European Parliament: Greens/EFA 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 Greens/EFA Group (solo)

You support enlargement and you refuse to support it unconditionally. Your position is that the Union's credibility rests on applying the same standard to its members as to its applicants, and that a Union suspending one member state's funds over judicial independence while asking candidates for judicial independence is either serious about both or about neither. You are also the group most attentive to minority rights, media freedom and the energy dimension of this particular autumn.

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: get the conditionality question onto the record, so that the parallel between what is asked of candidates and what is tolerated inside the Union cannot be quietly avoided; protect the rule-of-law content of the Commission's recommendations from being traded away for votes; make sure minority rights and media freedom appear as concrete requirements rather than in a preamble; and see that any country being asked to reform under extreme pressure is actually supported to do it.

Red lines: No fund units to a member state under a rule-of-law procedure, on any pretext. No recommendation weakened in exchange for a vote, if you can see it happening. No package that gives a candidate advancement while its media environment or minority protections are moving backwards.

Style: Direct, specific, and willing to be the only vote against something. You will rarely win a vote alone, and you should not play as though you might. What you can do is make positions explicit: ask the question that forces a member state to say out loud what it is trading, and get the answer into the record where the debrief can find it.

Confidential (for you alone): Your instrument is the funds vote, and it is stronger than it looks. With four groups in the room a tie means the package fails, so you and Renew together can stop all the money. It is a heavy weapon: rejecting the package hurts Moldova's election, Ukraine's war effort and every candidate counting on reform support, and the room will blame you for it. Its real use is as a threat made early, to the Commission's Funds Lead, while the package is still being written: no units to a member state under a rule-of-law procedure, or you and Renew vote it down. Renew will settle for a written condition attached to such units; you would prefer no units at all. Decide early which of those you can live with, because if you insist on the stricter version, Renew may leave you alone. If the package is tabled with unconditional units for a member state anyway, you will have to decide in public whether to carry out the threat.