

## **Online Appendix Framing Climate Policy Ambition in the European Parliament**

Lucy Kinski \* and Ariadna Ripoll Servent

Salzburg Centre of European Union Studies, University of Salzburg, Austria

\* Corresponding author (lucy.kinski@plus.ac.at)

*Politics and Governance* 2022, Volume 10, Issue 3

<https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v10i3.5479>

This online appendix contains further information on the codebook, coding instructions, examples and procedures as well as supplementary analyses. It has four main parts:

- A.1 Codebook Framing Climate Policy Ambitions in the European Parliament (pp. 2-12)
- A.2 Climate Policy Ambitions: Targets and Implementation (p. 13)
- A.3 Representative Claims and Justification Frames of Climate Policy Ambitions (pp. 14-15)
- A.4 Justification Frames by EPG and Representative Claims Western Europe and CEE (pp. 16-17)
- A.5 Reliability Test Results (p. 18)

## A.1 Codebook Framing Climate Policy Ambitions in the European Parliament

### 1. Aim and research question

This codebook provides guidelines for a manual content analysis of climate policy ambitions in parliamentary debates. It conceptualizes and operationalizes climate policy ambitions by combining insights from research on policy change and output (e.g., Schaffrin et al. 2015) with a coding of representative claims and justification frames (e.g., de Wilde 2013; Wendler 2016). We apply the codebook to key climate policy debates in the 9<sup>th</sup> European Parliament (EP) to investigate how its members (MEPs) debate climate policy ambitions. The codebook also contains additional information on how the debates were retrieved and prepared for analysis using DeepL and MAXQDA.

### 2. Defining climate policy ambitions (in parliamentary debates)<sup>1</sup>

Based on IPCC definitions (2018), we distinguish between *climate mitigation* ambitions and *adaptation ambitions*:

**Mitigation:** A human intervention to reduce emissions or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases” (p. 554).

**Adaptation:** In human systems, the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects” (p. 542).

**Mitigation measures:** “In climate policy, mitigation measures are technologies, processes or practices that contribute to mitigation, for example, renewable energy (RE) technologies, waste minimization processes and public transport commuting practices.” (p. 554).

**Adaptation options:** “The array of strategies and measures that are available and appropriate for addressing adaptation. They include a wide range of actions that can be categorized as structural, institutional, ecological or behavioural” (p. 542).

We then define five core elements of climate policy ambitions: *targets, scope, implementation, monitoring, and stakeholder involvement* (Duwe & Evans 2020; Garvey & Buzogány 2021; Schaffrin et al. 2015).

**Targets:** Climate policy goals and objectives that actors aim to achieve. These can be quantifiable or non-quantifiable, economy-wide or sector-specific and have different time horizons (short to long-term) (see Nachmany & Mangan 2018).

**Scope:** This refers to the target group of the policy ambition (demand vs. supply side) as well as the targeted energy sources (fossil energy, renewable energy, nuclear). It captures how encompassing actors are in their climate policy ambitions (Schaffrin et al. 2015).

**Implementation:** Measures, tools and instruments used to reach the climate policy targets. This includes some sub-categories (see Schaffrin et al. 2015), namely in how far actors discuss

**Budget / set expenditure:** Do actors earmark a certain amount of money, talk about budgetary implications, the need for investment, costs of climate policy ambitions etc.?

**Implementation procedures:** Do actors specifically name implementation procedures and actors / institutions responsible for the implementation process?

**Sanctioning mechanisms:** Do actors commit to any form of sanctioning in case of non-compliance with set targets or implementation mechanisms?

**Mainstreaming requirements:** Do actors discuss mainstreaming climate change ambitions into other policy areas such as trade policy for example? This means evaluating legislation and policies against the background of implications for climate change in all policy areas.

**Policy integration:** Do actors discuss climate policy measures as part of a larger framework, in relation to other (climate) policy measures?

---

<sup>1</sup> Please also consult the main article for the conceptual discussion.

**Monitoring:** Do actors talk about monitoring requirements? These include reporting requirements, evaluation requirements and updating requirements. This also captures in how far an independent scientific advisory board is discussed as part of the progress monitoring (Duwe & Evans 2020).

**Stakeholder Involvement:** This captures the participatory dimension, namely in how far actors discuss the involvement of citizens, civil society and interest groups as well as scientists in the climate policy process.

Since these elements come from research on policy outputs, activities and change, they are largely geared towards the analysis of policy instruments, legal texts or legislative amendments and do not yet capture elements of political debate.

To capture these elements, we additionally code

**Actor Position** towards climate policy ambition (both target and implementation separately)

**Representative Claim:** Whom does the actor claim to represent / speak for and about when discussing a certain climate policy ambition (see de Wilde 2013; Kinski 2021).

**Justification Frame:** How does the actor frame the climate policy ambition when it comes to why a policy ambition should (not) be done? (see Wendler 2016).

---

Overall, this coding scheme codes how actors answer the questions of WHAT, HOW, HOW WELL, BY & WITH WHOM (Duwe & Evans 2020), FOR WHOM and WHY (not) in their political debates

---

### 3. Two-step coding process: unitizing and coding unit

We apply a two-step coding process that first identifies climate policy ambitions and then codes their respective elements (target, implementation etc.) in a second step. The individual **climate policy ambition** is the **coding unit** and may range from a (part of) a sentence to an entire paragraph depending on how many core (target, scope, implementation, monitoring, stakeholder involvement) and additional elements (position, representation, justification) it contains.

**Example 1** (mitigation ambition only containing a target): “Today, we will enshrine into law that the EU, which started as a coal and steel union more than 70 years ago, will become the first carbon—neutral continent by 2050 at the latest.” *Jytte Guteland, Climate Law Debate 24.06.2021*

**Examples 2** (several mitigation ambitions incl. target and implementation):

“The Liberals want to see a 65% reduction in emissions by 2030, but we also want to focus on how we get there; climate targets mean nothing without economically efficient sustainable solutions” (target and unspecific implementation\_1).

“That is why we say yes to a common carbon tax (implementation ambition 1), yes to scrapping subsidies for fossil fuels (implementation ambition 2), yes to investing heavily in research and new technology (implementation ambition 3) and we say yes to nuclear power (4) and carbon storage (5) as part of the solution.” *Karin Karlsbro, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020*

**Example 3** (containing urgency and leadership frames)

“Madam President, climate change and environmental degradation pose a serious threat to Europe and the world. That is why it is important to be ambitious and make Europe the world's first climate-neutral continent.” *Edina Tóth, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020*

**Example 4** (target, implementation, justification, representation)

The need to reduce emissions (target) is indisputable. As is, for example, the move away from coal to RES (Renewable Energy Sources) (implementation\_1). The "New Green Deal" must propose a new fund for a just transition (implementation\_2) - one that will not affect thousands of miners in Poland (representation\_1 miners), and that will allow post-mining regions (implementation\_2 regions) to fairly maintain their cultural identity (justifications\_1\_2: fairness, cultural identity).” *Robert Biedroń, Green Deal Debate 11.12.2019*

#### 4. Coding scheme and instructions

##### **Speaker variables**

Coded in a separate Excel sheet formatted to correspond to MEP names and document (debate titles) in MAXQDA to allow for automatic identification of 'focus group speakers' and the merger of these speaker variables to the coded material.

Data was mainly retrieved from individual MEP websites on EP website:

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/home>

Example: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/97058/GUY\\_VERHOFSTADT/history/9#detailedcardmep](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/97058/GUY_VERHOFSTADT/history/9#detailedcardmep)

**MEP name** (automatically from debate transcript)

**EPG affiliation** at the time of speech, enter abbreviation:

Left Group (GUE/NGL)

Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats (S&D)

Group of the Greens/European Free Alliance (Greens/EFA)

Renew Europe Group (Renew)

Group of the European People's Party (EPP)

European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR)

Identity and Democracy Group (ID)

Not affiliated (NI)

**Nationality:** country abbreviation, e.g. AT, SW, HU etc.

Binary variable: CEE 1 (Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia), rest 0

---

In total, 134 MEPs gave 152 speeches in two plenary debates, 48 speeches were from CEE MEPs, 104 from Western European MEPs. Speeches GUE/NGL 9; S&D 35; Greens/EFA 17; Renew 23; EPP 33; ECR 15; ID 13; NI 7

---

## Content variables (measuring climate policy ambitions)

Only the subcodes were added in MAXQDA (frequencies automatically added to parent code)

### 0\_type of ambition

0\_ambition\0\_type\0\_mitigation: human action to fight climate change

0\_ambition\0\_type\0\_adaptation: human action to live with / become resilient to climate change and its effects

Added inductively in the coding process:

0\_ambition\0\_type\0\_general ambition: generic calls to actions / calls to be ambitious (often unclear whether mitigation and / or adaptation)

0\_ambition\0\_type\0\_environment ambition: human action related to protecting nature, biodiversity, stop pollution and resource depletion

**Note** that MEPs can also simultaneously talk about different ambitions that is for example link adaptation and mitigation or mitigation and environmental ambitions.

### Examples

Mitigation and environmental ambition:

“The European Parliament has, alongside several countries, local authorities and scientists, declared that our planet is facing a climate and environment emergency. To avoid accelerated and irreversible climate change and a massive decline in biodiversity, global greenhouse gas emissions need to be rapidly reduced” *Rovana Plumb, Climate Law Debate, 06.10.2020.*

“Agriculture, the environment and the climate are mutually dependent, not mutually opposed. That is why we must have concrete solutions on the table” *Asger Christensen, Climate Law Debate, 06.10.2020.*

“Madam President, climate change and environmental degradation pose a serious threat to Europe and the world. That is why it is important to be ambitious and make Europe the world's first climate-neutral continent” *Edina Tóth, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020.*

Adaptation ambition:

“One last word: adaptation to climate change is fundamental, all European territories are concerned, farmers who live with droughts, people who live with floods, rising waters on the coasts, this European law is still too weak on adaptation, that is why we have tabled an amendment, to stop spending European money if we do not test the capacity of the major projects we finance to adapt, to be resilient to climate change. I hope that all of us in this Chamber will be able to support this amendment tomorrow, which is absolutely fundamental, both for the climate, for the territories and for the proper use of public money” *Pascal Canfin, Climate Law Debate 06.10.2020.*

Adaptation and mitigation in farming:

“Farmers are the first to feel the impact of climate change. Yet bear in mind the pressure on their shoulders by the rigorous standards of the future CAP, the budget cuts, the unfair competition triggered by the Mercosur trade agreement and the international trade disputes countermeasures. It is, thus, fundamental to design policies that accompany our farmers towards this transition, instead of putting even more pressure on them.” *Carmen Avram, Green Deal Debate, 11.12.2019.*

Mitigation and environmental ambition in forestry:

“Forestry also plays a crucial role in addressing climate change. It has significant potential to reduce emissions, sequester carbon and boost economies in a sustainable manner. With over 40% of the EU's land area covered by forests, it is clear that the European Green Deal must include an updated post-2020 EU Forest Strategy, to put the legislation in line with renewed climate and biodiversity ambitions. However, as the Commission knows, each Member States has its specificities. During the last plenary debate on the protection of forests, Romanian illegal logging was discussed. I call on the Commission to explain all the concrete initiatives which might be taken in order to protect Romanian forests and its biodiversity” *Carmen Avram, Green Deal Debate, 11.12.2019.*

## 1\_target

### 1\_target\1\_position

- 1\_target\1\_position\1\_neutral, none
- 1\_target\1\_position\1\_pro, positive
- 1\_target\1\_position\1\_con, negative
- 1\_target\1\_position\1\_ambivalent

### 1\_target\1\_time

- 1\_target\1\_time\1\_long\_term
- 1\_target\1\_time\1\_short\_term
- 1\_target\1\_time\1\_no\_term

### 1\_target\1\_quantifiable

- 1\_target\1\_quantifiable\1\_non-quantifiable
- 1\_target\1\_quantifiable\1\_quantifiable

### 1\_target\1\_sector

#### 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_secondary sector

- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_secondary sector\1\_consumer goods
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_secondary sector\1\_construction
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_secondary sector\1\_transportation
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_secondary sector\1\_manufacturing

#### 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector

- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_primary energy sources
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_fishing
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_forestry
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_farming & livestock
- 1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_mining

#### 1\_target\1\_non-sector

- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_negative emissions
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_stop\_resource depletion
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_stop nature pollution
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_protect biodiversity
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_circular economy
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_green growth
- 1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_limit global warming at 1.5

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2050\_climate / carbon neutrality

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_ghg emissions reduction

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2040 interim target

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_40%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_60%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_not\_specified

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_55%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_70%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_65%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target\1\_50%

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_end fossil economy

## 2\_scope

2\_scope\2\_target groups

2\_scope\2\_target groups\2\_supply side (business, companies)

2\_scope\2\_target groups\2\_demand side (consumers, citizens)

2\_scope\2\_energy sources

2\_scope\2\_energy sources\3\_nuclear

2\_scope\2\_energy sources\2\_fossil energy (coal, oil, gas)

2\_scope\2\_energy sources\2\_renewables (wind, solar, hydro, biomass, heat & power)

## 3\_implementation

3\_implementation\3\_position

3\_implementation\3\_position\3\_neutral, none

3\_implementation\3\_position\3\_pro, positive

3\_implementation\3\_position\3\_con, negative

3\_implementation\3\_position\3\_ambivalent

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_industrial policy

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_common fisheries policy

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_common agricultural policy

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_trade policy

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_energy policy / Energy Union

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_environmental policy

- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_EU foreign policy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_financial policy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_cohesion policy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_infrastructure & transportation policy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_technology & innovation policy

### 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_directives\_strategies

- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_Methane Strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_Biodiversity Strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU Mobility Strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_Renewable Energy Directive
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU rules on air quality
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_circular economy action plan
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_50 steps to 2050 / 2050 long-term strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_reducing administrative burden
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU digital strategy / digitalization
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU chemicals strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU farm to fork strategy / food safety
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU industrial strategy
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_strategies\3\_EU forest strategy / deforestation

### 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms

- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_carbon compensation / offsetting
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_carbon tariff, quota
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_Horizon Europe
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_preventing carbon leakage
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_deregulation
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_Emissions Trading System, ETS
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_ghg emissions budget
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_subsidies
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_bans (e.g., plastic straws)
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_taxes (plastic, carbon)
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_carbon capture, storage, sinks
- 3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_border adjustment mechanism



3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_Just Transition Fund  
3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_Com\_impact assessment  
3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_technological neutrality

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_other

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_other\3\_measures to reach UN 2030 Agenda /  
SDGs  
3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_other\3\_SGP  
3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_other\3\_MFF, EU budget  
3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_other\3\_European Semester

3\_implementation\3\_sanctioning

3\_implementation\3\_procedure

3\_implementation\3\_policy integration

3\_implementation\3\_budget, investment

3\_implementation\3\_mainstreaming

#### 4\_monitoring

4\_monitoring\4\_scientific body w/ own resources  
4\_monitoring\4 Updating  
4\_monitoring\4\_evaluating  
4\_monitoring\4\_reporting

#### 5\_stakeholder Involvement

5\_stakeholder Involvement\5\_citizens  
5\_stakeholder Involvement\5\_civil society & interest groups  
5\_stakeholder Involvement\5\_scientists

## 6\_representation

Code references to sectoral, functional, territorial, social groups/interests (speaking for / about benefits and costs of ambition for them, their needs, problems, burdens, interests)

6\_representation\protesters  
6\_representation\next generation, youth, children  
6\_representation\citizens  
6\_representation\business, companies, industry  
6\_representation\vulnerable, marginalized, poor  
6\_representation\farmers, foresters, fishers  
6\_representation\member states  
6\_representation\workers  
6\_representation\families  
6\_representation\miners  
6\_representation\regions  
6\_representation\consumers  
6\_representation\small producers, SMEs

## 7\_justification

Justification of (not) doing / supporting a policy ambition. Actors can use the same frame to argue for or against an ambition. For example, an actor justifying a measure as socially just or criticizing it precisely because it is not socially just. Similarly, an actor can argue for EU leadership on climate policy ambitions, but also against it because other regions of the world are not contributing as much. In both cases social justice / leadership is the frame to be coded. The position is captured in 1\_target and / or 3\_implementation.

7\_justification\health

*Policy ambition (PA) framed with reference to consequences of climate change on health of citizens and health systems (e.g., air and plastic pollution)*

7\_justification\consistency & coherence

*PA framed with reference to being consistent with existing laws and coherent in terms of fitting into existing policies, including continuity and predictability of policy instrument (e.g., often used by those critical to argue against too rapid change / for planning certainty)*

7\_justification\urgency

*PA framed as (not) necessary because of emergency (not) requiring swift action (often used by proponents of swift actions, e.g., the planet is on fire, we have to act now and we have to be ambitious)*

7\_justification\adequacy

*PA framed as (not) adequate to fight / live with climate change, proportionality (often used by proponents of ambitious action calling for action adequate to the severe challenge)*

7\_justification\inclusiveness & accessibility

*PA framed as (not) taking everyone on board in the entire climate change transition process (specific stakeholders, but also general calls to leave no one behind)*

#### 7\_justification\intergenerational justice

*PA framed as (not) moral obligation towards future generations, youth, children; also reconciling interests of future and current generations*

#### 7\_justification\fairness

*PA framed as (not) fair with regard to distribution of costs and contributions (everyone has to contribute their fair share, we need a fair transition that takes into account where everyone started from)*

#### 7\_justification\solidarity

*PA framed as (not) shared interest and objectives creating a sense of unity and support, willingness to help (can be with social groups, but also among member states)*

#### 7\_justification\social justice

*PA framed as (not) just in terms of distribution of wealth, opportunities and privileges in a society; protection of most vulnerable groups in society; social equality / equity*

#### 7\_justification\competitiveness

*PA framed referring to (lack of) economic competitiveness mostly compared to non-EU countries, also maintaining exports*

#### 7\_justification\prosperity

*PA framed referring to country's / EU's wealth, economic growth, stable employment*

#### 7\_justification\leadership

*EU as a leader in climate policy ambitions, pioneer, example to follow (in terms of climate targets, but also with regard to technological innovation in response to climate change)*

#### 7\_justification\credibility

*PA framed with reference to (not) being trusted as both an international partner, but also vis-à-vis domestic stakeholders; credible commitment to policy ambitions*

#### 7\_justification\responsibility

*PA framed with reference to (lack of) obligation for someone or something, e.g. responsible for fighting climate change; often also in connection to being responsible with regard to international partners and commitments (can be linked to credibility, code two codes)*

#### 7\_justification\feasibility

*PA framed with reference to degree to which ambitions are possible. May include economic, institutional, social or technological feasibility constraints.*

#### 7\_justification\transparency

*PA framed with reference to a (lack of) publicly open process (policy process and implementation process)*

#### 7\_justification\accountability

*PA framed with reference to (lack of) answerability to various principals.*

#### 7\_justification\sovereignty

*PA framed with reference to member state sovereignty (e.g., EU encroaching upon that sovereignty)*

#### 7\_justification\cultural identity

*PA framed with reference to harming or helping cultural identity of a particular group, country*

#### 7\_justification\negotiation tactics

*PA framed with reference to ambition being part of bargaining strategy, inter-institutional power play and negotiation tactics*

## 5. European Parliament debates on climate policy ambitions

The following debates were coded by two coders (also check main article for justification of this sample):

**Table A.1.1.** Coded EP debates.

Debate Title	Date	URL
7. The European Green Deal (debate)	11/12/2019	<a href="https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-9-2019-12-11-ITM-007_EN.html">https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-9-2019-12-11-ITM-007_EN.html</a>
European Climate Law	06/10/2020	<a href="https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-9-2020-10-06-ITM-011_EN.html">https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-9-2020-10-06-ITM-011_EN.html</a>

Debates were accessed in HTML format via the EP debate search engine using information on the date, title and type of debate: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu>

Non-English debate contributions translated using DeepL (<https://www.deepl.com/en/translator>) (Google Translate for Croatian, Gaelic)

As a result of the debate on 11 December 2019, the EP adopted a **resolution**<sup>2</sup> on 15 January 2020 that, among other things, called for climate neutrality by 2050 (legally binding, EU-wide, national targets), a 2030 target of 55% on ghg emission reduction (and an interim target for 2040), Commission impact assessment prior to climate law (also for the following, see Erbach 2021).

The EP **negotiation position**<sup>3</sup> adopted on 6 October 2020 contained a 60% EU-wide 2030 target, 2050 climate neutrality (EU-wide and MS-level), negative emissions after 2050, and a call for a 2040 target.

The **agreement** between Council and EP of 21 April 2021 included a 55% ghg reduction target by 2030 (EU-wide), 2050 climate neutrality (EU-wide), creation of a European Climate Change Council (ECCC). Parliament approved this on 24 June 2021.

---

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0005\\_EN.html](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0005_EN.html)

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0253\\_EN.html](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0253_EN.html)

## A.2 Climate Policy Ambitions: Most frequent targets and Implementation measures

### 1\_target

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2050\_climate / carbon neutrality: **93**

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_2030 target (40, 50, 55, 60, 65, 70%, % not specified): **87**

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_ghg emissions reduction: **45**

1\_target\1\_sector\1\_primary sector\1\_primary energy sources: **36**

1\_target\1\_non-sector\1\_end fossil economy: **29**

### 3\_implementation

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_energy policy / Energy Union: **44**

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_technology & innovation policy: **43**

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_Just Transition Fund: **21**

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_infrastructure & transportation policy: **20**

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_policy fields\3\_trade policy: **20**

3\_implementation\3\_implementation type\3\_mechanisms\3\_taxes (plastic, carbon): **20**

### A.3 Representative Claims and Justification Frames of Climate Policy Ambitions

Absolute and relative frequencies behind code cloud in *Figure 2*, main article.

#### *Representative Claims*

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
citizens	98	24.7
member states	58	14.6
business, companies, industry	57	14.4
next generation, youth, children	35	8.8
regions	33	8.3
workers	27	6.8
vulnerable, marginalized, poor	26	6.6
farmers, foresters, fishers	25	6.3
protesters	13	3.3
families	9	2.3
miners	6	1.5
consumers	5	1.3
small producers, SMEs	4	1.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>100</b>

*Justification Frames*

	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
urgency	101	14.0
social justice	66	9.1
competitiveness	62	8.6
leadership	61	8.4
adequacy	59	8.2
feasibility	49	6.8
prosperity	45	6.2
fairness	44	6.1
responsibility	42	5.8
solidarity	33	4.6
credibility	30	4.1
inclusiveness & accessibility	26	3.6
intergenerational justice	24	3.3
consistency & coherence	22	3.0
sovereignty	20	2.8
health	17	2.4
cultural identity	7	1.0
transparency	5	.7
accountability	5	.7
negotiation tactics	5	.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>100</b>

Notes: Norm-based, resource-based, cultural justifications (similar Wendler 2016)

#### A.4 Justification Frames by EPG and Representative Claims Western Europe and CEE

**Table A.4.1** Justifications by EPG (in %).

	GUE/NGL	S&D	Greens/EFA	Renew	EPP	ECR	ID	NI
urgency	17	17	31	10	9	2	4	23
social justice	20	13	8	4	7	9	7	8
competitiveness	2	2	2	6	17	6	27	
leadership	2	9	2	14	15	5	4	3
adequacy	15	8	16	8	4	2		23
feasibility		2		6	11	23	9	5
prosperity	2	3	5	8	7	14	9	5
fairness	4	10	1	4	5	5	13	3
responsibility	9	7	8	8	5	3	2	5
solidarity	7	6	7	3	3	3		10
credibility	13	7	3	5	2	3		
inclusiveness & accessibility	2	6	1	4	6	2		
intergenerational justice		7	3	4	4			
consistency & coherence	4	2	2	4	4	6	2	
sovereignty				4	1	11	16	
health	2	1	8	3	1	2		8
cultural identity		1	1		0		7	
transparency		1		3	0	2		3
accountability		1			0	5		3
negotiation tactics				5	1			
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
N frames	46	183	87	79	168	65	55	40
(speeches)	(9)	(35)	(17)	(23)	(33)	(15)	(13)	(7)

Notes: Norm-based, resource-based, cultural justifications (similar Wendler 2016)



**Table A.4.2** Representative claims CEE and Western Europe (in 5)

	<b>CEE</b>	<b>Western Europe</b>
citizens	24	25
member states	26	9
business, companies, industry	8	18
next generation, youth, children	6	10
regions	10	7
workers	5	8
vulnerable, marginalized, poor	4	8
farmers, foresters, fishers	6	7
protesters	2	4
families	2	2
miners	3	.8
consumers	3	.4
small producers, SMEs	.7	1
Total	100	100
N claims	135	261
(speeches)	(48)	(103)

## A.5 Reliability Test Results

Unitising Reliability (statement identification)

	Decisions	Same	Deviant	% Agreement	Correlation
<b>MEP1</b>	4	4	0		
<b>MEP2</b>	8	7	1		
<b>MEP3</b>	12	11	1		
<b>Total</b>	24	22	2	<b>91.7</b>	<b>0.96</b>

Coding Reliability (for manually coded variables used in the article)

	Holsti	Corr	KALPHA	Comment
EPG	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
CEE	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Ambition_type	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Target_position	95.8	0.98	0.887	12, cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis
Target_quant	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Target_time	95.8	0.98	0.88	12, cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis
Target_sector	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Target_non_sector	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Implement_pos	95.8	0.98	0.846	12, cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis
Implement_type	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Rep_1	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Rep_2	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis
Justi_1	95.8	0.98	0.886	12, cases, 24 decisions, 1 dis
Justi_2	1	1	1	12 cases, 24 decisions, 0 dis

Results exceed accepted standards (Krippendorff, 2013; Lombard 2002).

Krippendorff, K. (2013). Content Analysis. An Introduction to its Methodology. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publishing.

Lombard, M., Snyder-Duch, K., & Bracken. C.C. (2002). Content Analysis in Mass Communication Assessment and Reporting of Intercoder Reliability. *Human Communication Research* 28(4): 587–604.