European Parliament: EPP Group

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 other Parliament groups. Positions are fictionalised for educational purposes and inspired by, but not identical to, publicly reported positions.

The Parliament in this scenario. Up to four political groups sit for the Parliament (the facilitator will say which are present tonight): the EPP, S&D, Renew Europe and the Greens/EFA. Each group has one vote; a majority of the groups present decides, and a tie means no. You vote twice in the Final Act. First, on the **funds package**, before the candidates answer the Commission. This vote is binding: if the Parliament rejects the package, no money moves at all, for anyone. It is your one real power tonight, and every delegation that needs money depends on it. Second, after the candidates have answered, a **signal vote** on each candidate's package: approve or not approve. At this stage of an accession process the Parliament has no formal power (its consent is needed to admit a new member state, not to advance a candidate), so the signal blocks nothing, but every capital reads it. Groups are under no obligation to coordinate, and nothing prevents them from doing so.

Your delegation: the EPP Group (solo)

You are the largest group in the Parliament and the one whose political family holds the Commission presidency. That shapes everything you do tonight: you want the process to be credible, you want the Commission to succeed, and you would like the Union to look serious rather than generous. You support Ukraine and Moldova as a matter of European security, you support the Western Balkans as a matter of European credibility, and you insist that neither should be advanced without real reform behind it.

Decision rule: one vote on the funds package and one per candidate. A majority of the groups present carries the Parliament; a tie means no.

Your role

Motivations and constraints: Your aims: keep the enlargement process merit-based and visibly so; get concrete benchmarks written into the Commission's recommendations rather than vague language; make sure Ukraine's support comes with anti-corruption conditions attached, because you will be asked at home why Union money is going to a country with those scores; and prevent the Western Balkans from concluding that the process has been abandoned. You are also the group the funds package most needs: the Commission cannot count on a majority in the Parliament without you.

Red lines: No advancement without a reform commitment behind it. No funds allocation without a stated purpose. No language that treats candidate status as a political gift, however well deserved the gesture might be.

Style: Institutional and slightly heavy. You speak for the largest group and you should sound like it: measured, unsurprised, quotable. You are at your most effective in bilateral meetings with the Commission, where you can shape the sheet before it is tabled, and least effective in public arguments with the other groups, which make the Parliament look divided and therefore ignorable.

Confidential (for you alone): Your group is not as united as you will sound. One of your national delegations wants Serbia advanced regardless of its alignment on Russia, for reasons of regional influence rather than principle, and if the package is harsh on Serbia you will be under pressure at home. More importantly, you have decided privately that you will not vote down a funds package tabled by a Commission led by your own political family unless it is truly indefensible, which means your public warnings about the money are worth less than they sound. Use them anyway: the other groups do not know this, and a warning you do not intend to carry out is still the cheapest leverage in the room. If Renew and the Greens both announce that they will vote the package down, the result depends on you and S&D, and you will have to decide in public, quickly, whether your family loyalty or your credibility as a watchdog costs you more.