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All bills presented in the parliamentary year 2009/2010. 224 bills in total. The entrance is www.ft.dk. Go to Gå til ”Dokumenter” 🡪 ”Vis efter dokumenttype: Lovforslag” 🡪 ”Samling: 2009-10” 🡪 ”Ministerområde: Alle” 🡪 ”Fremsat af: Alle” 🡪 ”Status: Alle”. Click the individual bill 🡪 ”Baggrundsmateriale” 🡪 ”Høringsnotat”. A few bills has no “baggrundsmateriale” because there has been no consultation (eg L1, Financial bill). For use in the coding of V L15 and V L16 use "Lovforslag som fremsat". The relevant information is found in the comments on the bill.

Coding takes place in two different files: (1) A file for the proposal and (2) a file for the nationwide groups that replies to the hearing. For the two files to communicate, it is crucial that the Proposal ID from the first file match the correct responses in the second file.

Initially coding on paper: A sheet filled out for each law, and a sheet for each group – eventually with several groups on each sheet.

**I. Proposal File**  
**V 0. Bill ID**  
Code ID: the number the proposal was given at presentation to parliament.

**V L0A. Number of concultations**

0. No consultation

1. One consultation

2. Two consultations, round 1

3. Two consultations, round 2

4. Two consultations, round 1

5. Two consultations, round 1

6. Two consultations, round 1

**V L1. Parliamentary session**  
Coded with eight digits. For 2009/10 the following: 20092010   
  
**V L2. Proposal name**

To be coded alphanumeric. Enter the first 150 characters of the name.   
  
**V L3. Resubmission?**  
1. yes   
2. no   
  
**V L4. Presenting minister**

01. Minister for Employment   
02. Minister of Finance

03. Minister of Defence

04. Interior and Health Minister   
05. Minister of Justice   
06. Church Minister   
07. Climate and Energy Minister   
08. Minister of Culture   
09. Minister of the Environment   
10. Minister of Integration   
11. Food and agriculture minister   
12. Science Minister

13. Minister of Taxation   
14. Minister of Social Affairs   
15. Prime Minister   
16. Minister of Transport   
17. Foreign Minister   
18. Development Minister   
19. Minister of Education   
20. Minister of Economics and Business Affairs   
21. Private Bill   
  
**V L5. Proposal fate**  
1. Adopted   
2. Rejected (ie voted down in parliament)   
3. Lapsed (because not processed before the end of the FT-years, an election, etc.).   
4. Withdrawn   
  
**V L6. Consultation time**  
Three digits   
  
Number of days from invitation to deadline for response

**V L7. Number of actors invited to consultation**  
Three digits   
  
May be found at [www.hoeringsportalen.dk](http://www.hoeringsportalen.dk)   
  
**V L8. Number of invited interest groups (including local groups, community organizations, etc.).**  
Three digits   
  
May be found at [www.hoeringsportalen.dk](http://www.hoeringsportalen.dk)

**V L9. Number of invited nationwide interest groups**  
Three digits   
  
May be found at [www.hoeringsportalen.dk](http://www.hoeringsportalen.dk)

**V L10. Number of responses, total**   
  
Three digits   
  
Count everyone who has submitted a response   
  
**V L11. Number of substantive responses in total**  
Three digits   
  
Count everyone who has submitted a response which contains more that is more than a “thank you for the inquiry and we do not have any comments”. A substantive response is also when an actor just “support” the proposal.

**V L12. Number of responses from all interest groups (including local organizations and associations)**  
Three digits   
  
Count every interest group who has submitted a response   
  
**V L13. Number of responses from nationwide interest groups**  
Three digits   
  
Count every nation wide interest group who has submitted a response  
  
**V L14. Policy area**  
(Follows analysis of radio news: [www.agendasetting.dk/files/uploaded/83120071051081.pdf](http://www.agendasetting.dk/files/uploaded/83120071051081.pdf))   
  
01. Macroeconomics   
02. Personal and Civil Rights   
03. Church, religion   
04. Refugees and immigrants   
05. Health   
06. Agriculture, Fisheries and Food   
07. Labour market

08. Education   
09. Culture, sports and games   
10. Environment   
11. Energy   
12. Traffic and infrastructure   
13. Legal and justice affairs  
14. Social and family matters   
15. Housing   
16. Business and consumer issues   
17. Defence, security  
18. Research, technology, IT, telecommunications and mass media   
19. Foreign affairs and conditions in other countries   
20. EU   
21. Greenland and the Faroe Islands   
22. The public sector in general   
23. The relationship between central and local levels, including politics at regional and local levels   
24. Politics in general   
25. Monarchy   
26. Miscellaneous   
  
Some bills could be placed in several categories. Choose the main category.

**V L15. Public expenditure implications**  
Determined on the background of the ministry’s own information, check. proposal to parliament.  
  
0. The bill has no implications for public expenditures  
1. Increased costs and increased revenue, but all in all cost neutral   
2. Increases net costs or reduces net revenue  
3. Reduces net costs or increases net revenue  
  
**V L16. Adaptation to EU rules**  
Determined on the background of the ministry’s own information, check. proposal to parliament.  
  
0. No relation to the EU  
1. All or part of the bill is a consequence of adaptation to EU rules.Lyt

Læs fonetisk

**II. Answering/responding groups**

**V S0. Bill ID**

**V S00 Response ID**

**V S1. Nationwide interest group with substantial responses, name**   
  
Organization name.   
  
**V S2. Nationwide interest group with substantial answer, ID**   
  
Use codes from the main register.   
  
**V S3. The groups’ overall assessment of the proposal**  
  
1. The group overwhelmingly supports the bill (objections are negligible)   
2. The group supports the bill, but also has significant objections   
3. The group is overwhelmingly against the bill

4. The group has misunderstood the proposal, and the objections are not relevant

9. Not possible to code

This variable is difficult; a lot of examples and discussions with the coders were necessary to obtain a high reliability  
  
**V S4. Are the groups’ proposals accomodatedThe following groups proposal**  
0. The group has no proposals for amendments of the proposal   
1. The group’s proposed changes fully or almost completely followed by ministry

2. The group’s proposed changes partially followed by ministry   
3. The groups’ proposed changes rejected

This variable is difficult; a lot of examples and discussions with the coders were necessary to obtain a high reliability.