

RESEARCH NOTES

Brokering Deals in EU Trilogues? Legislative Priorities and Success of the Belgian Presidency

Thomas Laloux^{1,2}, Tom Delreux², Emilien Mercenier³

Abstract

In the first half of 2024, Belgium held the rotating Presidency of the Council of the European Union (EU). In that capacity, the Belgian Presidency was responsible for brokering legislative deals in trilogues. This research note examines [1] whether the Belgian Presidency was successful in reaching trilogue deals on files that it had prioritised, and [2] what explains the variation in that success. Based on an originally compiled data set that is analysed via logistic regression models, we argue that files explicitly identified as priorities by the Belgian Presidency were significantly more likely to result in a trilogue deal. However, the Presidency has not been equally successful in all policy fields. Preference heterogeneity within the Council significantly increases the likelihood of agreement, while stakeholder attention decreases it.

Keywords: Belgium, European Union, Council of the EU, Rotating presidency

Politics of the Low Countries is published with financial support from the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS.

- 1 Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS, France
 - 2 Institut de sciences politiques Louvain-Europe, UCLouvain, Belgium
 - 3 European Studies, UCLouvain, Belgium
- Corresponding author: tom.delreux@uclouvain.be

Introduction

In the first half of 2024, Belgium held the rotating Presidency of the Council of the European Union (EU). Despite carrying out this task in a time-constrained context, marked by the close proximity to national and European elections in June 2024, the Belgian Presidency was “widely regarded as a success” (de Brouwer 2024: 1). Belgium claims to have conducted around 2,500 meetings and events, reached approximately 30 general approaches in the Council, and, importantly in the context of this research note, concluded 58 legislative deals in trilogues (FPS Foreign Affairs, 2024). This prompted Alexander De Croo, the Prime Minister at the time, to describe Belgium as “truly a dealmaking Presidency” (Brussels Times, 2024).

The Council Presidency rotates every six months between EU Member States in a predetermined order. One of the main tasks of the Presidency is to “get things done” (Mühlböck and Rittberger 2015: 7). It implies that the Presidency is responsible for managing the Council’s political work, both intra-institutionally and inter-institutionally. Intra-institutionally, the Presidency chairs meetings of the Council and its preparatory bodies, including the Permanent Representatives Committee (COREPER) and the Council Working Parties, where it is expected to steer discussions and to facilitate decision-making among Member States (Häge, 2019; Kočí & Antal, 2025). Inter-institutionally, the Presidency represents the Council in negotiations with the European Parliament (EP) and the European Commission in so-called ‘trilogues’ at the political and administrative level (Laloux, 2020). In trilogues, the Presidency is assumed to broker compromises with the EP that can be accepted by a qualified majority of Member States in the Council and eventually be adopted as legislation (Delreux & Laloux, 2018).

While its tasks are not limited to the realm of legislative policy-making, the rotating Presidency is a key player in brokering legislative deals. It is supposed to act as an honest broker, resolving deadlocks and mediating compromises in the Council and in trilogues (Delreux & Laloux, 2018; Smeets & Vennix, 2014). While holding the Presidency usually does not allow for pushing and maximising the national interest, there is nonetheless a widely accepted norm within the Council that a Presidency can prioritise specific files or pay less attention to others (Häge, 2019). Importantly, as the formal right of initiative on legislative matters lies exclusively with the Commission, the Presidency does not have the power to propose legislation or to add files to the agenda. Hence, the possibility to prioritise specific files over others is limited to legislative proposals already on the table at the beginning of the Presidency’s term.

At the start of its term, a Presidency publishes a programme with a list of priorities, i.e. a list of the main legislative files and policy areas that it intends to take forward during its six-month term (Cross & Vaznonytė, 2020; Toneva-Metodieva, 2020). The Belgian Presidency published its priorities in December 2023 (Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union 2023). While not the only criterion, making

progress on its legislative priorities is considered key for evaluating the success of a Presidency, by both scholars and practitioners (Häge, 2019; Kočí & Antal, 2025).

Holding the Presidency offers a good opportunity for a Member State to demonstrate its deal-making capabilities and to make progress on files it considers important. As this opportunity only comes around every 13 and a half years, the Member State holding the Presidency is thus generally motivated to make the most of it. This is even more important for small and medium-sized Member States, such as Belgium, which face more considerable structural challenges than larger countries when it comes to influencing the EU agenda, for example, in terms of voting power or manpower (Harwood, 2025).

This raises the question of whether Belgium has been able to take advantage of its Presidency to broker deals on its priorities, and which factors explain its success in doing so. More specifically, this research note addresses two research questions:

1. Did the Belgian Presidency's prioritisation of a file make reaching a trilogue deal more likely? In other words, has the Belgian Presidency been able to advance its priorities?
2. What explains the variation in the Belgian Presidency's success across the files it prioritised?

To address these questions, we compiled an original data set covering all of the files in the legislative pipeline at the start of the Belgian Presidency (see Annex). Among those files, we then identified, first, those prioritised by Belgium and, second, those on which the Belgian Presidency reached a deal in trilogues. Importantly, this research note focuses on a single Presidency, and it does not seek to assess the success of the Belgian Presidency in comparative terms. Instead, we seek to understand the priorities that Belgium set itself during its term, the extent to which it achieved them, and the factors that explain the Presidency's success.

The agenda-shaping capacity of the Presidency

The literature identifies several resources that equip the Presidency to fulfil its tasks, including organisational and procedural prerogatives used to shape the Council's agenda (Häge, 2016; Warntjen, 2007), access to information about the preferences of other member states as a result of frequent bilateral consultations (Cross & Vaznonytė, 2020; Warntjen, 2013), a first-mover advantage in proposing compromises (Tallberg, 2010; Warntjen, 2008), as well as discretion in negotiating agreements in trilogues (Brandsma & Hoppe, 2020; Delreux & Laloux, 2018). The literature on the role of the Presidency in legislative policy-making has, broadly speaking, focused on two questions. A first strand of the literature examines the Presidency's *influence* in the policy-making process, referring to the extent to which the Presidency can take

advantage of its position to advance its own interests. A second strand assesses the Presidency's *success* (or performance)⁴. This research note is positioned in the second strand of the literature, as it examines the Belgian Presidency's success in brokering legislative deals in trilogues.

The literature on the Presidency's influence examines whether the Presidency can promote its national interests. It argues that a Presidency is generally not in a position to shape policy outcomes in a way that disproportionately favours its national interests (Laloux, 2021). Yet, a Presidency can shape the Council's agenda to advance national priorities or slow down negotiations on issues it opposes (Häge, 2019; Tallberg, 2003). Its control over the timing and agenda of meetings allows the Presidency to influence the relative allocation of attention to different files (Häge, 2016). Such 'agenda-shaping' practices are widely accepted as legitimate by the other Member States (Häge, 2019).

The literature on the Presidency's success predominantly draws on qualitative approaches. It has studied success either by focusing on a single Presidency (e.g. Karolewski, Mehlhausen, & Sus, 2015; Smeets & Vennix, 2014) or by comparing several Presidencies (Kočí & Antal, 2025; Toneva-Metodieva, 2020; Vidačak & Milošić, 2020). Despite variations in evaluation frameworks and success indicators, the literature broadly considers the number of legislative agreements reached and the proportion of the Presidency's priority files that were successfully negotiated as key criteria of a Presidency's success (Bursens & Van Hecke, 2011; Kočí & Antal, 2025; Vandecasteele & Bossuyt, 2014).⁵

Not all Presidencies are equally successful. Three factors explain variation in success: the organisational structure of the Presidency, the external context in which it operates, and the nature of the files it deals with (Cross & Vaznonytė, 2020; Kočí & Antal, 2025). As this research note is interested in a single Presidency, where the organisational structure and context remain constant, we focus on the third factor.

Our study not only tests the effect of the prioritisation of a file on the Presidency's success, but also the effect of six characteristics of the legislative file, selected based on the literature on EU legislative policy-making. First, we expect that it will be more difficult for the Presidency to be successful when there is *preference heterogeneity in the Council*. Indeed, when the preferences of the Member States diverge, more positions need to be reconciled for reaching a compromise, which makes reaching a deal more difficult and increases the duration of the negotiations (Brandsma, 2015; Bursens & Van Hecke, 2011). Second, we expect that *stakeholder*

4 While assessments of a Presidency's success are often not limited to success on legislative matters, the latter are generally an essential part of such an assessment.

5 Other criteria include, for instance, the launch of political initiatives, the organisation of extraordinary summits, engagement in media campaigns, and progress on enlargement discussions.

attention to a legislative file decreases the likelihood of the Presidency reaching an agreement, in the sense that such external attention incentivises Member States to negotiate harder, which makes finding an acceptable compromise more difficult (Chalmers, 2014). Third, it should be easier for the Presidency to negotiate when *the members of the EP negotiating team come from the Member State that holds the Presidency* (here Belgium) because of their common political and cultural background (Kirpsza, 2018). Fourth, success is more likely when the legislative file is not *complex* (Hurka & Haag, 2020). Complex legislative files require obtaining information, which slows down and complicates the negotiation process. Fifth, the *progress made on a file during the period preceding the Belgian Presidency* is relevant (Karolewski, Mehlhausen, and Sus 2015). The more advanced the negotiations are, the less remains to be negotiated and the more the positions of the actors are already known, making it more likely that a deal will be achieved. Sixth, it is easier for the Presidency to reach a deal when the legislative file is also *important for the other institutions* (the Commission and the EP), as the latter are then more inclined to negotiate intensively and to accept concessions to secure an agreement (Brandsma, 2015).

Data and method

As a first step, we identified the legislative files which were in the legislative pipeline at the start of the Belgian Presidency. This list, compiled based on the EP Legislative Observatory, included all pending Commission proposals for legislation as of January 2024. From that list, we excluded three types of files. First, since we aim to examine deal-making by the Belgian Presidency, files on which a compromise had already been reached under the Spanish Presidency in the second half of 2023, but which were not yet formally adopted, were excluded. Second, we excluded so-called ‘trivial agreements’ (Laloux, 2024), i.e. cases where the Commission’s proposal was adopted without amendments from the co-legislators. As trivial agreements do not require trilogues, the Presidency’s role in their adoption is, at best, very limited. Hence, we did not consider them a success for the Presidency. Third, we excluded proposals that the Commission issued after the start of the Belgian Presidency, as they could not feature as a priority in the Presidency’s programme. Overall, this resulted in a list of 158 legislative files that were on the table on the first day of the Belgian Presidency (see Annex).

In a second step, among the 158 files in the legislative pipeline, we identified those files that were a priority for Belgium. For each pending file, we searched for a corresponding key point in the text of the Presidency (Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union 2023). In most cases, the legislative file was explicitly referred to in the Presidency programme. In a few other cases, we considered a file as a priority when the keywords in its title matched a specific Belgian priority. Consequently, the

files that we could not match to any reference in the Presidency programme were considered not to be a priority file. This step resulted in 84 files, which were a priority for the Belgian Presidency (53% of the sample). For each of them, we also determined the corresponding policy area, using the responsible EP committee as a proxy.

In a third step, we identified all files on which the Belgian Presidency reached a deal in trilogues. We did so by checking, for each file in the legislative pipeline, whether the final trilogue, in which a deal was reached, took place during the first half of 2024. We relied on documents available in the Council's public register. This resulted in 58 files on which a trilogue deal was reached under the Belgian Presidency (36% of the sample).

In order to answer the first research question ('Did the Belgian Presidency's prioritisation of a file make reaching a trilogue deal more likely?'), we conducted two regression models to assess the effect of prioritisation on the likelihood of concluding an agreement. Both models use the brokering of a deal in trilogues as the dependent variable. Since this variable is binary (i.e., whether a deal was reached or not), we run logistic regressions. The first model has only one independent variable, namely, whether a file was prioritised or not.

The second model adds six control variables, which are identified in the literature as facilitating legislative deal-making in the EU. This allowed us to determine the net effect of prioritisation by the Belgian Presidency, controlling for other factors that might also influence the likelihood of reaching an agreement. We operationalised these six variables as follows:

- preference heterogeneity in the Council: the number of meetings held in the Council to discuss the file⁶, as reported on the EurLex website;
- stakeholder attention: the number of meetings between MEPs and stakeholders, as reported on the OEIL website;
- nationality of members of the EP negotiating team: whether a Belgian MEP was part of the EP negotiating team;
- complexity of the file: the number of Eurovoc descriptors of the proposal⁷;
- progress made before the Belgian Presidency: the number of months since the Commission issued its proposal;
- importance for other EU institutions: whether the file is mentioned in the Joint Declaration on legislative priorities (an interinstitutional agenda agreed annually by the European Commission, the Council and the EP, highlighting common priorities).

6 Noteworthy, the number of meetings in the Council might also reflect the complexity of a file. Yet, by having a separate control variable accounting for complexity in the model, we are able to isolate the effect of preference heterogeneity on the likelihood of reaching a trilogue deal.

7 Eurovoc descriptors are standardized keywords used to classify EU legislative documents, more descriptors typically indicating broader – and thus more complex – content.

In order to address the second research question ('What explains the variation in the Belgian Presidency's success across the files it prioritised?'), we conducted a third logistic regression, in which we only analysed the 84 files that were a priority for the Belgian Presidency. The dependent variable remains whether an agreement was reached during the Presidency's term. This third model includes the same variables that we used as controls in the second model, except for the prioritisation indicator. It allows us, first, to explain the Presidency's success in reaching deals on its priorities, and second, to qualify the nature of the priorities successfully negotiated by the Belgian Presidency.

Results

Figure 1 shows the distribution of the 84 prioritised files per policy field, both in absolute numbers (left panel) and as a proportion of all files per policy field (right panel). The number of files varies widely across policy fields, ranging from 28 files in the fields of home affairs and economic and monetary policy, to just one or two in fields like culture and education or constitutional affairs. This confirms that the existing legislative agenda largely determines the Belgian Presidency's deal-making potential. The Belgian Presidency prioritised files unevenly across policy fields, focusing heavily on civil liberties, transport, and the internal market, while giving less relative attention to fields such as economic policy, the environment, and legal affairs, despite their legislative volume. Some policy fields received few or no priorities, suggesting that they were either less important to the Belgian Presidency or considered less likely to produce tangible results within the limited timeframe of the Presidency. When comparing priority and non-priority files in terms of the characteristics that influence the likelihood of adoption, there is no evidence that Belgium prioritised files that were 'easier' to negotiate. The only significant differences concern preference heterogeneity within the Council and the level of stakeholder attention, indicating that Belgium prioritised files that were arguably harder to conclude (more heterogeneity and more stakeholder attention).




Figure 1 Prioritised files by the Belgian Presidency (Left: absolute number of files per policy field; Right: proportion of prioritised files per policy field)

As regards the brokering of legislative deals in trilogues, the Belgian Presidency reached agreements on 58 files, representing 37% of the pending files. Interestingly, there is a strong difference between prioritised and non-prioritised files. While only 15% of non-prioritised ($n=11$) files resulted in an agreement, 56% of prioritised files were successfully negotiated ($n=47$). This suggests that the Belgian Presidency successfully steered the Council and the trilogues towards its own priorities.

The two logistic regressions, assessing the effect of prioritisation on the probability of reaching an agreement – first without (Model 1) and then with (Model 2) control variables – show that being among the priorities has a substantial and statistically significant effect ($p < 0.01$ in both models). Figure 2 shows that this effect remains strong and significant even when accounting for potential confounding factors. Model 2 estimates that prioritised files were 6.7 times more likely to lead to an agreement than non-prioritised ones, all else being equal. The robustness of this result suggests that the observed relationship is not merely driven by variables facilitating the brokering of a deal but instead reflects a genuine association between prioritisation and success. Hence, the Belgian Presidency was largely effective in shaping the Council's agenda according to its priorities, and this was not merely due to the prioritisation of 'easier' files.




Figure 2 Predicted probability of reaching a legislative agreement under the Belgian Presidency based on whether files were prioritised

Taking a closer look at the types of prioritised files on which the Belgian Presidency brokered a deal, Figure 3 presents the success rate of prioritised files per policy field, in absolute and in relative terms. Among the Belgian Presidency's priority files, the number of trilogue deals varies considerably from one policy field to another. In absolute terms, most deals were reached in the areas of civil liberties, justice and internal security (13 deals), economic policy (10) and transport (8). These areas include a high number of priority files, indicating that the Belgian Presidency was not only ambitious in these fields but also capable of brokering trilogue deals⁸.

8 The high number of deals in the area of freedom, security and justice illustrates a strong strategic focus on justice and immigration legislation – a policy field that featured prominently in Belgium's priorities and that was salient in the general EU context.




Figure 3 Trilogue deals among the Belgian Presidency's prioritised files (Left: absolute number of files per policy field; Right: proportion of prioritised files with trilogue deal)

When assessed in relative terms, i.e. looking at the proportion of priority files on which a trilogue deal was reached, there are, for example, higher success rates in economic and monetary affairs (10 out of 12) or justice and home affairs (13 out of 19) than in environmental policy (7 out of 15). Overall, this comparison between policy fields highlights significant variation in results between and within different policy areas, indicating that the Belgian Presidency has not been equally successful on all its priorities.

The findings on these different success rates suggest that the success of a Presidency is not only a question of the agency and capabilities but also of the characteristics of the legislative file. This is precisely what we examine in the final model (Model 3), which assesses the influence of the characteristics of the priority files on the likelihood of a trilogue deal. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Odds ratios of the logistic regression⁹

Attention from stakeholders (<i>Number of meetings between MEPs and interest representatives (sqrt)</i>)	0.846** (0.057)
Preference heterogeneity in the Council (<i>Number of Council meetings</i>)	1.225*** (0.082)
Complexity (<i>Number of Eurovoc descriptors</i>)	1.076 (0.222)
Belgian MEP in the EP negotiation team	1.899 (1.144)
Duration of the process (<i>Number of months from the proposal (sqrt)</i>)	1.335 (0.288)
Importance for EU institutions (<i>In the Joint Declaration on legislative priorities</i>)	2.957* (1.912)
Constant	0.042* (0.080)
Observations	84
Log Likelihood	-45.424
Akaike Inf. Crit.	104.848
Nagelkerke pseudo R ²	0.36
McFadden pseudo R ²	0.23

* $p < 0.1$; ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$

Two variables relate to the dependent variable non-linearly: the external attention and the number of months since the proposal. Therefore, the square roots of these variables were used in place of them.

Among the control variables, stakeholder attention and preference heterogeneity within the Council have a significant effect. As expected, Belgium was less successful in concluding files with more stakeholder attention. This suggests that high external visibility or pressure may have led to tougher bargaining, thereby constraining the Presidency's ability to broker agreements. By contrast, against our expectations, the more preference heterogeneity in the Council, the more likely it is that a trilogue deal was reached by the Belgian Presidency. One explanation for this counterintuitive finding may be that, when a file is neither too salient nor too visible, preference heterogeneity in the Council allows the Presidency to better position itself as a mediator between the Member States (Vandecasteele & Bossuyt 2014), facilitating its efforts to assemble member states around a trilogue deal and reducing the likelihood of a

9 The model achieves a McFadden R² of 0.23, indicating a moderate-to-strong improvement over the null model, and a Nagelkerke R² of 0.36, suggesting a substantial proportion of the variation in outcomes is accounted for by the predictors.

cohesive blocking coalition. The effect of a file being important to the other institutions approaches conventional levels of statistical significance ($p=0.06$), suggesting a possible association that warrants further investigation. For the other three control variables, no significant effect is found.

Figure 4 illustrates the number of legislative agreements brokered by the Belgian Presidency on issues not among its priorities, as well as the percentage of trilogue deals involving non-priorities. Unsurprisingly, Belgium concluded more agreements of this type in policy areas of lower priority, such as industry and energy, legal affairs or budgetary policy. On the other hand, in high-priority areas, the Presidency made relatively little progress on non-priority files. This suggests that in these areas, the Presidency has focused on making progress on its priority files, while in the lower priority areas, it may have had more opportunity to concentrate on making progress on files that were not part of its programme originally.




Figure 4 Trilogue deals brokered by the Belgian Presidency (Left: absolute number of files per policy field; Right: proportion of non-prioritised files)¹⁰

¹⁰ Some policy fields are not shown in Figure 4 because no legislative agreements in these fields were reached during the Belgian Presidency. These include constitutional affairs, budgetary matters, cultural policy, and health policy.

Conclusion

The aim of this research note was twofold: assessing whether the 2024 Belgian Presidency of the Council of the EU succeeded in advancing its priorities, and explaining variation in the Presidency's successes. Our results suggest Belgium was able to make the most of its Presidency. The analysis clearly shows that prioritisation played a crucial role: files explicitly identified as priorities by the Belgian Presidency were significantly more likely to result in a trilogue deal, even after controlling for other explanatory factors via logistic regression models. In addition, the number of non-prioritised files that resulted in a deal was much lower, particularly in the high-priority policy fields. Overall, Belgium indeed shaped the policy outcomes of the Council and the trilogues during its Presidency. This finding confirms the importance of agenda-shaping capabilities of Council Presidencies.

However, the Belgian Presidency has not been equally successful in all policy fields. While the Presidency has achieved high rates of legislative progress on economic affairs, justice and internal security, it has a lower success rate in other areas, such as environment and legal affairs. Examining the factors linked to the Presidency's success in brokering trilogue deals on its prioritised files, we found that preference heterogeneity within the Council significantly increases the likelihood of agreement, while stakeholder attention decreases it. This suggests that Belgium was able to overcome internal constraints effectively but was less successful in managing external pressures. In conclusion, the Belgian Presidency successfully brokered legislative deals in trilogues that aligned with its own priorities. Yet, we also found that the Presidency's success depends not only on its own efforts but also on factors beyond its control and is linked to the characteristics of the legislative files.

Our results – and their limits – also warrant further research on the success of Council Presidencies. First, we found that the success of the Belgian Presidency did not depend on explanations often mentioned in the literature on legislative policy-making, such as the complexity of the file or the national proximity between the negotiators. Therefore, further research should focus on why this is the case, and particularly on why Presidencies are not necessarily more successful on the 'easier' files. Second, although our analysis shows that Belgium was successful in its priorities, our analysis may not have taken everything into account. For instance, the Belgian Presidency may have had better knowledge of the files on the verge of agreement. Therefore, further (qualitative) research should investigate whether the Presidency's success reflected its ability to shape the agenda according to a strategic selection of priorities. Finally, by focusing on the brokering of legislative deals, we address only one – albeit crucial – dimension of Presidency success. Further research is thus also needed to evaluate the Belgian Presidency's performance more comprehensively, going beyond legislative policy-making and trilogue deals.

References

- Belgian Presidency of the Council of the European Union. (2023). *Programme: Protect, strengthen, prepare*. https://belgian-presidency.consilium.europa.eu/media/3kajw1io/programme_en.pdf
- Brandsma, G. J. (2015). Co-decision after Lisbon: The politics of informal trilogues in European Union lawmaking. *European Union Politics*, 16(2), 300–319. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116515584497>
- Brandsma, G. J., & Hoppe, A. (2020). He who controls the process controls the outcome? A reappraisal of the relais actor thesis. *Journal of European Integration*, 43(3), 347–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2020.1753041>
- Bursens, P., & Van Hecke, S. (2011). *Readjusting the Council Presidency: Belgian leadership in the EU*. ASP/VUBPRESS/UPA.
- Chalmers, A. W. (2014). In over their heads: Public consultation, administrative capacity and legislative duration in the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 15(4), 595–613. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116514529849>
- Cross, J. P., & Vaznonytė, A. (2020). Can we do what we say we will do? Issue salience, government effectiveness, and the legislative efficiency of Council Presidencies. *European Union Politics*, 21(4), 657–679. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116520950829>
- de Brouwer, J.-L. (2024). *Belgium's Council Presidency: Reviewing a remarkably stimulating six months (EPIN Council Presidency Report)*. European Policy Institutes Network. <https://epin.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Belgiums-Council-Presidency.-Reviewing-a-remarkably-stimulating-six-months.pdf>
- Delreux, T., & Laloux, T. (2018). Concluding early agreements in the EU: A double principal-agent analysis of trilogue negotiations. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(3), 477–495. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12641>
- FPS Foreign Affairs. (2024). *The Belgian presidency of the Council of the EU – Retrospective in five questions*. <https://diplomatie.belgium.be/en/policy/policy-areas/highlighted/belgian-presidency-council-eu-retrospective-five-questions>
- Häge, F. M. (2016). Political attention in the Council of the European Union: A new dataset of working party meetings, 1995–2014. *European Union Politics*, 17(4), 683–703. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116516649062>
- Häge, F. M. (2019). The presidency of the Council of the European Union. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.1071>
- Harwood, M. (2025). The continuing significance of the Council of the EU Presidency for small states: Agenda setting or painting-by-numbers? *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 33(3), 719–733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2024.2411633>
- Hurka, S., & Haag, M. (2020). Policy complexity and legislative duration in the European Union. *European Union Politics*, 21(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116519854877>
- Karolewski, I. P., Mehlhausen, T., & Sus, M. (2015). The Polish EU Council Presidency in 2011: Master or servant? *Journal of European Integration*, 37(6), 667–684. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2015.1079379>
- Kirpsza, A. (2018). How to win the Brussels game? Explaining the European Parliament's success under the co-decision. *World Political Science*, 14(1), 123–148. <https://doi.org/10.1515/wps-2018-0005>
- Kočí, K., & Antal, J. (2025). Doing the same with different results: Variations in EU Presidencies of Austria, Finland, Slovakia and Czechia. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 63(3), 765–785. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13646>
- Laloux, T. (2020). Informal negotiations in EU legislative decision-making: A systematic review and research agenda. *European Political Science*, 19(3), 443–460. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41304-019-00213-5>
- Laloux, T. (2021). Agency slack as a cause of deviation in trilogue negotiations. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(1), 132–151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2020.1859595>

- Mühlböck, M., & Rittberger, B. (2015). The Council, the European Parliament, and the paradox of inter-institutional cooperation. *European Integration Online Papers*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.1695/2015004>
- Smeets, S., & Vennix, J. (2014). 'How to make the most of your time in the chair': EU presidencies and the management of Council debates. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(10), 1435–1451. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2014.914055>
- Tallberg, J. (2003). The agenda-shaping powers of the EU Council Presidency. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350176032000046903>
- Tallberg, J. (2010). Explaining the institutional foundations of European Union negotiations. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17(5), 633–647. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501761003748559>
- The Brussels Times. (2024, July 2). 'We got the job done': Belgium bows out of six-month 'dealmaking' EU Presidency. *The Brussels Times*. <https://www.brusselstimes.com/1115649/we-got-the-job-done-belgium-bows-out-of-6-month-dealmaking-eu-presidency>
- Toneva-Metodieva, L. (2020). Evaluating the Presidency of the Council of the EU: Towards a comprehensive evidence-based framework for performance assessment. *European Politics and Society*, 21(5), 650–667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2020.1712539>
- Vandecasteele, B., & Bossuyt, F. (2014). Assessing EU Council Presidencies: (Conditions for) success and influence. *Comparative European Politics*, 12(2), 233–247. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cep.2013.1>
- Vidačak, I., & Milošić, T. (2020). Measuring the success of the Presidency of the Council of the EU – Austria and Croatia in comparative perspective. *Croatian International Relations Review*, 26(87), 32–63. <https://doi.org/10.37173/cirr.26.87.2>
- Warntjen, A. (2007). Steering the Union: The impact of the EU Presidency on legislative activity in the Council. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 45(5), 1135–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2007.00763.x>
- Warntjen, A. (2008). Steering, but not dominating: The impact of the Council Presidency on EU legislation. In D. Naurin & H. Wallace (Eds.), *Unveiling the Council of the European Union: Games governments play in Brussels* (pp. 203–218). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230583788_12
- Warntjen, A. (2013). The elusive goal of continuity? Legislative decision-making and the Council Presidency before and after Lisbon. *West European Politics*, 36(6), 1239–1255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2013.826028>

Annex: Files in the legislative pipeline, Belgian priorities and trilogue deals under the Belgian Presidency

Procedure reference	File	Policy field	Priority for Belgian Presidency?	Deal reached by Belgian Presidency?	Preference heterogeneity in the Council (number of Council meetings)	Stakeholder attention (number of meetings between MEPs and stakeholders)	Nationality members of the EP negotiating team (Belgian MEP in negotiating team?)	Complexity (number of Eurovoc descriptors)	Progress made before Belgian Presidency (date Commission proposal)	Importance for other institutions (in Joint Declaration?)
2023/0155(COD)	Minimum requirements for breaks/rest	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	10	16	No	7	31/05/2023	No
2023/0452(COD)	Interim Regulation on ePrivacy derogation	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	11	12	No	9	03/12/2023	No
2023/0368(COD)	Company law: sustainability reporting standards	Legal affairs	Yes	Yes	6	8	No	9	29/10/2023	No
2023/0138(COD)	Coordination of economic policies	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	4	11	Yes	8	03/05/2023	Yes
2023/0046(COD)	Reducing the cost of gigabit networks	Industry, research & energy	Yes	Yes	8	57	No	8	22/02/2023	No
2023/0105(COD)	Breakfast Directives amendment	Environment	Yes	Yes	14	38	No	10	24/04/2023	No
2023/0042(COD)	CO2 targets for heavy-duty vehicles	Environment	Yes	Yes	14	116	No	9	21/02/2023	Yes
2020/0279(COD)	Asylum and migration management	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	9	11	No	8	29/09/2020	Yes
2023/0272(COD)	Mercury restrictions	Environment	No	Yes	7	5	No	8	10/09/2023	No
2023/0083(COD)	Repair of goods rules	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	10	82	No	8	27/03/2023	Yes
2023/0081(COD)	Net Zero Industry Act	Industry, research & energy	Yes	Yes	19	222	Yes	8	20/03/2023	No
2021/0428(COD)	Schengen Borders Code	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	8	12	No	9	16/12/2021	Yes
2023/0206(COD)	North-East Atlantic fisheries	Fisheries	No	Yes	8	3	No	9	17/07/2023	No
2023/0049(COD)	Digital labelling of fertilisers	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	15	3	No	9	26/02/2023	No
2022/0280(COD)	Single Market emergency instrument (Directives)	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	16	0	No	9	25/09/2022	Yes
2022/0279(COD)	Single Market emergency instrument (Regulations)	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	15	0	No	9	25/09/2022	Yes

2022/0278(COD)	Single Market emergency instrument	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	18	16	Yes	7	20/09/2022	Yes
2023/0355(COD)	Euro counterfeiting protection	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	Yes	7	0	No	7	29/10/2023	No
2023/0356(COD)	INSPIRE reporting requirements	Environment	No	No	6	0	No	9	22/10/2023	No
2023/0311(COD)	Establishing Disability/Parking Cards	Employment & social affairs	Yes	Yes	11	27	No	4	17/10/2023	Yes
2022/0432(COD)	Substances/mixtures classification	Environment	Yes	No	13	73	No	7	20/12/2022	Yes
2022/0411(COD)	Public capital markets access	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	12	51	Yes	9	12/12/2022	Yes
2022/0406(COD)	Multiple-vote share structures	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	11	9	Yes	7	11/12/2022	Yes
2022/0405(COD)	Public capital markets access	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	11	8	Yes	7	11/12/2022	Yes
2022/0347(COD)	Ambient air quality recast	Environment	Yes	Yes	15	61	No	8	03/11/2022	Yes
2021/0414(COD)	Digital labour platforms work	Employment & social affairs	Yes	Yes	21	137	No	6	09/12/2021	Yes
2013/0186(COD)	Single European Sky implementation	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	7	23	No	8	19/06/2013	Yes
2022/0392(COD)	Community designs recast	Legal affairs	Yes	No	2	2	No	5	04/12/2022	No
2022/0391(COD)	Community design protection	Legal affairs	Yes	No	16	2	No	5	04/12/2022	No
2022/0272(COD)	Cyber Resilience Act	Industry, research & energy	Yes	No	12	70	Yes	9	20/09/2022	Yes
2022/0404(COD)	Concentration/counterparty risk	Economic & monetary affairs	No	Yes	9	29	No	9	11/12/2022	Yes
2022/0094(COD)	Construction Products Regulation	Internal market & consumer protection	No	No	14	66	Yes	9	04/04/2022	Yes
2023/0378(COD)	Plant pest measures	Agriculture	Yes	Yes	13	0	No	9	29/10/2023	No
2023/0237(COD)	European statistics	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	11	2	Yes	7	12/07/2023	No
2023/0177(COD)	ESG rating transparency	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	13	0	No	9	19/06/2023	No
2023/0172(COD)	Flag State compliance	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	12	4	Yes	9	04/06/2023	No
2023/0171(COD)	Ship-source pollution penalties	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	14	5	No	9	04/06/2023	No
2023/0165(COD)	Port State control	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	11	14	Yes	7	04/06/2023	No
2023/0164(COD)	Maritime accident investigations	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	12	2	No	4	04/06/2023	No
2023/0093(COD)	Criminal proceedings transfer	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	15	3	Yes	6	10/04/2023	Yes
2022/0403(COD)	CCP exposures/clearing efficiency	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	Yes	8	51	No	9	08/12/2022	Yes
2022/0394(COD)	Carbon removals certification	Environment	Yes	Yes	13	83	No	8	04/12/2022	Yes
2022/0345(COD)	Urban wastewater recast	Environment	Yes	Yes	5	135	No	8	03/11/2022	Yes
2022/0210(COD)	Environmental economic accounts	Environment	No	No	10	2	No	9	10/07/2022	No
2021/0296(COD)	Insurance/reinsurance resolution	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	12	40	Yes	9	26/09/2021	Yes
2021/0295(COD)	Solvency II amendments	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	12	82	Yes	9	26/09/2021	Yes
2023/0108(COD)	Managed security services	Industry, research & energy	No	Yes	13	14	No	6	19/04/2023	No
2023/0089(COD)	Company law: digital tools	Legal affairs	No	Yes	10	8	No	9	03/04/2023	Yes
2023/0090(COD)	Non-road mobile machinery	Internal market & consumer protection	No	Yes	13	7	Yes	8	02/04/2023	No
2022/0288(COD)	Firearms Protocol recast	International trade	No	Yes	7	5	No	9	03/11/2022	No
2023/0109(COD)	Cybersecurity solidarity measures	Industry, research & energy	Yes	Yes	16	24	No	9	23/04/2023	No
2023/0052(COD)	Road traffic offences info	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	17	15	Yes	9	01/03/2023	No
2022/0425(COD)	Passenger information (terrorism/crime)	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	12	8	Yes	9	14/12/2022	Yes

2022/0424(COD)	Passenger information (border control)	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	12	7	Yes	9	14/12/2022	Yes
2022/0396(COD)	Packaging waste rules	Environment	Yes	Yes	17	503	Yes	7	04/12/2022	Yes
2022/0132B(COD)	Digital visa procedure	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	No	8	0	No	9	12/07/2023	Yes
2020/0161(COD)	Railway safety rules (Channel Link)	Transport & tourism	No	No	4	0	No	7	28/07/2020	No
2020/0160(COD)	France-UK Channel Link agreement	Transport & tourism	No	No	5	0	No	9	28/07/2020	No
2020/0042(COD)	Airport slots allocation	Transport & tourism	No	No	5	0	No	7	15/03/2020	No
2018/0230(COD)	European Solidarity Corps	Culture & education	Yes	No	11	3	No	9	17/06/2018	No
2023/0463(COD)	Transparency of third-country lobbying	Internal market & consumer protection	No	No	13	11	No	8	18/12/2023	Yes
2023/0462(COD)	IMI/Single Digital Gateway amendments	Internal market & consumer protection	No	No	3	0	No	6	13/12/2023	No
2023/0449(COD)	Multiannual fisheries plans	Fisheries	No	No	3	2	No	9	06/12/2023	No
2023/0437(COD)	Passenger rights enforcement	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	5	28	No	10	04/12/2023	No
2023/0436(COD)	Multimodal passenger rights	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	10	42	No	9	04/12/2023	No
2023/0435(COD)	Package travel protection	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	6	52	No	9	04/12/2023	No
2023/0439(COD)	Illegal immigration facilitation rules	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	11	27	No	8	27/11/2023	No
2023/0421(COD)	Carcinogens at work codification	Legal affairs	Yes	No	3	0	No	7	27/11/2023	No
2023/0396(COD)	Combined transport framework	Transport & tourism	No	No	5	25	No	9	08/11/2023	No
2023/0376(COD)	ADR/consumer protection amendments	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	4	21	No	8	29/10/2023	No
2023/0373(COD)	Plastic pellet losses	Environment	Yes	No	8	67	Yes	8	29/10/2023	Yes
2023/0371(COD)	Visa Suspension Mechanism revision	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	4	8	No	4	29/10/2023	No
2023/0363(COD)	Financial services reporting requirements	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	No	7	13	No	9	29/10/2023	No
2023/0314(COD)	IMI/SDG for associations	Internal market & consumer protection	No	No	3	0	No	9	29/10/2023	No
2023/0323(COD)	Late payment in transactions	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	17	105	No	5	28/09/2023	Yes
2023/0315(COD)	Cross-border associations	Legal affairs	No	No	10	4	No	7	28/09/2023	Yes
2023/0265(COD)	Road vehicles' weights/dimensions	Transport & tourism	No	No	8	93	No	9	10/09/2023	Yes
2023/0290(COD)	Toy safety	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	9	79	No	8	28/08/2023	No
2023/0271(COD)	Single railway area rules	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	9	73	No	9	12/07/2023	Yes
2023/0234(COD)	Waste Framework (textiles/food)	Environment	Yes	No	3	95	No	9	06/07/2023	Yes
2023/0232(COD)	Soil Monitoring Law	Environment	Yes	No	12	191	Yes	6	06/07/2023	Yes
2023/0228(COD)	Forest reproductive material	Agriculture	Yes	No	11	3	No	9	06/07/2023	No
2023/0227(COD)	Plant reproductive material	Agriculture	Yes	No	26	51	No	8	06/07/2023	No
2023/0226(COD)	New genomic techniques (plants)	Environment	No	No	34	153	No	9	06/07/2023	Yes
2023/0202(COD)	GDPR procedural rules	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	No	8	35	No	8	04/07/2023	No
2023/0212(COD)	Digital euro establishment	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	7	158	No	4	02/07/2023	Yes
2023/0211(COD)	Digital euro services (non-euro MS)	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	7	0	No	8	02/07/2023	Yes
2023/0210(COD)	Payment services (internal market)	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	5	29	No	8	02/07/2023	Yes
2023/0209(COD)	Payment/e-money services	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	5	16	No	8	02/07/2023	No
2023/0208(COD)	Euro legal tender	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	5	12	No	5	02/07/2023	Yes

2023/0205(COD)	Financial Data Access	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	5	81	Yes	9	02/07/2023	Yes
2023/0169(COD)	Protection of adults	Legal affairs	No	No	5	3	No	9	06/06/2023	No
2023/0167(COD)	Retail investor protection	Economic & monetary affairs	Yes	No	8	141	No	7	31/05/2023	Yes
2023/0166(COD)	PRIPs information document	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	8	9	No	6	31/05/2023	Yes
2023/0156(COD)	EU Customs Code/Authority	Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	7	77	Yes	7	21/05/2023	Yes
2023/0135(COD)	Combating corruption	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	11	16	No	8	03/05/2023	Yes
2023/0134(COD)	CO2 class for heavy-duty trailers	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	2	35	No	8	03/05/2023	No
2023/0130(COD)	Medicinal SPC recast	Legal affairs	No	No	8	3	No	3	03/05/2023	No
2023/0128(COD)	Plant SPC recast	Legal affairs	No	No	8	2	No	3	03/05/2023	No
2023/0133(COD)	Standard essential patents	Legal affairs	No	No	14	167	No	7	02/05/2023	Yes
2023/0129(COD)	Crisis compulsory patent licensing	Legal affairs	Yes	No	12	16	No	8	02/05/2023	Yes
2023/0127(COD)	Unitary medicinal SPC	Legal affairs	No	No	9	19	No	3	02/05/2023	No
2023/0126(COD)	Unitary plant SPC	Legal affairs	No	No	9	7	No	3	02/05/2023	No
2023/0124(COD)	Detergents/surfactants	Environment	No	No	6	79	No	8	02/05/2023	No
2023/0131(COD)	Medicinal products/EMA rules	Public health	No	No	10	271	Yes	9	01/05/2023	Yes
2023/0132(COD)	Medicinal products (human use)	Public health	No	No	9	441	No	10	27/04/2023	Yes
2023/0112(COD)	Bank resolution measures	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	7	55	No	8	23/04/2023	Yes
2023/0111(COD)	Bank funding resolution	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	8	22	No	9	23/04/2023	Yes
2023/0115(COD)	Deposit protection schemes	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	11	12	No	7	19/04/2023	Yes
2023/0055(COD)	Driving disqualifications (EU-wide)	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	11	7	No	8	01/03/2023	No
2023/0053(COD)	Driving licences	Transport & tourism	Yes	No	11	71	No	9	01/03/2023	No
2023/0008(COD)	Population/housing statistics	Employment & social affairs	Yes	No	9	4	No	8	23/01/2023	No
2022/0408(COD)	Insolvency law harmonisation	Legal affairs	No	No	8	38	Yes	8	11/12/2022	Yes
2022/0344(COD)	Groundwater protection	Environment	No	No	7	87	No	9	03/11/2022	Yes
2022/0303(COD)	AI liability rules	Legal affairs	No	No	8	64	No	9	05/10/2022	Yes
2022/0155(COD)	Child sexual abuse online	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	No	11	235	Yes	9	16/05/2022	Yes
2022/0135(COD)	Visa requirements (Kuwait/Qatar)	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	2	14	No	5	03/05/2022	Yes
2022/0134(COD)	Long-Term Residents recast	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	5	10	No	7	03/05/2022	Yes
2022/0084(COD)	EU institutions' information security	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	2	4	No	9	28/03/2022	No
2021/0427(COD)	Instrumentalisation of migration	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	6	7	No	9	16/12/2021	Yes
2021/0400(COD)	Vehicle weights/dimensions codification	Legal affairs	No	No	3	0	No	8	07/12/2021	No
2021/0375(COD)	EU political parties/foundations	Constitutional affairs	No	No	10	0	No	6	30/11/2021	Yes
2021/0297(COD)	Tariff preferences scheme	International trade	No	No	2	44	Yes	9	23/09/2021	Yes
2021/0060(COD)	Rough diamonds trade (Kimberley)	International trade	No	No	2	2	No	6	21/03/2021	No
2020/0264(COD)	EASA Performance Review Body	Transport & tourism	Yes	Yes	15	10	No	8	22/09/2020	Yes
2019/0017(COD)	Maritime CO2 data collection	Environment	No	No	4	0	No	9	05/02/2019	No
2017/0035(COD)	Implementing power control	Legal affairs	No	No	8	0	No	5	02/03/2017	No

2015/0270(COD)	EU deposit insurance scheme	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	30	5	Yes	9	07/12/2015	Yes
2023/0453(COD)	Chemicals data platform	Environment	No	No	5	18	Yes	9	11/12/2023	No
2023/0455(COD)	Chemicals agencies cooperation	Environment	No	No	6	4	Yes	9	07/12/2023	No
2023/0454(COD)	Hazardous substances (EEE)	Environment	No	No	6	0	Yes	7	07/12/2023	No
2023/0447(COD)	Dogs/cats' welfare	Agriculture	No	No	14	45	No	8	07/12/2023	No
2023/0438(COD)	Police cooperation (migrant smuggling)	Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	No	10	11	Yes	8	27/11/2023	No
2023/0404(COD)	EU talent pool	Civil liberties & home affairs	No	No	9	63	Yes	9	21/11/2023	No
2023/0379(COD)	Benchmarks framework	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	5	42	No	8	29/10/2023	No
2023/0288(COD)	Labour market business stats	Economic & monetary affairs	No	No	7	0	Yes	9	17/10/2023	No
2023/0200(COD)	Ukraine Facility	Foreign affairs; Budget	No	Yes	6	8	No	9	21/06/2023	No
2023/0199(COD)	Strategic Technologies for Europe Platform ('STEP')	Budget; Industry, research & energy	No	Yes	7	24	No	8	21/06/2023	No
2023/0397(COD)	Reform and Growth Facility (Western Balkans)	Foreign affairs; Budget	No	Yes	6	13	No	9	09/11/2023	No
2022/0066(COD)	Combating violence against women	Civil liberties & home affairs; Gender equality	Yes	Yes	13	198	Yes	9	08/03/2022	Yes
2021/0240(COD)	Anti-Money Laundering Authority	Economic & monetary affairs; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	21	104	No	8	29/07/2021	Yes
2021/0250(COD)	AML/CFT mechanisms	Economic & monetary affairs; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	20	55	No	8	29/07/2021	Yes
2021/0239(COD)	AML/CFT prevention	Economic & monetary affairs; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	21	47	No	7	29/07/2021	Yes
2022/0426(COD)	Combating human trafficking	Civil liberties & home affairs; Gender equality	Yes	Yes	12	38	No	7	19/12/2022	Yes
2022/0162(COD)	Financial Regulation recast	Budget; Budgetary control	No	No	7	10	No	8	23/05/2022	Yes
2023/0393(COD)	European Disability/Parking Card (third-country nationals)	Employment & social affairs; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	7	2	No	7	06/11/2023	No
2022/0269(COD)	Forced labour products ban	International trade; Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	Yes	18	150	Yes	8	22/09/2022	Yes
2022/0140(COD)	European Health Data Space	Environment; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	Yes	21	188	No	9	03/05/2022	Yes
2012/0299(COD)	Gender balance in boards	Legal affairs; Gender equality	No	No	6	6	No	4	26/11/2012	No
2023/0448(COD)	Animal transport protection	Transport & tourism; Agriculture	Yes	No	11	191	Yes	6	07/12/2023	No
2023/0266(COD)	Transport emissions accounting	Environment; Transport & tourism	Yes	No	8	56	No	8	12/07/2023	Yes
2023/0250(COD)	Victims' rights protection	Civil liberties & home affairs; Gender equality	Yes	No	8	20	Yes	9	12/07/2023	No
2023/0085(COD)	Green Claims Directive	Environment; Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	7	406	No	9	23/03/2023	Yes
2022/0125(COD)	Financial Regulation amendments	Budget; Budgetary control	No	No	2	0	No	7	03/05/2022	Yes
2021/0387(COD)	Transport operators and trafficking sanctions	Transport & tourism; Civil liberties & home affairs	Yes	No	1	4	No	9	23/11/2021	No
2023/0413(COD)	Forest monitoring framework	Environment; Agriculture	Yes	No	14	68	No	9	22/11/2023	No
2023/0410(COD)	Forest expert group	Environment; Agriculture	No	No	4	2	No	3	22/11/2023	No
2023/0284(COD)	Circular vehicle design/end-of-life	Environment; Internal market & consumer protection	Yes	No	8	201	No	8	12/07/2023	No