Ukraine: Government Representative

The Pirate Academy was made possible by the Greens/EFA group in the European Parliament.

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

The candidates in this scenario. Eight countries sit at this table without a vote: Ukraine, Moldova, Serbia, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Albania, Kosovo, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In reality you would not be in the room when the Union decides about you. Here you are, because you hold the one thing the Union cannot obtain any other way: a commitment to reform that somebody actually intends to carry out. At the end of the conference the Commission tables a recommendation for you in each of four areas, each costing you reform capacity. Each recommendation you accept raises that score by the same number after the session, up to 5, provided your government survives. Before you answer, the Council and the Parliament vote on the funds package, so you will know what support you have: reform support expands your capacity, at a rising cost (1 unit for the first extra point, 2 for the second, 3 for the third). You may accept more than your capacity, but every point over it raises the chance that your government falls and nothing is delivered: 25, 50, 75 and 90 per cent for one, two, three and four or more points over. You may accept or decline each recommendation, you may bargain about them beforehand, and you may **leave the process**, which freezes your line where it is and is a real option that has been taken before. Your scores are public and in the factsheet. **Your reform capacity is yours alone**, unless the Commission spends one of its two detailed reviews on you or you choose to tell somebody. The Council may also attach a one-sentence note to its decision on you, proposed by a member state and entered unless another objects: that is where conditions and promises about you get written down. Side agreements with anyone, including the other candidates, are allowed; they should be written down with the clear support of everyone in them, and they are published only after the scenario.

Your delegation: Ukraine (two representatives)

Ukraine applied for membership four days after the invasion and received candidate status in June. Tonight you are asking for the next step: a commitment that accession negotiations will open, and that the path is irreversible. Your institutions are under wartime strain, your economy depends on Western support, and the influence of large private interests over politics and the economy remains a serious problem that your own government acknowledges.

Your delegation has two people and should use that: one of you carries the political and moral argument, the other the technical question of what can actually be delivered while the country is at war. You will not always agree, and you should settle your differences privately rather than in plenary.

Your scores (public, as in Annex A of the factsheet). Rule of Law 3, Corruption 2, Democracy 3, Economy 2. **Your reform capacity (do not publish):** 1. The war absorbs almost everything your administration has. Anything beyond one point has to be paid for with reform support (1, 3, 6 or 10 units in total for one to four extra points) or carried at a risk. **The war effort** also needs **3 fund units of stabilisation**. Without them your Economy score drops by 1 after the session and the next year at the front goes badly. If you over-reform and your government falls, it falls in the middle of a war: nothing is delivered, your Economy score drops by 1, and the front suffers a major setback.

Decision rule: your two representatives decide together. If you cannot agree, Ukraine says nothing, which is the worst available outcome.

Your role

Motivations and constraints: You are the political voice of the delegation. Your aims: a clear statement that Ukraine's path is irreversible and that negotiations will open, with a date if you can get one; funds that reach Ukraine rather than being spread evenly for the sake of appearances, because Ukraine needs more money than anyone at this table: 3 units for the war effort and, for any serious reform sheet, several more for reform support; and the maintenance of solidarity from both the Commission and the Parliament without losing the Western Balkans, whose resentment you can feel and whose argument you privately understand. You should be working on Poland, who is with you already, and then on the states that are not: France, the Netherlands, Germany, and Hungary, who has a grievance about the Hungarian minority in western Ukraine that will not go away by being ignored.

Red lines: No suggestion that the process pauses until the war ends. No ranking of Ukraine behind countries whose reform records are better but whose situation is not comparable. No advancement for Serbia while it refuses to align with sanctions, because a Serbia deepening its European relationship while keeping its Russian one open is a route around the measures your country depends on.

Style: Serious, unsentimental, and sparing with the moral argument. Everyone in the room already knows what is happening to your country; repeating it turns your strongest card into background noise. What persuades a sceptical member state is specificity: what reform you will do, by when, and what you need to do it. Save the emotional register for one moment and choose it well.

Confidential (for you alone): You know something your technical colleague will resist. Accepting no reforms at all tonight is politically impossible: a Ukraine that declines everything hands every sceptic in the Council a reason to stall, and the reason will be reported at home as a failure of your delegation. You are therefore authorised to accept reforms beyond your capacity, with the risk that carries, if that is what it takes to get negotiations opened, and you should not tell your colleague that until you have to. Your other private assessment: the greatest threat to Ukraine tonight is not a veto but an even-handed package, in which everyone receives something and nobody receives enough, because it would let the Council describe a stalemate as balance. If you have to choose between Ukraine advancing alone and a package where all eight advance slightly, take the first.