

Appendix to accompany manuscript

Europarties' election pledges and European Commission legislative priorities: An assessment of their overlap

I. Sources of documents and coding procedures

This section discusses how we define and identify the units of analysis used in this project, and how we code them to generate our data. As sources of the data we use the following sets of documents. All documents were read in English by the authors.

(1) 2004 and 2009 election platforms for ELDR, EPP, PES, and the EGP Euro-parties; those were obtained from the Euromanifesto study project <http://europeanelectionstudies.net/ees-study-components/euromanifesto-study>. All documents were approved by the respective trans-national party congresses in preparation for each election. The documents vary in length by party and year; ELDR (27p in 2004, 3p in 2009), EPP (3p in 2004, 35p in 2009), PES (7p in 2004, 31p in 2009), EGP (6p in 2004, 8p in 2009). **To account for this variation in length and style, in our analyses, we cluster the standard errors by document/year.** The entirety of each document was coded using the procedure outlined below, **and each pledge was included only once in the analysis.**

(2) Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions for 2006 (issued on 25.10.2005), 2007 (issued on 4.06.2008), 2008 (issued on 23.10.2007), 2009 (issued on 5.11.2008), 2010 (issued on 31.03.2010), 2011 (issued on 27.10.2010), 2012 (issued on 15.11.2011), and 2013 (issued on 23.10.2012). In the text we refer to these documents as **Work Programmes**. From these documents we extracted a list of priorities, outlined in the Annexes, as priority items or initiatives. This way we use the legislative actions identified by the Commission itself as falling under its priorities. Those exact statements were used in our analyses, and we matched each pledge to at least one of the priorities, articulated in Commission documents.

See text below and tables 1 and 2 at the end of this document for further details on which sets of documents were compared to each other.

I.a. Identifying units of analysis

We use the following definitions for the units of analysis.

(1) To identify *pledges* in the context of the Euromanifestos we included both narrow and broad statements following the procedures and examples detailed in Thomson et al (2017a). We include all statements that fall within these definitions regardless of which institution(s) should undertake the action. Each pledge was included once in the dataset.

Both researchers read all Euromanifestos to identify promise-type statements as defined above, and only statements **where both coders agreed meet the criteria are included in the analysis.** The researchers divided the coding of the remaining documents, and any questions/discrepancies about specific statements were discussed until an agreement was reached. Thus, the researchers are in full agreement on identifying the statements/units of analysis included in this study. Additionally, we conducted inter-coder reliability analyses with two research assistants external to this project. These coders read a total of 45% of the pledges, and the agreement between the authors on one hand and each of the coders was 84% and 92%, respectively. These rates are

consistent with recommended reliability metrics (see Lacy S and Riffe D 1996 Sampling error and selecting intercoder reliability samples for nominal content analysis. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 73(4): 963–973, and Krippendorff K (1980) *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. London: Sage.)

Examples of pledges identified in Euromanifestos:

“We welcome the creation of the post of EU Foreign Minister, who will chair the Council of External Relations and be a Vice-President of the Commission, running a joint administration made up of Commission and Council officials as well as national civil servants.” (ELDR 2004)

“We demand the reform of the European agricultural policy to support rural development ...” (PES 2004)

“We will also work to maintain cultural diversity, for instance, by allowing incentives to the public broadcasting, ...” (Greens 2004)

“Language courses, ...[are needed to assist legal migrants in integrating into the labour market and society]” (EPP 2009)

“There should be ... limits on excessive borrowing and bad loans to prevent excessive risk-taking and debt.” (PES 2009)

(2) The task of identifying policy priorities in the Commission Work Programmes was more straight forward, and from those documents we extracted the initiatives identified by the Commission in the annexes of each document. Unless noted otherwise by the Commission (e.g. noting a package of initiatives), each initiative was considered a separate policy priority. Each pre-legislative priority was included once in the dataset.

1.b. Coding by policy (sub)-area

Once the pledges and policy priority statements were identified and input into an Excel spreadsheet from the respective documents, each statement was assigned a policy area code and subcode following the latest version of the European Union Policy Agendas (CAPIC) codebook at the time when our research was undertaken. The CAPIC codebook is available here http://euagendas.weebly.com/uploads/9/9/4/3/9943893/eu_codebook_3.2_october-2013_general.pdf

We conducted a reliability analysis on 28% of the pledges to validate the authors coding of pledges by CAPIC area. Agreement was in the 84%-87% range between the researchers and the two external coders.

1.c. Ascertaining overlaps among documents

The aim of our research is to determine if and to what extent election promises made by the political groups in the European Parliament are subsequently ‘adopted’ among the policy priorities issued by the European Commission in their communications to other European Union institutions. For that purpose we manually compared the following sets of documents, listed in si Table 1. The number of pledges/policy priorities in each document are noted in parenthesis.

{refer to si Table 1}

Automated comparison, utilizing software packages such as Turnitin.com or SafeAssign.com did not narrow down the overlap between documents in a way to make their use worthwhile. For the purpose of manual/visual comparison between documents, each was first sorted by CAPIC subcode. In the cases where statements in the two documents in each set had been assigned the same subarea code, each statement was read in full to determine if in addition to being on the same topic (e.g. VAT), it was also about the same issue/policy direction (e.g. reducing VAT). Through this process we identified all instances where pledge statements made by the Euro-parties represented in the EP's political groups were also reflected in the respective Commission documents.

The following are examples of overlap between pledges and Commission priorities. These were used to code our dependent variables.

EPP 2009 called for “increase overall transparency” [of international financial architecture]. Commission Work Programme from 2011 proposed a Directive for Market in Financial Instruments to ... “to meet the overall aim of a level playing-field delivering market efficiency and transparency.”

Greens 2004 called for “Our transport system must be reformed to increase efficiency and reduce pollution.”. This pledge was coded as overlapping with the following Commission *Work Programme issued in 2006*: “Green transport package: a) Communication on greening the transport sector. a) This Communication will present the main findings of three initiatives in the area of transport (Internalisation of external costs, Green Propulsion and ITS Action Plan) and will draw possible recommendations for the future.”

PES 2004 called for more transparency “We will continue to press for further reform of the EU's institutions. We will fight for openness and transparency, with sound financial management, open competition and value for money in the European Commission.” Similarly, *Work Programme from 2006* noted the following priority “European Transparency Initiative. The goal of the initiative is to increase transparency (e.g. use of Community funds, lobbying).”

ALDE 2009 called for “The single market should be reinforced and extended in energy”. Among the priorities listed in *Work Programmes 2012* was: “Internal energy market: This initiative will consider the state of play of the process towards the completion of the internal energy market by 2014 and encourage Member States to step up efforts by underlining benefits of the IEM for the citizens and business, identifying a possible need for further action in order to ensure that this objective is realised.”

1.d. Agreement between election platforms

Following the procedure discussed above, we also identified overlap among election programs issued by the Europarties during the same election campaign. This information is used to test the expectation that when parties agree on policy priorities among themselves, those statements are more likely to be included in subsequent Commission documents. Comparison among the election platforms listed in si Table 2 (at the end of the document) was conducted.

{refer to si Table 2}

The following are examples of overlap between pledges issued by different political groups. These were used to code our independent variable(s) on agreement with other political groups.

In 2004, ALDE, EPP, and PES made pledge related to enhancing security and defense policy in the EU: “In order to develop European security and defence policy, ELDR fully supports the concept of structured cooperation among certain member states that are both militarily capable and politically willing.” (*ALDE 2004*); “We should further develop the European Security and Defence Policy to become a credible instrument in terms of conflict prevention and crisis management.” (*PES 2004*); “This includes making European Security and Defence Policy in close cooperation with NATO. New threats such as international terrorism must be met with suitable strategies, new mechanisms of conflict prevention and management, as well as a reassignment of our defence capabilities. More cooperation and joint standards in the field of armaments may contribute to more efficiency and better use of national defence budgets.” (*EPP 2004*).

In 2004, both the Greens and PES supported reform of the Common Agricultural Policy: “In order to achieve this we will continue to seek and support radical reform of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), with a strong reorientation towards organic farming, regional food products and rural development. This is also the way forward to safeguard the diverse landscapes of Europe and protect the biodiversity of its flora and fauna.” (*Greens 2004*) and “It is critical that the reformed agricultural policy...” (*PES 2004*).

In 2009, ALDE and EPP made pledge related to financial regulations involving international institutions: “A relapse into policies of nationalisation, over-regulation and protectionism would be a major mistake. ELDR supports intensified international cooperation among regulators and strengthening of international standards and believes a reformed IMF should play a leading role in this process in order to prevent future financial crises.” (*ALDE 2009*) and “Global institutions must be adapted to the new facts: This means improving the controls of worldwide financial markets in organisations like the International Monetary Fund.” (*EPP 2009*).

In 2009, EPP and PES committed to helping migrants with language acquisition: “Language courses, ... [are needed to assist legal migrants in integrating into the labour market and society]” (*EPP 2009*) and “We therefore propose to promote action at the appropriate levels (local, regional, national or European), such as language or cultural training, which supports the full integration of migrants in their new communities.” (*PES 2009*).

Pledges by the Greens and PES in 2009 called for faster rail network in Europe: “We want to speed-up investment in trans-European railroad connections and networks.” (*Greens 2009*) and “This includes building a more competitive and affordable high-speed rail network between major European cities and regions.” (*PES 2009*).

II. List of variables

II.a. Dependent Variables

DV: Agree WP 06-09 equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2004 EP elections overlaps with the content of at least one policy priority identified in an European Commission Work Program document issued during the 2006-2009 period.

DV: Agree WP 10-13 equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2009 EP elections overlaps with the content of at least one

policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program documents issued in the period 2010-2013.

The list of auxiliary variables used to calculate the dependent variables is listed in si Table 3 at the end of this document.

{refer to si Table 3}

II.b. Main independent Variables

For each pledge, issued by a Euro-party represented in the EP (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES), Ordinary Legislative Procedure equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if the policy area associated with the pledge falls under the ordinary legislative procedure rules of the European Parliament. To identify the policy areas that fall under this procedure pre- and post-Lisbon we relied on the document available here http://ec.europa.eu/codecision/docs/legal_bases_en.pdf, and matched the CAPIC (sub)codes to each area listed in the document, noting the year when the legal basis took effect.

Details on the matching are available in si Table 4.

{refer to si Table 4}

The following dummy variable were created for test hypothesis 2

EPP/ELDR equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), for each pledge issued by this Europarty in the respective election year.

The following variables were used to test hypothesis 3

Commission Presidency equals one (1), otherwise zero, if the party that made the pledge also held the Commission Presidency.

Commission Portfolio equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if the party that issued the pledge subsequently controlled the Commission portfolio associated with that policy area.

Commission Presidency x Commission Portfolio is the interaction between the above two variables.

II.b. Control independent variables

Council Saliency is a continuous measure capturing the saliency of the policy area of each pledge for the member states government parties represented in the Council of Ministers configurations. It is constructed in the following way. (1) For each election year, using the codebooks for the Euromanifesto project, we matched each pledge's CAPIC score to a variable, or a series of variables. For example, the CAPIC code 2301 corresponds to Euromanifesto variable 070100. CAPIC code 1980 – to variables 2-316 and 2-317; (2) We further identified which parties were in government after each election in each member state; (3) For each variable in the Euromanifesto data, we took the difference between positive and negative mentions of the topic, and averaged the resulting number across the government parties for each election period. (4) We then input those numbers for each pledge, by CAPIC category.

EP Salience is a continuous measure, provided by the Euromanifesto project, also reflecting the emphasis that the four Eurogroups included in this analysis attribute to the policy area of each pledge. Similar to the Council salience, the EP variable is calculated using the difference between positive and negative mentions of a topic (for those topics where there are such mentions).

Agreement is the share of seats held by the political groups that issued the same pledge. For this variable, we first coded whether a pledge issued by any political group shares the policy intent and direction with an election statement by another group, made during the same election, 2004 and 2009, respectively. We then summed up the percentage of seats that all the groups that agreed on a pledge held in the respective EP.

III. Supplementary analyses and robustness checks

sa **Table 1.** Regression results combining Work Programmes for both legislative periods and adding a control variable Year.

	Pledges by all Europarties		Pledges by Europarties with Commission portfolios	
	Logit coefficient	Odds ratio	Logit coefficient	Odds ratio
Ordinary Leg. Procedure	0.848*** (0.175)	2.335*** (0.409)	0.800*** (0.193)	2.226*** (0.430)
Council salience	0.346*** (0.058)	1.413*** (0.082)	0.322*** (0.062)	1.380*** (0.086)
EP salience	-0.046 (0.026)	0.955 (0.025)	-0.067*** (0.020)	0.935*** (0.019)
Agreement	0.014* (0.007)	1.014 (0.007)	0.008 (0.012)	1.008 (0.012)
Year	-0.063 (0.059)	0.939 (0.055)	-0.084 (0.071)	0.920 (0.066)
Commission Presidency			0.504 (0.316)	1.656 (0.524)
Commission Portfolio			-0.007 (0.747)	0.993 (0.742)
Commission Presidency x Commission Portfolio			-0.059 (0.172)	0.942 (0.162)
Constant	125.003 (118.046)	1.94E+54 -2.29E+56	166.584 (143.176)	2.22E+72 -3.18E+74
N		597		483
Log pseudolikelihood		-355.9703		-293.03221

sa **Table 2.** Logistic regression results with an additive measure for the two salience variables.

	Pledges by all Europarties				Pledges by Europarties with Commission portfolios			
	Agree WP 06-09		Agree WP 10-13		Agree WP 06-09		Agree WP 10-13	
	Logit coefficients	Odds ratio	Logit coefficients	Odds ratio	Logit coefficients	Odds ratio	Logit coefficients	Odds ratio
Ordinary Leg. Procedure	1.242*** (0.259)	3.462*** (0.897)	0.699*** (0.145)	2.012*** (0.292)	1.130*** (0.246)	3.096*** (0.763)	0.555*** (0.063)	1.742*** (0.111)
EPP and ELDR	0.541* (0.216)	1.719* (0.372)	1.060*** (0.154)	2.886*** (0.446)				
Commission Presidency					0.000 (0.587)	1.000 (0.587)	0.801*** (0.110)	2.229 (0.245)
Commission Portfolio					-0.526** (0.201)	0.591 (0.119)	1.666*** (0.172)	5.291 (0.912)
Commission Presidency x Commission Portfolio					0.034 (0.193)	1.035 (0.200)	-0.310 (0.245)	0.734 (0.180)
Council salience	0.174 (0.121)	1.190 (0.144)	0.371*** (0.032)	1.450*** (0.046)	0.228 (0.136)	1.257 (0.171)	0.323*** (0.072)	1.381*** (0.099)
EP salience	0.014 (0.041)	1.014 (0.042)	-0.066* (0.029)	0.936 (0.028)	-0.010 (0.023)	0.990 (0.023)	-0.086** (0.029)	0.918 (0.027)
Agreement	0.021 (0.011)	1.021 (0.011)	-0.002 (0.005)	0.998 (0.005)	0.020 (0.016)	1.021 (0.016)	-0.008 (0.012)	0.992 (0.012)
Constant	-2.006 (0.137)	0.135 (0.018)	-1.838 (0.110)	0.159 (0.017)	-1.589 (0.242)	0.204 (0.049)	-1.230 (0.617)	0.292 (0.180)
N	296		301		244		239	
Log pseudolikelihood	-364559.4		-338995		-314088		-269586	

si. Table 1. List of documents that were compared to identify overlap between pledges and priorities.

2004 election cycle		2009 election cycle	
Document	Compared to	Document	Compared to
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	WP 2006 (n = 119)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	WP 2010 (n = 37)
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	WP 2007 (n = 90)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	WP 2011 (n = 40)
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	WP 2008 (n = 108)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	WP 2012 (n = 194)
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	WP 2009 (n = 50)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	WP 2013 (n = 60)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	WP 2006 (n = 119)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	WP 2010 (n = 40)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	WP 2007 (n = 90)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	WP 2011 (n = 38)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	WP 2008 (n = 108)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	WP 2012 (n = 194)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	WP 2009 (n = 50)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	WP 2013 (n = 60)
PES 2004 (n = 56)	WP 2006 (n = 119)	PES 2009 (n = 161)	WP 2010 (n = 37)
PES 2004 (n = 56)	WP 2007 (n = 90)	PES 2009 (n = 161)	WP 2011 (n = 40)
PES 2004 (n = 56)	WP 2008 (n = 108)	PES 2009 (n = 161)	WP 2012 (n = 194)
PES 2004 (n = 56)	WP 2009 (n = 50)	PES 2009 (n = 161)	WP 2013 (n = 60)
EGP 2004 (n = 50)	WP 2006 (n = 119)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)	WP 2010 (n = 37)
EGP 2004 (n = 50)	WP 2007 (n = 90)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)	WP 2011 (n = 40)
EGP 2004 (n = 50)	WP 2008 (n = 108)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)	WP 2012 (n = 194)
EGP 2004 (n = 50)	WP 2009 (n = 50)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)	WP 2013 (n = 60)

si. Table 2. List of party platforms that were compared to identify overlap/agreement between pledges.

2004 EP elections		2009 EP elections	
Document	Compared to	Document	Compared to
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	PES 2004 (n = 56)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	PES 2009 (n = 161)
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	EPP 2004 (n = 23)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)
ELDR 2004 (n = 167)	EGP 2004 (n = 50)	ELDR 2009 (n = 37)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	PES 2004 (n = 56)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	PES 2009 (n = 161)
EPP 2004 (n = 23)	EGP 2004 (n = 50)	EPP 2009 (n = 41)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)
PES 2004 (n = 56)	EGP 2004 (n = 50)	PES 2009 (n = 161)	EGP 2009 (n = 62)

si Table 3. Auxiliary variables used to calculate each dependent variable

<p><u>DV: Agree WP 06-09</u></p>	<p><u>Agree WP 06</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2004 EP elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2006, issued on October 25, 2005.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 07</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2004 EP elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2007, issued on June 4, 2008.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 08</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2004 EP elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2008, issued on October 10, 2007.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 09</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2004 EP elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2009, issued on November 5, 2008.</p>
<p><u>DV: Agree WP 10-13</u></p>	<p><u>Agree WP 10</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2009 elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2010, issued on March 31, 2010.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 11</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2009 elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2011, issued on October 27, 2010.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 12</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2009 elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2012, issued on November 15, 2011.</p> <p><u>Agree WP 13</u> equals one (1), otherwise zero (0), if a pledge made by an Euro-party (EGP, ELDR, EPP, PES) during the 2009 elections overlaps with the content of a policy priority identified in European Commission Work Program document 2013, issued on October 23, 2012.</p>

si Table 4. List of policy areas following under the ordinary legislative procedure, pre- and post- the Lisbon Treaty, and the corresponding CAPIC code(s). Information is used to construct independent dummy variable Ordinary Legislative Procedure.

Pre-Lisbon	CAPIC CODE(S)	Added/changed with Lisbon	CAPIC CODE(S)
Procedures for the right of access to documents	208	Regulation on services of general economic interest	1500
Data protection	208	Procedures and conditions required for citizen initiative	2012
Measures to combat discrimination of the grounds of nationality	201	Application of competition rules to agricultural products	
Basic principles for anti-discrimination incentive measures	201, 202, 204, 205	Legislation concerning the common agricultural policy and the common fisheries policy	412, 408
Measures to facilitate the exercise of the right to move and reside freely in the Union	200	Exclusion of certain activities from the application of provisions on the right of establishment	
Customs operations	2009	Extending provisions on freedom to provide services to service providers who are nationals of a third state and established within the Union	
Free movement of workers	529	Liberalization of a specific service	
Social security measures for Community migrant workers	529	Measures on the movement of capital to and from third countries	1804
Right of establishment	1500	Administrative measures relating to capital movements in connection with preventing and combating crime and terrorism	1227
Coordination of the provisions in Member states with regard to the right of establishment	1500	Visas, border checks, free movement of nationals of third countries, management of external frontiers, absence of controls at internal frontiers.	940, 950

Coordination of the provisions in Member states concerning the taking-up and pursuit of activities as self-employed persons and the mutual recognition of qualifications	1521	Measures for a common European asylum system	931
Services	1500	Measures for a common immigration policy	900
Implementation of common transport policy	1000	Incentive measures for the integration of nationals of third countries	941
Sea and air transport	1003, 1007	Judicial cooperation in civil matters with cross-border implications (excluding family law).	200
Measures for the approximation of national provisions concerning the establishment and functioning of the internal market to promote the objectives of Article 26	1530	Judicial cooperation in criminal matters - procedures, cooperation, training, settlement of conflicts, minimum rules for recognition of judgments	1201
Inceptive measures for cooperation in the field of employment		Minimal rules concerning the definition of criminal offenses and sanctions in the areas of particularly serious crime with a cross-border dimension	1201
Social policy (to encourage cooperation and adopt minimum requirements for gradual implementation)	1300	Measures to support crime prevention	1211
Equal opportunities, equal treatment of men and women in the matters of employment and equal pay.	202	Eurojust (structure, operation, field of action and tasks)	1201
Implementing regulations relating to the European Social Fund		Procedures for scrutiny of Europol's activities by EP and national parliaments	1201
Incentive measures in the field of education		Measures to eliminate the distortions in the internal market	1541, 1540
Vocational training policy	604	Intellectual property except language arrangements for the European intellectual property rights.	1522
Incentive measures in the field of culture		Multilateral surveillance procedures (broad guidelines of the economic policies)	1501

Public health- measures to tackle common safety concerns in the health sphere	331	Modifications of certain articles of the Statutes of ESCB and ECB	104
Consumer protection	1525	Measures necessary for the use of the Euro	104
Trans-European networks	800	Incentive measures in the field of sport	1526
Industry	108	Public health - incentive measures to protect human health and in particular to combat the major cross-border health scourges, and measures to tackle tobacco and alcohol abuse.	341, 342
Measures in the area of economic and social cohesion outside the Structural funds.		Structural funds	1420
European Regional Development Fund		Cohesion fund	1420
Framework programme for research	1798	Implementation of European Research area	1798
Implementation of the Framework program for research- rules for the participation of undertakings and dissemination of research results/Supplementary research programmes for some member states/participation in research programmes undertaken by several member states	1798	Space policy	1701, 1704
Environment (community measures to achieve environmental objectives except measures of a fiscal nature)		Energy (excluding measures of fiscal nature)	all of category 8
Environment (general action programmes)	700	Tourism - measures to complement the action on the MS in the tourism sector	1524
Implementation of development cooperation policy	1901	Civil protection against natural and man-made disasters	2018
Regulations governing political parties and their funding		Administrative cooperation in implementing Union law by member states	

Fight against fraud affecting the Union's financial interests	2007	Implementing measures of the common commercial policy	
Measures for the production of Union statistics.	2013	Economic, technical, and fiscal cooperation with third countries, other than developing countries.	1900
		General framework for humanitarian operations	1901
		European Voluntary Humanitarian Aid Corps	
		Creation of specialized courts	
		Modification of statutes of court of justice	
		Rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by member states of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers	
		European Administration	
		Adoption of financial rules	1502
		Staff regulations of Officials and Conditions of employment of other servants in the Union	2004

si Table 5. List of Commission portfolios associated with each CAPIC code. This list, along with information from the European Commission’s website on the political group of each Commissioner, was used to construct the Commission Portfolio Party variable.

CAPIC codes	Commission Portfolio	
	<i>Barroso I</i>	<i>Barroso II</i>
100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 107, 110, 120, 199	Economic and Financial Affairs	Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Euro
108	Enterprise and Industry	Industry and Entrepreneurship
200, 201, 201, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 212, 213, 299	Justice, Freedom and Security	Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship
300, 301, 302, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 327, 331, 332, 333, 334, 341, 342, 343, 398, 399	Health	Health
400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 410, 411, 412, 498, 499, 1405	Agriculture and Rural Development	Agriculture and Rural Development
408, 1007	Fisheries and Maritime Affairs	Agriculture and Rural Development
500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 509, 529, 599, 1300, 1302, 1303, 1304, 1305, 1306, 1308, 1310, 1399	Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities	Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion
600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 606, 607, 698, 699, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2310, 2311, 2399	Education, Training and Culture and Multilingualism	Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth
700, 701, 703, 707, 708, 709, 711, 712, 722, 723, 724, 730, 731, 798, 799, 2100,	Environment	Environment

2101, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2199		
800, 801, 802, 803, 805, 806, 807, 898, 899	Energy	Energy
900, 929, 931, 932, 933, 940, 941, 950, 999	Justice, Freedom and Security	Home Affairs
1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1005, 1010, 1098, 1099	Transport	Transport
1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1227, 1230, 1240, 1241, 1299	Justice, Freedom and Security	Justice, Fundamental Rights and Citizenship
1400, 1401, 1403, 1404, 1406, 1408, 1409, 1420, 1499	Regional Policy	Regional Policy
1500, 1501, 1502, 1504, 1505, 1507, 1521, 1522, 1524, 1526, 1530, 1541, 1542, 1595, 1598, 1599	Internal Market and Services	Internal Market and Services
1525	Consumer Protection	Consumer Protection
1540	Competition	Competition
1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1608, 1610, 1611, 1612, 1614, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1619, 1620, 1698, 1699, 1900, 1902, 1906, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1929, 1999	External Relations and European Neighbourhood Policy	Foreign Affairs and Security Policy
1700, 1701, 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1798, 1799	Science and Research	Research, Innovation and Science

1800, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1899,	Trade	Trade
1901, 1905	Development and Humanitarian Aid	Development
1980	Enlargement	Enlargement and European Neighbourhood Policy
2000	Financial Programming and the Budget	Financial Programming and the Budget
2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2015, 2018, 2030, 2032, 2033, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2099	Institutional Relations and Communication Strategy	Inter-Institutional Relations and Administration
2010	Administrative Affairs, Audit and Anti-Fraud	Inter-Institutional Relations and Administration
2304	Information Society and Media	Education, Culture, Multilingualism and Youth