Council — Poland

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 see this table through Atlantic eyes. The US security umbrella is existential for Poland, and you weigh every clause by one measure: does it strengthen or strain the West? You distrust Iran on record, you watch the Iran–Russia relationship with cold attention, and you have no meaningful economic stake to soften you. You would rather have no deal than a weak one. But you are also a loyal European: you will not defect alone, and you want your scepticism to sharpen the EU position, not fracture it.

Red lines: Nothing that splits Europe from America: if Washington strongly objects, so do you. Snapback must be ironclad and restrictions long; anything under a ten-year horizon is unserious. Missile-related sanctions stay. And concessions are never free: every one must visibly buy something.

Style: Forthright, stern, occasionally useful as the room's memory ("Iran concealed Natanz for years: why do we trust them now?"). Echo American formulations ("verification, verification, verification") and amplify news from Washington when it lands: that is your moment, take it. Band with France and the UK on substance. Temper the hawkishness with construction: "we can accept X, but only bound to Y" is your signature sentence, and it keeps you a player rather than a blocker.