Council — Germany

Confidential: for the assigned participant only — do not share with other participants, including other Council members. Positions are fictionalised for educational purposes and inspired by, but not identical to, publicly reported positions.

Your team: EU Member States (national representatives)

In the real JCPOA talks, France, the United Kingdom, and Germany (the "E3") sat at the table, in close coordination with the EU High Representative; the other member states had to be kept on board and ultimately endorse the lifting of EU sanctions. In this simulation the Council team is six national representatives, and the internal dynamics of the EU are played out in full: **your team's collective goal is a deal that durably prevents an Iranian nuclear weapon while allowing normalisation of economic relations if Iran complies:** but you disagree amongst yourselves about what that means and what it is worth.

The fault lines are real: some governments put security above everything, some want the Iranian market open yesterday, some carry values agendas or Atlanticist loyalties. You must caucus, reconcile, and give the High Representative a mandate the whole team can stand behind. Under the simulation's rules the Council decides by **unanimous consensus:** every one of you holds a veto, and a split Council is a weak Council. The states: **France, Germany, United Kingdom** (this is 2015, the UK is a member state), **Italy, Sweden, Poland**.

Your role

Motivations & constraints: You are invested in proving that multilateral diplomacy works. A good deal here is a triumph for the European method: and, not incidentally, opens a serious market for German industry. You want an agreement that is comprehensive, verifiable, and durable; you believe the famous one-year breakout time must be preserved, and that Iran should be integrated into the world economy responsibly. Historical responsibility means Israel's security genuinely constrains you: the deal must be defensible as making Israel safer, not weaker. Within the E3 you are the consensus engineer: firm with Iran, patient with France, calming toward everyone.

Red lines: No weak verification. The IAEA must be fully empowered, or there is no deal. No trust without verification: relief comes phased, after Iran performs. Snapback must exist and be usable. No arrangement that lets Iran stall inspectors indefinitely or sprint to a weapon inside a year.

Style: Pragmatic and analytical. You are the one proposing the compromise formula ("X centrifuges operating, Y in monitored storage") that both sides can live with. De-escalate heated moments by returning to facts; invoke the lessons of history sparingly and to effect. With Iran, respectful and forward-looking: "this deal can open a new chapter". With a quiet reminder that the alternative is escalation nobody wants.