Law

Electoral system

Representation: Proportional representation (closed lists): Election of representatives to the European Parliament is made by a proportional system. Seats are allocated among all the lists of parties or coalitions of parties who obtain the 3% of the votes. The votes of Greeks living in other EU Member States are also counted.

Number of MEP's: 21

Allocation of seats: Proportional. The High Electoral Commission, based in the Interior Ministry, proclaims the results. The Courts of First Instance sends the results of each region to the Ministry. On that basis the High Electoral Commission draws up the final, overall table of results for the whole territory and then allocates the seats.

Constituencies: Single constituency

HUNGARY

Legal basis
The regulations concerning the right to vote are laid down by the Fundamental Law of Hungary.
Act XXXVI of 2013 regulates the electoral procedure.
The regulations of the substantive law concerning the elections to the European Parliament are established in the Act CXIII of 2003 on the Election of the Members of the European Parliament.
Act XXXVI of 2013
Act CXIII of 2003
Act LVII of 2004

Electoral system

Representations The election takes place in a proportional election system and list voting system procedure. Lists may be set up by political parties registered in compliance with the Act on the Operation and Financial Functioning of Political Parties. Only the lists that have won more votes than 5% of all the valid ballots cast on all the lists may be considered when awarding seats.

Number of MEPs 21 (2014-2019)

Allocation of seats The seats will be distributed according to the D'Hondt method. Voters will be voting for party lists; one citizen may vote for one list. Candidates in the list will win seats in the order originally notified registered by the party.
Constituencies The country will be considered as one constituency.

IRELAND
Legal basis
Electoral system
General remarks A Constituency Commission was set up to examine how the European constituencies should be changed to take into account the reduction of Irish MEPs from 12 to 11 (Treaty of Nice provision, confirmed in the Lisbon Treaty). The Commission, which published its report in 2013, recommended that the existing four multi-member constituencies be reduced to three. There are now two four-member constituencies and one three-member constituency (see section on constituencies below).
Number of MEPs 11
Allocation of seats. The Single Transferable Vote (STV) method in multi-member constituencies is used. This system is quasi-proportional: votes cast + 1 = quota seats + 1. Candidates are listed on the ballot paper in alphabetical order. Each voter casts his/her vote for one candidate and in addition indicates in order of preference the candidate(s) to whom his/her vote is to be transferred if the candidate of his/her first or subsequent choice has already reached the quota or has obtained too few votes and has thus been eliminated.
A candidate is elected once he or she has reached the quota. Any votes accruing to a candidate in excess of the quota are redistributed on a proportional basis among the remaining candidates in accordance with the preferences expressed by the voters.
Constituencies 3 constituencies (Dublin, Midlands-North-West, South). Dublin is the only constituency which maintains the same geographical area and number of MEPs. The new constituencies of Midlands-North-West and South now have four MEPs each. Midlands-North-West is comprised of the following counties: Cavan, Donegal, Galway, Kildare, Laois, Leitrim, Longford, Louth, Mayo, Meath, Monaghan, Offaly, Roscommon, Sligo and Westmeath; and the city of Galway. The South constituency is comprised of the following counties: Carlow, Clare, Cork, Kerry, Kilkenny, Limerick, North Tipperary, South Tipperary, Waterford, Wexford and Wicklow; and the cities of Cork, Limerick and Waterford.

ITALY
Legal basis
Law No 18 of 24 January 1979 as amended by Law No 10 of 20/02/2009.
Law No 78 of 27 March 2004 and Law No 90 of 8 April 2004
Electoral system Italian voters elect 73 members of the European Parliament. The election is carried out with a proportional system and it is possible to cast preferential votes for individual candidates. The country is divided up into five constituencies: North West, North East, Centre, South, Islands. Each constituency elects a number of deputies proportional to the number of inhabitants resulting from the latest census returns. Seats are allocated to electoral districts by means of a Decree of the President of the Republic (DPR).
LATVIA

**Legal basis**
Law on Elections to the European Parliament
Electoral Register Law
Law on the Central Election Commission
Law on City and Municipality Election Commissions and Polling Station Commissions
The Law on Pre-election Campaign
Law on Financing of Political Organisations (parties)

**Electoral system**

**Representations:** Party list proportional representation. Every party or party unit submits a list of candidates

**Number of MEPs:** 8

**Allocation of seats:** MEP seats are allocated by a fixed proportionally applied voting system. Political parties that have received less than 5% of submitted votes do not take part in the MEP allocation. Each party’s MEPs are allocated by the Sainte-League method (division by successive odd numbers).

**Constituencies:** On 1 January 2013 the right to vote has 1 548 873 Latvian citizens. The Central Election Commission has no data of EU citizens residing in Latvia which have the right to vote. These data could be adjusted by information from the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs.

LITHUANIA

**Legal basis**

**Electoral system**

**Representations** Electoral system with preferential voting, universal suffrage.

**Number of MEPs:** 11

**Allocation of seats** Lists gaining less than 5% of the total votes cast are not entitled to parliamentary representation. Mandates for lists of candidates shall be distributed according to the number of votes received by each of them, applying the method of quotas and remainders.

**Constituencies** A single multi-member constituency shall be formed of the territory of Lithuania.

LUXEMBOURG

**Legal basis**
The electoral law of 18 February 2003 (as amended)

**Electoral system**

**Representations** The members of Parliament are elected by the list system, the distribution of MEPs to their respective list is proportional to the number of votes received by them.

**Number of MEPs** 6 members

**Allocation of seats** D’Hondt method. Each voter has the same number of votes as there are seats (six). Cross-party voting is permitted. A voter may also vote for an entire list, vote for candidates from more than one list, or choose individual candidates from a particular list. When a voter votes for an entire list consisting of fewer than six candidates, this list is credited with as many votes as there are candidates. No list may include more than six names. Seats are allocated on the basis of the number of votes obtained by the candidate and lists.

Seats are allocated proportionally to the number of votes obtained by a candidate or a list.

**Constituencies** Luxembourg constitutes a single constituency.
MALTA

Legal basis
General Elections Act (1991)
Electoral polling Ordinance (1939)
Constitution of Malta

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote system. No party lists.
Number of MEPs: 6
Allocation of seats: Through the system of single transferable vote, voters express a preference by writing 1, 2, 3 etc next to the name of as many candidates as they wish (minimum one candidate). Candidates are listed by party and in alphabetical order.
Constituencies: A single national constituency. Candidates are elected when they obtain, in the first or subsequent counts, at least as many votes as the “quota” which is equal to 1/7th of the total number of valid votes cast plus one.

NETHERLANDS

Legal basis

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional representation on a national basis. No threshold.
Number of MEPs: The number of Dutch MEPs will stay the same in 2014, namely 26.
Constituencies: One.

POLAND

Legal basis
All the indications (Articles) in the text below make reference to the Act of 5 January, 2011 Election Code (Journal of Laws 31 January, 2011)

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional
Number of MEPs: 51
Allocation of seats: After receiving the results of the vote from all electoral constituencies the National Electoral Commission shall determine, by the d'Hondt's method, the aggregate results of voting across the nation and which of the lists meet the requirements for entitlement to participate in the allocation of seats, and then it shall divide all the seats, using the Hare-Niemeyer’s method, among election committees in accordance with the aggregate number of valid votes cast for constituency lists of the respective election committee, and shall proceed to establish the number of seats among each of the constituency lists of each election committee which has gained the seats, and to distribute the seats to specific candidates. Art.354

Constituencies: 13
- Constituency No 1 - covers the territory of the Pomorskie Voivodeship
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Gdańsk
• **Constituency No 2** - covers the territory of the Kujawsko-Pomorskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Bydgoszcz  
• **Constituency No 3** - covers the territory of the Podlaskie and Warmińsko-Mazurskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Olsztyn  
• **Constituency No 4** - covers the territory of part of the Mazowieckie Voivodeship: Capital City of Warszawa and following districts (powiats): grodziski, legionowski, nowodworski, otwocki, piaseczyński, pruszkowski, warszawski zachodni i wołomyński.  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Warszawa  
• **Constituency No 5** - covers the territory of part of the Mazowieckie Voivodship: the following districts (powiats): ciechanowski, gostyniński, mławski, płocki, płoński, przasnyski, sierpawki, sochaczewski, żuromiński, ży饶dowski, białobrzeski, grójecki, kożienicki, lipski, przysuski, radomski, szydłowiecki, zwoleniński, garwoliński, łośnicki, makowski, miński, ostrołęcki, ostrowski, pultusk, siedlecki, sokolowski, węgrowski, wyszkowski and the cities of Płock, Radom, Ostrołęka and Siedlce.  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Warszawa  
• **Constituency No 6** - covers the territory of the Łódzkie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Łódź  
• **Constituency No 7** - covers the territory of the Wielkopolskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Poznań  
• **Constituency No 8** - covers the territory of the Lubelskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Lublin  
• **Constituency No 9** - covers the territory of the Podkarpackie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Rzeszów  
• **Constituency No 10** - covers the territory of the Małopolskie and Świętokrzyskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Kraków  
• **Constituency No 11** - covers the territory of the Śląskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Katowice  
• **Constituency No 12** - covers the territory of the Dolnośląskie and Opolskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Wroclaw  
• **Constituency No 13** - covers the territory of the Lubuskie and Zachodniopomorskie Voivodeship  
The location of the Constituency Electoral Commission: Gorzów Wielkopolski

PORTUGAL

Legal basis

- act concerning the election of the representatives of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage as amended by a Council decision of 25 June 2002 and 23 September 2002;  
- electoral law of the Assembly of the Portuguese Republic, Law No 14/79, of 16 May.  
Directive 93/109/EC, 6 December 1993, laying down detailed arrangements for the exercise of the right to vote and stand as a candidate in elections to the European Parliament for citizens of the Union residing in a Member State of which they are not nationals.

Electoral system


Ordered list system of proportional representation Using the d'Hondt method.

ROMANIA

Legal basis
Law 33 of 16 January 2007, republished

Electoral system
Representations Proportional representation, closed lists (supported by 200,000 signatures) and non-affiliated candidates (supported by 100,000 signatures), at national level. Maximum 10 candidates more than the number of seats assigned to Romania can be on the list (35 places - 45 candidates on the list).

Number of MEPs 32 (in 2009 - 33, in 2007 - 355)

Allocation of seats two stages (carried out by the Central Electoral Bureau):
- Calculation of electoral threshold and the national electoral coefficient -> decreasing order of the political entities according to the number of valid votes cast.
- Allocation of mandates for the selected lists within the national circumscription through the d’Hondt method.

Constituencies one country = one constituency

SLOVAKIA

Legal basis

Electoral system
Representations: Proportional representation system is used.

Number of MEPs: According to the current text of the law, 13 MEPs will be elected.

Allocation of seats: Mandates are allocated only to parties or coalitions which have passed over the 5 percent threshold from overall number of valid votes. Sum of valid votes for parties or coalitions that are proceeding to the second counting is divided by number of mandates plus one. The result is a republic vote number. Sum of valid votes that the political party or coalition received is divided by the republic vote number and political parties or coalitions will get mandates depending on how many times this vote number is included in all valid votes received by this political party or coalition. If there is one additional mandate assigned by this system than it should be, this extra mandate will be deducted from political party or coalition that shows the smallest division residual. If there are more political parties or coalitions with equal residuals, the mandate is deducted from the political party or coalition that received lower number of votes. If the number of votes is equal, lots will be cast. Voters can attribute preferential votes to 2 candidates of one party or coalition.

Constituencies: For the purpose of European Parliament Election, the whole territory of Slovakia represents one constituency.
SLOVENIA

**Legal basis**
Law on Elections and Referendum Campaign, ZVRK, Official Gazette of RS, 1/07 str. 1
Decision finding that the second paragraph of Article 5 of the Law on Elections and Referenda Campaigns Act is inconsistent with the Constitution, Official Gazette of RS, No 28/2011

**Electoral system**

**Representations** Proportional representation with preference voting.

**Number of MEPs** 8

**Allocation of seats** D’Hondt system.

**Constituencies** Slovenia is one constituency.

---

SPAIN

**Legal basis**
- Royal decree 605/1999 of 16 April, supplementing the rules on electoral procedures (boe no 92, 17 april), as amended by royal decree 1382/2002 of 20 December (boe no 305, 21 December).
- ROYAL DECREE 1612/2007 of 7 December on an accessible voting procedure to help visually impaired people exercise their right to vote.
- ROYAL DECREE 1621/2007 of 7 December on a voting procedure for Spanish citizens who are temporarily resident abroad.
- ROYAL DECREE 422/2011 of 25 March approving the Regulation on the basic conditions for the participation of people with disabilities in political life and in electoral procedures.

**Electoral system**

**Representation:** Representative system, national constituency, closed and blocked lists.

**Number of MEPs:** 54.

**Allocation of seats:** A D’Hondt-style proportional system is used.

**Constituencies:** The constituency for the election of MEPs is the national territory.
SWEDEN

**Legal basis**
SFS 2005:837

**Electoral system**

**Number of MEPs** 20

**Allocation of seats** To qualify for the allocation of seats, parties must obtain at least 4% of the total number of votes cast. The number of personal votes shall be determined only for candidates who have had specific personal votes corresponding to at least 5 per cent of the number of votes that his/her party received in the constituency.

**Constituencies** The whole of Sweden is one constituency.

UK

**Legal basis**
European Parliamentary Elections Act 1978
European Parliamentary (Elections) Act 1999
Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000
European Parliamentary Elections Act 2002
European Parliament (Representation) Act 2003
European Parliamentary and Local Elections (Pilots) Act 2004
Representation of the People Act (various dates)
European Parliamentary (Amendment) Regulations 2009
European Parliamentary Elections (Northern Ireland) (Amendment) Regulations 2010

**Electoral system**

**Representations:** Closed regional list system, distribution by D'Hondt system. (in Northern Ireland: Single Transferable Vote system)

**Number of MEPs:** 73

**Allocation of seats:** By region (minimum 3 seats)

**Constituencies:** Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, 9 English regions: Eastern, East Midlands, London, North East, North West, South East, South West, West Midlands, Yorkshire and Humberside
ANNEX III: SAMPLE BALLOTS

AUSTRIA

Amtlicher Stimmzettel
für die
Wahl der österreichischen Mitglieder
des Europäischen Parlaments
am 25. Mai 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liste Nr.</th>
<th>Für die gewählte Partei im Kreis ein X einsetzen!</th>
<th>Kurzbezeichnung</th>
<th>Parteibezeichnung</th>
<th>Bezeichnung eines Bewerbers oder einer Bewerberin (Name und/oder Reihungsnummer) durch den Wähler oder durch die Wählerin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>ÖVP</td>
<td>Österreichische Volkspartei – Liste Othmar Karas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>SPÖ</td>
<td>Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>leer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>FPÖ</td>
<td>Freiheitliche Partei Österreich, B(Ö) – Die Freiheitlichen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>GRÜN</td>
<td>Die Grünen – Die Grüne Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>BZÖ</td>
<td>Liste Mag. Werthmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>NEOS</td>
<td>NEOS Das Neue Österreich und Liberales Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>REKOS</td>
<td>Die Reformkonservativen – Liste Ewald Stadler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>ANDERS</td>
<td>Europa Anders – KPÖ, Piratenpartei, Wandel und Unabhängige</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>EUSTOP</td>
<td>EU-Austritt, Direkte Demokratie, Neutralität (EU-Stop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Belgie

**Verkiezing van het Europees Parlement**

**Van 25 mei 2014**

**Vlaamse kieskring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vlaams Belang</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Vld</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sp.a</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-VA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD&amp;V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PvdA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Election du Parlement Européen**

**25 mai 2014**

**Circonscription électorale wallonnes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD&amp;V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecolo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N-VA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Vld</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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CYPRUS

ΔΗΚΟ

ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΚΟ ΚΟΜΜΑ

ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΚΟΣ ΣΥΝΑΓΕΡΜΟΣ

ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΚ ΣΕΦΕΡΒΕΡΛΙΚ

1. ΖΕΝΙΟΣ Σταύρος
2. ΘΕΟΧΑΡΟΥΣ Ελένη
3. ΣΤΥΛΙΑΝΙΔΗΣ Χρήστος
4. ΣΥΛΛΟΥΡΗΣ Δημήτρης
5. ΧΟΠΛΑΡΟΥ Ρένα
6. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΟΡΟΥ Λεωνίδας

1. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ Κων. Ανιστάδη
2. ΓΕΩΡΓΙΟΥ Γιώργος
3. ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΟΥ Ανδρουλλά
4. ΜΑΥΡΙΔΗΣ Κωστάς
5. ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΟΥ Πάνος
6. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ Αντ. (ΠΕΡΙΚΛΕΟΥΣ)

1. ΕΥΑΓΩΡΟΥ Στάφυλος
2. ΠΟΛΥΚΑΡΠΟΥ Βίκο
3. ΠΟΛΥΚΑΡΠΟΥ Χώρης
4. ΣΤΑΥΡΙΝΙΔΗΣ Panagiotis
5. ΣΥΛΙΩΤΙΔΗΣ Νεολίθης
6. ΧΑΤΖΗΩΡΩΠΟΥ Τάκης

1. ΑΚΕΛ
2. AKEΛ
3. AKEΛ

KyproEkloges.com
CZECH REPUBLIC
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HLASOVÁCÍ LÍSTEK

Volte Právý Člnek - stranu za snadnou a rychlou ODEVOLATELNOST politiků a státních úředníků přímo občany, za NÍZKÉ daně, VYROVNÁNÝ rozpočet, MINIMALIZACI byrokracie, SPRAVEDLIVOU a NEZKRUMPOVAŇOU policie a justici, REFERENDA a PRÍMOU demokracii www.CIBULKA.NET, kandidující s nejlepším protikriminalním programem PRÍMÉ demokracie

VE NEVĚŘÍTE POLITIKŮM A JEJICH NOVINÁŘŮM?
NO KONEČNĚ! VĚRME SAMI SOBĚ!!
- ale i s mnoha dalšími DŮVODY,
proč být hynům méj život obsaženým VŠECHNÍm k volbám,
ale - pokud nechceme být ZNOVU obětími, podevzatí a okrazení

- NEVOLIT žádnou parlamentní stranu

vědoucí (post) komunistické kriminalní fyzikolakracie!!!
- jenž žádá o volební podporu všechny české občany
a dalších podplatníků, kteří chtějí změnit dnešní kriminalní pověry,
jejichž jsou všichni obětí v jejich právě opak!

V BOJI MEZI DOBREM A ZLEM, PRAVÍDU A LŽÍ, NELZE BÝT NEUTRÁLNÍ A PŘESTO ZŮSTAT SLUŠNÝ!!!

Proto děkujeme za Vaší podporu!!

Kandidáti pro volby do Evropského parlamentu konané ve dnech 7. a 8. června 2009

1. Petr Cibulka, 55 let, státní úředník, ČR, přednosta jednotek zdravotnictví, vedoucí zaměstnavatel, 369, jmenovitý poslanec a poslance zvolený, předseda NEDUO

2. Věra Hamoušová, 49 let, státní úřednice, ČR, předsedkyně úřadu protipovánočního a humanitárního jazyka, příslušnice a dětemořic, právní a politické nadšenka, novinářka,

3. František Kalafeř, 72 let, státní úředník, ČR, předsedkyně nadšenky, novinářka, Lidové slovo

4. Jaromír Žďár, 55 let, státní úředník, ČR, jmenovitý poslanec, předseda,

5. Eduard Sefer, 61 let, státní úředník, ČR, předsedkyně nadšenky, novinářka, Lidové slovo

6. Jindřich Mičina, 59 let, státní úředník, ČR, jmenovitý poslanec, předseda

Sada hlasovacích lístků

pro volby do Evropského parlamentu konané ve dnech 23. a 24. května 2014
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### Europa-Parlamentsvalget 2014

Sæt x i én af affyldningsrubrikkene til højre for et partinavn eller et kandidatnavn
Sæt kun ét x på stemmesedlen

#### A. Socialdemokratiet
- Jeppe Kofod
- Ole Christensen
- Christel Schaldemose
- Lasse Øvrum Rasmussen

#### B. Radikale Venstre
- Morten Helvøg Pedersen
- Christian Kjelhede
- Kristine Blig
- Samira Nawa Amiri

#### C. Det Konservative Folkeparti
- Bente Bendtsen
- Jørgen Holst Gøbel
- Nicolai Vinde
- Christian Wadel-Naagaard

#### D. SF – Socialistisk Folkeparti
- Marthe Aukien
- Torre Vestergaard Iversen
- Mette Rugaard
- Allan Vorre Pedersen

#### I. Liberal Alliance
- Christina Egekild
- Niels Westh
- Kasper Heumann Kristensen

---

Veje Syddjurs
ESTONIA

EUROOPA PARLAMENDI VALIMISED

HÄÄLETAN KANDIDAADI NR POOLT

25. mai 2014

FINLAND

Europarlamenttivaalit 2014
Europaparlamentival
FRANCE

L’Europe de la finance, ça suffit !
Place au peuple!

1. Marie-Christine VERGIAT

2. Éric COQUEREL
3. Anne MEDILLAND (13)
4. Jacques LERICHOMME (13)
5. Hélène LE CACHÉUX (12)
6. Jérôme MARCUCCINI (38)
7. Florence CIARAVOLA (06)
8. Raphaël DEBU (69)
9. Tiphaine DUCHARNE (73)
10. Robert INUYE (06)
11. Monique NIRONI (83)
12. Idré BOUMERDIT (69)
13. Martine DUBOIS (07)
14. Marcel BERNON (42)
15. Horia MEKRELOU (07)
16. Raphaël LAINÉ (59)
17. Catherine LAURENTI (83)
18. Pierre TRAPIER (26)
19. Elisa MARTIN (38)
20. Frédéric SOULA (84)
21. Annie ANSELME (74)
22. Hervé BORDES (42)
23. Christine CALANDRA (42)
24. David EMAIN (13)
25. Katia PHILIPPE (01)
26. Michel STEFANI (Corse)

LISTE BLEU MARINE
NON À BRUXELLES - OUI À LA FRANCE

LISTE CONDUITE PAR
Marie-Luce BRASIER-CLAIN

1. Marie-Luce BRASIER-CLAIN
Section Colom Indien
2. Marc GUILLLE
Section Altimarine
3. Meriel DAUDRIN
Section Pacifique
4. René TRAN VAN NGHA
Section Altimarine
5. Yvone ARMAND
Section Altimarine
6. Stéphane CHAUVET
Section Pacifique
7. Fouad CHENEDON
Section Colom Indien
8. Joseph GRONDEL
Section Pacifique
9. Blance HENIN
Section Pacifique

ELECTION DES REPRÉSENTANTS AU PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN DU 25 MAI 2014
CIRCONSCRIPTION NORD-OUEST
BASSE-NORMANDIE - HAUTE-NORMANDIE - NORD-PAS-DE-CALAIS - PICARDE

« Pour la France, agir en Europe »
avec Jérôme LAVRILLEUX

1. Jérôme LAVRILLEUX
35 ans, Conseiller départemental, SAINT-DENIS (93)
2. Tokia SARI
34 ans, Député européen, LILLY (99)
3. Jean-Paul GAUDÈS
38 ans, Député européen, SIAMANTE (31)
4. Amandine FRANCOIS
33 ans, Député européen, SAINT-ADrien-D’ALBERMONT (18)
5. Philippe BOULLAUD
52 ans, Député européen, METZ (57)
6. Camille TUBIANA
23 ans, Député européen, ESPACES (27)
7. Philippe MIGNONET
30 ans, Député européen, CALAIS (62)
8. Margaux DELEGUE
27 ans, Député européen, AMIENS (80)
9. Laurent MARTING
46 ans, Député européen, REIMS (51)
10. Nédége DELAFOSSE
30 ans, Député européen, SAINTES (17)
11. Philippe VARLET
36 ans, Député européen, PERPIGNAN (66)
12. Sophie ROCHER
39 ans, Député européen, MARCO-EN-BARBOUL (89)
13. David MARGUERITE
33 ans, Conseiller régional, CHIBERT-OGIVEL (80)
14. Camille FLAVIGNY
31 ans, Député européen, MONTSANT-VIMARAN (18)
15. Guillaume GAUTIER-LAIR
41 ans, Député européen, SAINT-MAURICE (14)
16. Coralie DOUCREUX
32 ans, Député européen, BOULOGNE-SUR-MER (62)
17. Johan AUVRAY
34 ans, Député européen, VERNEUIL (27)
18. Nadège LEFEBVRE
33 ans, Député européen, LE CHATELLET-EN-POITOU (86)
19. Jean-Pierre BATAILLE
30 ans, Député européen, TROYES (88)
20. Christelle CHEVALIER
32 ans, Député européen, SAINTES (17)

LISTE D’UNION DE LA DROITE ET DU CENTRE
HUNGARY

**SZAVAZÓLAP**
Európai Parlament tagjainak választása
2014. május 25.

**ORSZÁGOS LISTA**
Érvényesen szavazni csak egy listára lehet!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSZP</td>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>FIDESZ - KDNP</td>
<td>JOBBÍK</td>
<td>LMP</td>
<td>EGYÉRT</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. GYÖRGY ISTVÁN DR.</td>
<td>1. LÁROTH LÁSzlÓ DR.</td>
<td>1. TÁKomA ROMÁN</td>
<td>1. TÖRÖK ISTVÁN DR.</td>
<td>1. KÖVETI KÁROLY DR.</td>
<td>1. MÁCSA GÁbor</td>
<td>1. MOLNÁR GYÖRGY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TOKÁR ÁLADÁS DR.</td>
<td>1. CSEZMUJZESZ SIROK László</td>
<td>1. BEREZIN GÁbor</td>
<td>1. SÁRDAI LÁSZLÓ</td>
<td>1. HAGYI László</td>
<td>1. SÁNCHEZ-TAMÁS JORDÁN</td>
<td>1. POHÁK SADIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. BOGDÁN KÁRÓL</td>
<td>1. LÓVÁRDI László</td>
<td>1. BERNÁD Kelemen</td>
<td>1. LŐCSE KÁLAMOSZ</td>
<td>1. KRAUSZI-KÁLAMOSZ</td>
<td>1. ÉKKÖVETÉNYI KÁROLY</td>
<td>1. PÁIDY ANTON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Érvényesen szavazni a lista neve föléi körte talal löt kelt, egyébik metsző vonalat lehet, jólélő: ☐ vagy ☑.

IRELAND

**BYRNE - FIANNA FAIL**
(Thomas Byrne of 42, The Boulevard, Grange Rath, Clonsilla, Co. Meath; Senator)

**GILROY - DIRECT DEMOCRACY IRELAND**
(John Gilroy of 29 Riverview, Athloneen Abbey, Naul, Co. Meath; Businessman)

**HOLMES - THE LABOUR PARTY**
(John Holmes of Blackhill, Haddington, St. Mullens, Co. Meath; Film Producer)

**KEDDY - NON PARTY**
(Charlie Keddy of Sea Road, Kilcoole, County Wicklow; Plumber)

**MARTIN - NON PARTY**
(Chuck Martin of Stackallen, Slane, Co. Meath; Financial Services Advisor)

**MCDONAGH - THE WORKERS PARTY**
(Seamus McDonagh of 22 St. Bridget's Terrace, Kelly's Court Meath; Steel Fitter)

**MCENTEE - FINE GAEL**
(Heleen Mcintee of Castletown, Navan, Co. Meath; Political Researcher)

**O'BRIEN - FINE GAEL**
(Gerard Michael O'Brien of Whitemount, Kells Rd., Navan, Co. Meath; Psychiatric Nurse)

**O'BRIEN / O'REILLY / CONHOMANS GLAS**
(Seán GeaOíodh O'Briallach an Bheir Pháirc, Din Bánne, Co. na Mí; Ollscoil Forbartha Chumann Óg)

**O'ROURKE - SÓIN ÍNÉ**
(Darren O'Rourke of 79 Chain Rd., Ashbourne, Co. Meath; Health Policy Advisor)

**TALLON - NON PARTY**
(Jim Tallon of Glanmore, Enniscorthy, Arklow, Co. Wicklow; Farmer)
**LATVIA**

**1. "Saskaņa" sociāldemokrātiskā partija**

1. Boriņa Čileviča
2. Gunārs Jērgensons
3. Andris Ķiemenēvičs
4. Andrejs Māmskins
5. Jānis Tūlins
6. Elīza Kruķe
7. Sergejs Māksis
8. Sergejs Poļapkins
9. Ineta Krišjāņa
10. Ivars Pimenovs
11. Marija Ivanova-Josifova
12. Nicki Nīķis
13. Ineta Čekševa
14. Vilhelma Truskaeva
15. Elīza Vīķe
16. Sergejs Dolgopolovs

**2. Pasts par ties "Alternative"**

1. Aleksandrs Māksis
2. Natalija Bukovska
3. Andreja Ādamsons
4. Ineta Bebrīte
5. Natalija Sproge
6. Natalija Stejmeņa
7. Irena Ramanenko
8. Anita Lāzītē

**3. Latvijas Sociāldemokrātiskā strādnieku partija**

1. Jānis Dinevičs
2. Aivars Timofejevs
3. Margarita Krauja
4. Mēra Pjuviņa
5. Ilga Ozoliņa
6. Juris Dzelme
7. Andris Biķenieks
8. Alisa Biķenieks
9. Skaidra Kalnīņa
LITHUANIA

1. Lietuvos Respublikos liberalų sąjūdis

2. Tėvynės sąjunga – Lietuvos krikščionys demokratai

3. Lenkų rinkimų akcijos ir Rusų aljanso koalicija „Valdemaro Tomasevičio blokas“

4. Darbo partija

5. Partija Tvarka ir teisingumas

6. Lietuvos žaliųjų partija

7. Tautinininkų sąjunga

8. Liberalų ir centro sąjunga

9. Lietuvos valstiečių ir žaliųjų sąjunga

10. Lietuvos socialdemokratų partija
### Eighth Schedule

(Article 49)

**Form of Ballot Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Members to be elected</th>
<th>Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Badge of Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House of Candidates</td>
<td>Mail order of preference in order of ballot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maltese Election of 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lenzetti</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Paul's Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grima</td>
<td></td>
<td>12, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Abela</td>
<td></td>
<td>18, St. John's Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Attard</td>
<td></td>
<td>50, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bonnici</td>
<td></td>
<td>20, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td>16, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vassallo</td>
<td></td>
<td>14, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bonnici</td>
<td></td>
<td>18, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td>20, Malta Street, Sliema, Malta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substituted by: XN. 1996.64.
NETHERLANDS

[Image of a ballot for the European Parliament elections in 2014, showing various parties and candidates listed for selection]
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**POLAND**

**WZÓR**

**KARTA DO GŁOSOWANIA**

w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego na okręgowe listy kandydatów na posłów

w dniu _______________________

Listy kandydatów na posłów

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lista nr</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lista nr</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMACJA**

Głosować można tylko na jedną listę kandydatów, stawiając znak „X” w kratce z lewej strony obok nazwiska jednego z kandydatów z tej listy, przez co wskazuje się jego pierwszeństwo do otrzymania mandatu. Postawienie znaku „X” w kratce obok nazwisk kandydatów z różnych list lub niepostawienie znaku „X” w żadnej kratce powoduje nieważność głosu.

(Miejsce na umieszczenie pięciu
(zwrotnej karioli wyborczej))

(odtisk pięciu okręgowej
(konfekcji wyborczej))
### Eleição para o Parlamento Europeu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partido</th>
<th>Código</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partido Socialista</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Democracia</td>
<td>PND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido da Terra</td>
<td>MPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movimento Alternativa Socialista</td>
<td>MAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido pelos Animais e pela Natureza</td>
<td>PAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Operário de Uniidade Socialista</td>
<td>POUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Trabalhista Português</td>
<td>PTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVRE</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloco de Esquerda</td>
<td>B.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Comunista dos Trabalhadores Portugueses</td>
<td>PCTP/MRPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal pro Vida</td>
<td>PPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Democrático do Atlântico</td>
<td>PDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Nacional Renovador</td>
<td>PNR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDU - Coligação Democrática Unitária</td>
<td>PCP-PEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliança Portugal</td>
<td>PPD/PSD . CDS-PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partido Popular Monárquico</td>
<td>PPM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kandidáti pre voľby do Európskeho parlamentu 26. mája 2014

1. Marek Šifľovčík, RUDr., Ph.D., 47 r., podpredsedu Európskej komisie, Bratislava
2. Miroslav Hlaváčková-Bábková, PhD, 45 r., poslanica Európskeho parlamentu, Bratislava
3. Monika Smotková, Mgr., 57 r., poslanická Európskeho parlamentu, Košice
4. Vladimir Maňák, Ing., 54 r., poslanec Európskeho parlamentu, Žilina
5. Boris Zába, doc. Dr., 59 r., poslanec Európskeho parlamentu, Bratislava
6. Katarína Novalčíková, Bc., 31 r., poslanická Európskeho parlamentu, Čeľadice
7. Gabriela Krehľárová, Mgr., 36 r., poradca podpredsedu Európskej komisie, Žilinské Marúšovce
8. Joseph Štúr, Ing., 51 r., podpredsedu Žilinského samosprávneho kraja, Žilina
9. Peter Rížovský, MUDr., MPH, 57 r., riaditeľ Leborského nemocnice, o.o., Stará Lubovňa
10. Alexander Bačík, Ing., 53 r., riaditeľ ÚPS Váh Levice, Levice
11. Ján Hrubý, Bc., 26 r., asistent poslance NR SR, Trnavo
12. Martin Nemčok, Ing., 34 r., predsedu Okresného úradu Nitra, Nitra
13. Božena Kováčová, Ing., 55 r., starostka, Janová Lebota
SLOVENIA
Ballot paper

VOLITVE POSLANCEV IZ REPUBLIKE SLOVENIJE V EVROPSKI PARLAMENT 2014 – GLASOVANJE PO POŠTI

URADNA PRAZNA GLASOVNICA

Navodilo: V desni del pravokotnega prostora na glasovnici lastnoročno ali na drug način vpišite ime liste kandidatov za katero glasujete.

V levi del pravokotnega prostora na glasovnici lastnoročno ali na drug način lahko vpišete ime in priimek kandidata, iz liste kandidatov za katero ste glasovali, ki mu dajete preferenčni glas.

Lists and candidates

1. Jaka KACIR
2. Polona SAGADIN
3. Dorijan MAKIŠ
4. Fella LAČIŠ
5. Andrej LAVIC
6. Tatjana GREIF
7. Jan PUCKO
8. Sara KABA

1. Sergej PLČANEC
2. Polonca ROMAN
3. Marko PAULIŠ
4. Vesna ALABIR
5. MIHÁL DUBRAVAC
6. Erika HADŽIČ
7. Monika BRNIČAK
8. Miha ISTRAŠIČ

Vladimir BODROŽNIN
3. Dusan PLUT
4. Lukas MIŠEC
5. Jakovina DRĐIĆ
6. Janez PLATZ
7. Ivan JANŠOVIČ
8. Petra REZAR

1. Zoran BUČČIČ
2. Srećko ČAS
3. Helena RUPNIK
4. Alekseja JELINCOVIČ
5. Janez ZAKAR
6. Katerina LANGERŠ ŠILKO
7. Branko STRUKELJ
8. Folka PUCIONIA

1. Igor SOTZES
2. Katarina KOŠAK
3. Borjan HORVAT
4. Mojca BLAS
5. Urska PREŠAR
6. Monika KUZNIČ
7. Gregor VELIČKOV
8. Blaž SLADNIK

1. Ljuba PERELEJ
2. Alenka HUŠ
3. Mojca KLEVER KERŠUŠ
4. Neža PAULIČ
5. Vida CAŽANČ SPILIČ
6. Janez FREIBERG
7. Anja MARIČ
8. Petra VLAČIČ

7. Mojca KLEVER KERŠUŠ
8. Patrick KLEMPERER
9. Blaž SLADNIK
10. Andraž KOŠAR
11. Blaž SLADNIK
12. Mojca KLEVER KERŠUŠ
13. Andraž KOŠAR
14. Mojca KLEVER KERŠUŠ
15. Patrick KLEMPERER
16. Andraž KOŠAR

1. Branko KERBI
2. Marjana HAFNER
3. Dajana MANDUŠ
4. Nataša OSOLNIK
5. Tjaša LČUKAN
6. Johna PLEČNIK
7. Manca LURIČ KOSAN
8. Lenart ZAIC

1. Vlado CUL
2. Barbara CINOČIJA
3. Martina GOŠAR
4. Nives GRIL
5. Manca Majo PEŠUŠ
6. Tomaz CALIČ
7. Franc Branko SVOD
8. Andreja GALAJEC

1. Ina VIJES
2. Marija PUTI
3. Izidor SALOBER
4. Jože KOLAC
5. Boštjan BLAŠIČ
6. Jane ČERNINA
7. Ante DRAJČAN
8. Marjeta IZMIR KORNIČ

1. Uroš LURIČ
2. David BRANKI
3. Barbara LUKAR
4. Borjan NOVAK
5. Nada KORNIČAK
6. Andreja MEGGIN
7. Mario KORNIČAK
8. Brita BLAŠA
9. Peter VELJAN
10. Vesna GANTAR
11. Branko KERBI
12. Maja ŽUPANCE
13. Valentina MEDIC
14. Jerko ČEŠVINEK
15. Mojca BUKVEC
16. Maja ŽUPANCE
17. Maja ŽUPANCE
18. Vesna GANTAR

1. Miha MAK
2. Simona DREZ
3. Branko KERBI
4. Roman TONC
5. Peter GOLNIK
6. Andraš BOBEN
7. Marko VNIK
8. Matjaž MČKA
9. Voka KONČELJ
10. Voka KONČELJ
11. Voka KONČELJ
12. Voka KONČELJ

VISA FERRERINO
SWEDEN

VAL TILL EUROPAPARLAMENTET

Europeiska Arbetarpartiet-EAP

Du kan personrösta genom att sätta ett kryss för den kandidat du helst vill ska bli vald. Du kan inte personrösta på fler än en eller någon annan kandidat än de som står nedan.

1. Hussein Askary, Partiledare
2. Malin Wik, Redaktör larouche.se
3. Andreas Persson, Ordf. "Rätt till egen bostad"
4. Ulf Sandmark, Civilekonom Bankdelningsgruppen
5. Elias Dottemar, Ordf. Fusionsenergiföreningen
6. Kjell Lundqvist, Förläggare Ny Solidaritet
7. Sergej Strid, Projektledare "Den klassiska revolutionen"
8. Lotta-Stina Thronell, Sånginstruktör
9. Stephen Brawer, Taxichaufför
10. Astrid Sandmark, Undersköterska

SVERIGE
0029-05611
### UNITED KINGDOM

**SCHEDULE 1**

**FORMS FOR EUROPEAN PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS**

Form A: Form of Ballot Paper

*Front of ballot paper*

**Election of Members of the European Parliament for the [insert name of Region, e.g. ‘North-West Region’]**

*Vote only once by putting a cross \(\times\) in the box next to your choice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservative Party</th>
<th>Green Party</th>
<th>Labour Party</th>
<th>Liberal Democrat Party</th>
<th>UKIP</th>
<th>United Kingdom Independence Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Basket, Greenwood turquoise*
- *Independent*

**Nightingale, Elizabeth Penelope**
- *Independent*

**Singh, Manmeet**
- *Independent*
ANNEX IV. GLOSSARY OF BASIC TERMS USED

Closed list. In a multi-member district by proportional representation, each voter has to choose a list of candidates as given. Also called liste pré-ordonnée bloquée (French).

Multi-member district. A district electing more than one seat. Usually (but not necessarily) associated with proportional representation.

Open list. In a multi-member district by proportional representation, each voter may select one or more individual candidates from a single list. Also called preferential vote, flexible list, free list. When the selection of an individual candidate is compulsory, quasi-list system.

Panachage. In a multi-member district by proportional representation, each voter can vote for as many candidates as seats in the district from any party or list. Also called open ballot.

Plurality rule. The winner is the alternative(s) with highest number(s) of votes, not necessary achieving a majority or any other quota. Also called relative majority rule or first past the post (FPTP) (Britain and Commonwealth), winner-takes-all (USA), pluralité (French).

Proportional representation. In a multi-member district, seats are allocated to different parties or lists in proportion to the votes received.

Semi-open list. A semi-open list allows the voter one vote but two choices. They can either place an “X” next to the preferred candidate on the ballot paper or place an “X” next to the preferred party list as published. A vote either for the party list or an individual candidate on that party list would count towards the party’s allocation of seats. A semi-open list system would require an individual candidate to reach an agreed threshold of personal votes to override the list ranking.

Single non-transferable vote (SNTV). In a multi-member district by plurality rule, each voter can vote for only one candidate.

Single-member district. A district electing a single seat. Plurality rule is required.

Single transferable vote (STV). In a multi-member district by some formula of proportional representation, each voter can order all the candidates as preferred; seats are allocated on the basis of quotas, elimination of least voted candidates and voters’ second and further preferences. Also called choice voting, or preference voting.
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ROLE
Policy departments are research units that provide specialised advice to committees, inter-parliamentary delegations and other parliamentary bodies.

POLICY AREAS
- Constitutional Affairs
- Justice, Freedom and Security
- Gender Equality
- Legal and Parliamentary Affairs
- Petitions

DOCUMENTS
Visit the European Parliament website:
http://www.europarl.europa.eu/supporting-analyses