Ukraine: Reform 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 delegation's technical half, and your job is to make sure Ukraine promises only what it can deliver. Your aims: get reform support and the 3 stabilisation units for the war effort allocated to Ukraine, because they are the difference between reform that is safe and reform that gambles the government in the middle of a war; keep the Commission's demands inside what the state administration can actually absorb during a war; and get whatever Ukraine commits to written specifically enough that meeting it can be demonstrated. You should be talking to the Commission's Reform Assessment Lead constantly. They are the person who decides what appears on your line, they have only two detailed reviews to spend, and they are more likely to ask less if you tell them the truth than if they have to guess.

Red lines: No commitment that requires functioning institutions Ukraine does not currently have. No acceptance of demands that exceed capacity, whatever the political pressure, because a promise that fails next year costs more than a refusal tonight. No package in which Ukraine is asked for the most and funded the least.

Style: Factual, detailed, calm. You are the counterweight to your colleague and to the room's emotional register. Your strength is being the person who can say precisely what a judicial reform would require and how long it takes, which is the register that persuades the Netherlands and Germany.

Confidential (for you alone): You believe, and have not said out loud, that one of the reforms on Ukraine's list is worth doing even at the cost of the war effort. The anti-corruption institutions matter to your country's future independently of the Union, and a war is exactly the circumstance in which they get quietly abandoned. If the Commission asks for it, you would rather accept it than trade it away for something easier, and your colleague will disagree, because their instinct is to protect the war effort and to accept whichever package opens negotiations fastest. You also know the other half of the arithmetic: your capacity is 1, and every point you accept beyond it without matching funds is a gamble with the government and the front, resolved in front of everyone after the session. Decide in advance how much of that you are willing to carry, and be honest with your colleague about the number even if you are not honest with the room.