European Tech Champions Act Simulation: Role Handout

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

Council: Netherlands

Confidential: for the assigned participant only. Do not share with other participants, including members of your own institution. Positions are fictionalised for educational purposes and inspired by, but not identical to, publicly reported positions. Roles are institutional functions, never named living individuals.

The Council in this scenario

Five or six member states sit in the Council: Germany, France, Italy, Spain and Poland, plus the Netherlands if cast (the facilitator will say who is present). Each state has one vote. A text is adopted if **no more than one member state present votes against**. If the budget sheet contains any **EU borrowing for grants** or a **new own resource**, the Council has to decide **unanimously**, and abstention then counts as against. If the Commission opposes the final text, unanimity applies as well. On day 1 you build a Council mandate with the other member states; on day 2 you defend and trade it in the trilogue against the Parliament. Only member states present can declare loans, pledge voluntary national contributions or redirect their cohesion and Recovery money. The rules in full are in the general factsheet.

Your position in October 2025

The Netherlands is home to ASML, the only company in the world that makes the most advanced chipmaking machines, and to a dense high-tech ecosystem around Eindhoven. It knows better than anyone in the room what technological dependence and technological leverage mean: Dutch export controls on ASML machines have been part of the US-China technology conflict for years.

Your country is also one of the Union's traditional "frugals". It opposed NextGenerationEU grants, and it opposes any repeat: no EU borrowing for grants, no new EU taxes. It believes in

excellence, open markets and the transatlantic relationship. A “Buy European” programme that provokes the United States would hurt Dutch exporters first.

Your government is a caretaker. The coalition collapsed in June 2025 and elections are due on 29 October. You have little room to make new commitments, and every concession will be read in a campaign.

There is something else. Your government is dealing with a sensitive case involving a Chinese-owned chip company on Dutch soil. You cannot discuss it, and it may become public at any moment.

Your needs, wants and pain points

Needs (+3 each if fully met)

1. **No EU debt for grants, no EU tax (budget sheet, block B).** Fully met: both “EU borrowing for grants” and “new own resource” are zero. Partly met (+1): only one of the two is zero.
2. **Screening and supply security (Article 7).** Fully met: every acquisition of a beneficiary by a third-country buyer must be notified and screened (Article 7(3) as proposed only monitors, which does not count), and the text recognises that member states may take national security measures to protect supply, with EU coordination. Partly met (+1): one of the two.
3. **Excellence, not quotas (block C, Article 6).** Fully met: open calls get at least 70% and there is no guaranteed minimum share per member state or group of member states. Partly met (+1): one of the two.

Wants (+2 each if fully met)

1. **More excellence (block C).** Open calls get at least 80%. Partly met (+1): 75 to 79.5%.
2. **Private leverage (block A).** The co-investment target is at least three times the public envelope. Partly met (+1): at least twice.
3. **Open to trusted partners (Article 6).** Article 6 explicitly opens the programme to companies controlled from the United States and other partners with which the Union has trade and technology frameworks. Partly met (+1): Article 6(1) as proposed, which admits them only through subsidiaries established in the Union.

Pain points (-5 each if they happen)

1. **National carve-up (block C).** National or regional envelopes above 20%. Partly (-2): above 10% up to 20%.
2. **Provoking Washington (Articles 4 and 7).** A “Buy European” rule that excludes US suppliers from programme procurement. Partly (-2): a preference that does not exclude them.

Confidential (for you alone)

The Hague needs **EU political cover, not EU control**, for national security measures like the one it has quietly taken against a Chinese-owned chipmaker. Wording in Article 7 that supports member states taking such measures, with Commission coordination but without Commission powers over them, is worth more to your government than any number on the budget sheet. If the

case becomes public during the simulation, you may say as much as your government has said in public.

Who you need and who is in your way

- **No debt, no tax:** Germany is your closest ally, and ECR and the Patriots (if cast) share your line in Parliament. France, Spain, S&D and the Greens are in your way.
- **Excellence:** Germany, Renew and the Commission are allies. Italy, Poland, ECR and the Patriots (if cast) want envelopes.
- **Screening and supply security:** Germany, Poland, the EPP and Renew are allies.
- **The United States:** Poland, Renew and the EPP are allies. France is in your way.

What you can give away

The size of the public envelope, as long as it comes from loans, reprogramming or voluntary pledges you do not have to make; a climate tag; Parliament oversight; quantum and defence earmarks; a widening bonus in open calls.

If there is no deal

Your no-deal score is **+1**. No new EU spending is a result your caretaker government can present at home. You can afford to block. Others may suspect it.

Scorecard: Netherlands

For the peer scorer. Score the final text, or record the no-deal score if no act is adopted. Each item scores once, at the highest level reached.

Item	Fully met if	Partly met if	Points	Score
Need 1: no debt for grants, no tax (block B)	both lines zero	one of the two zero (+1)	+3	
Need 2: screening and supply (Art. 7)	mandatory notification and screening of acquisitions, and national security measures recognised	one of the two (+1)	+3	
Need 3: excellence (block C, Art. 6)	open calls at least 70% and no country share	one of the two (+1)	+3	
Want 1: more excellence (block C)	open calls at least 80%	75 to 79.5% (+1)	+2	
Want 2: leverage (block A)	co-investment target at least three times the envelope	at least twice (+1)	+2	
Want 3: trusted partners (Art. 6)	Art. 6 explicitly opens to US and framework partners	Art. 6(1) as proposed (+1)	+2	
Pain 1: national carve-up (block C)	envelopes above 20%	above 10% up to 20% (-2)	-5	
Pain 2: provoking Washington (Art. 4 and 7)	Buy European excludes US suppliers	a preference that does not exclude them (-2)	-5	
Total				
No-deal score			+1	