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Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation is a role-play simulation involving a process of negotiating and passing an anti-terrorism legislative text for the EU. The Council of the European Union (Council of the EU) and the European Parliament will each negotiate the legislative text separately, after which a third and final negotiation on the legislative text will take place between representatives from the Council of the EU and representatives from the European Parliament in the Conciliation Committee. This third round of negotiation is conducted with facilitation/mediation assistance provided by representatives from the European Commission. This “two-house, three-step process” is laid out in Article 289 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union:

“Article 289 of the TFEU states that the ordinary legislative procedure (formerly "codecision"), as described in article 294 TFEU, consists in the joint adoption by the European Parliament (EP) and the Council of a Regulation, Directive or Decision. These two institutions are the co-legislators and are therefore the primary interlocutors during the negotiations. The Commission has the role of helping to reconcile the positions of the EP and the Council. “The three institutions have agreed, in a Joint Declaration, to "cooperate in good faith throughout the procedure with a view to reconciling their positions as far as possible and thereby clearing the way, where appropriate, for the adoption of the act concerned at an early stage of the procedure.”

The Council of the European Union is the institution representing the EU’s member states at ministerial level. Also known as the EU Council, it is where national ministers from each EU country meet to adopt laws and coordinate policies. For the purpose of this exercise, the Council of the EU meets as the Justice and Home Affairs Council. The Justice and Home Affairs Council is attended by the Justice and Home Affairs Ministers of the 28 Member states. The Council of the EU is an inter-governmental institution. The Council of the EU, together with the European Parliament, jointly form the legislative branch of the European Union and its budgetary authority. In this exercise, the Council is tasked, first, with passing a legislative text regarding anti-terrorism within the EU and afterwards, negotiating with the European Parliament to create a legislative text which, if passed, will become EU law and part of the EU acquis communautaire.


2 Joint Declaration on practical arrangements for the codecision procedure, OJ C 145/5 of 30.6.2007, Par. 4, 13, 17, 22 and 27 (reproduced in Annex III of this Guide).

3 The body of European Union law
The **European Parliament (EP)** is the directly elected parliamentary institution of the European Union (EU). Together with the Council of the EU, it forms the legislative branch of the European Union and its budgetary authority. The Parliament acts as a co-legislator, sharing with the Council of the European Union the power to adopt and amend legislative proposals and to decide on the EU’s budget. It comprises 751 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), who are elected every five years. The EP is led by its President, and functions through committees, subcommittees and delegations covering third countries. Most MEPs are part of a political group; these parties are pan-European groups acting to affect EU policy similar to the way national political parties do in each state with regards to country-level policy. For the purposes of this exercise, the MEPs will be part of the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee (LIBE) and the parties represented are: European People’s Party (EPP), Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D), European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), European Union Left- Nordic Green Left (GUE-NGL) and Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENL).  

The Conciliation Committee is the place where final negotiations on the legislative text are conducted between an equal number of representatives from the Council of the EU and from the European Parliament. In real life, the Conciliation Committee is chaired by the President of the European Parliament and a delegate from the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU. For reasons that will be elaborated on in the Instructor’s Guide, in this exercise, the Conciliation Committee will be chaired by representatives from the European Commission who will mediate/facilitate dialogue between the representatives of the two institutions.

The first part of this Instructor’s Guide includes general guidelines for conducting simulations of the proceedings of the Council of the EU, of the European Parliament, and of the Conciliation Committee. Using these guidelines, instructors can design their own simulation by choosing suitable topics and creating materials to use with their students.

The second part of this Instructor’s Guide includes full instructions for preparing, conducting, and debriefing the “Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation” Council of the EU-European Parliament-European Commission role-play simulation.

---

4 Not all the political groups in the European Parliament are included in this simulation. The political groups which have MEPs in the European Parliament may change over time. The general positions and interests of the groups listed in this role-play simulation should be usable regardless, as the ideologies represented are not expected to modify much.

Part I: General guidelines for Conducting Model Council of the EU - European Parliament-European Commission Simulations

1. Basics of the European Union
2. Suitable frameworks for Council of the EU-European Parliament-European Commission simulations
3. Choosing Topics
4. Creating Material
5. Reference Sources for Participant Preparation
6. Timeline
7. Simulation Conduct
8. Simulation Debrief
9. Post-Simulation Learning Activities

1. Basics of the European Union

The European Union (EU) was originally established as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC, Treaty of Paris, 1951), completed by the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC or Euratom) with the Treaty of Rome, 1957. The six founding states were: Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Italy, and the Federal Republic of Germany. States wishing to be considered for EU membership must be European and satisfy the Copenhagen Criteria. Additional members were added in enlargement rounds, as detailed below.\textsuperscript{7}

EU Enlargement Rounds

1973 Denmark, Ireland, and the U.K.
1981 Greece
1986 Portugal and Spain
1995 Austria, Finland, and Sweden
2004 Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia, Estonia, Cyprus, and Malta

\textsuperscript{6}Applicants must: have market economies; have democracies maintaining the highest standards for civil rights and civil liberties; and, be capable of applying EU laws and policies (the \textit{acquis}).

Currently, 28 states are members of the EU, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1. Key Information on EU Member states*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population (millions)</th>
<th>% Pop. of EU**</th>
<th>Surface Area (1000 km²)</th>
<th>Size GDP (billion€)***</th>
<th>Euro Member</th>
<th>Schengen Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>15.93</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,358</td>
<td>14,631</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Situation in autumn 2016; ** Threshold 65% - 330,811,621; ***Figures for 2015

EU Treaties

The two treaties on the basis of which the EU operates are the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). Together, the TEU and the TFEU form the legal basis for governance in the European Union. The TEU contains 55 articles and the TFEU 358.

Broadly speaking, the distinction between the two treaties is that the TEU establishes the general principles and operating structures of the European Union, whereas the TFEU deals primarily with the policies of the EU and details how policies are decided.

---

8“When not all Council of the EU members participate in the vote, for example due to an opt-out in certain policy areas, a decision is adopted if 55% of the participating Council members, representing at least 65% of the population of the participating member states, vote in favour. When the Council votes on a proposal not coming from the Commission or the high representative a decision is adopted if: a) at least 72% of Council members vote in favour; b) they represent at least 65% of the EU population (Source: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-voting-system/qualified-majority/ checked on July 17, 2017)

European Union Institutions
The EU functions through a number of institutions. Its four primary institutions which are part of its decision-making process are the European Council, the European Commission, the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament. All these are detailed in this section, and their key data is summarized in Table 2.

European Council (EUCO)

The European Council is the EU institution that defines the general political directions and priorities of the European Union. Its membership comprises the 28 heads of state or government of the EU Member states, as well as the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission. The EUCO sets policy directions across a wide range of topics, including economic growth, competitiveness, poverty and social exclusion, energy and climate policies, migration, organized crime, security and terrorism, and the EU’s role on the global stage. For the most part, EUCO decisions are reached through consensus. The President of the EUCO is one of the main representatives of the European Union (EU) on the world stage, and the person presiding over and steering the work of the EUCO. The president of the EUCO is elected for 2 ½ years, renewable once.

European Commission (EC)

The European Commission is the supra-national institution, which promotes the general interest of the Union in all matters. It is essentially the executive branch of the EU; the European Commission has 28 Commissioners (one per Member State, but acting under the authority of the President of the European Commission) who act as ministers/secretaries within a government with each assigned to a particular portfolio (e.g., Commissioner for Trade, Commissioner for Justice and Consumers, Commissioner for Migration and Citizenship). Its main initiatives are adopted in a collegial manner. The President controls the policy agenda and technically, no policy can be initiated without his/her consent. According to Article 17 of the Treaty on European Union the European Commission has several responsibilities: proposing draft legislation (it is the only EU institution that can table legislative proposals); developing medium-term strategies; drafting legislation and arbitrating in the legislative process between the Council of the EU and the European Parliament; representing the EU in trade negotiations; promulgating rules and regulations (e.g., with regards to competition policy within the EU); drawing up the budget of the European Union; and overseeing the implementation of the EU treaties mentioned above and all EU legislation (it is in charge of making sure that the EU legislation is applied in a uniform manner across the Union, and can bring Member states and companies to court if needed).

Council of the European Union

The Council of the EU is the institution representing the Member states at ministerial level. Also known informally as the EU Council, it is where national ministers from each EU country meet to adopt laws and coordinate policies (http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/).
The Council of the EU is an inter-governmental institution. The Council of the EU, together with the European Parliament (below), form the legislative branch of the European Union and its budgetary authority. The Council meets in ten configurations, with ministers from each of the 28 Member states represented on each of the councils, detailed below:

- General Affairs
- Foreign Affairs
- Economic and Financial Affairs (Ecofin)
- Justice and Home Affairs
- Employment, Social Policy, Health, and Consumer Affairs
- Competitiveness (Internal Market, Industry, and Research)
- Transport, Telecommunications, and Energy
- Agriculture and Fisheries
- Environment
- Education, Youth, and Culture

The Council of the EU negotiates, drafts, and adopts EU laws; coordinates Member state policies such as economic and fiscal policies, education, culture, youth and sport policies, and employment policy; develops the EU’s common foreign and security policy; concludes international agreements; and adopts the EU budget.

The Council of the European Union (distinct from the European Council), is the equivalent of an “upper house” of the EU legislature (with the European Parliament, discussed below, filling the role of the “lower house”). The Presidency of the Council of the European Union is responsible for the functioning of the Council. The Presidency rotates among the Member states of the EU every six months. Member states holding the presidency work together closely in groups of three, called ‘trios;’ the trio includes the current presiding country, the former presiding country, and the future presiding country. This system was introduced by the Lisbon Treaty in 2009. The trio sets long-term goals and prepares a common agenda determining the topics and major issues that will be addressed by the Council over an 18 month period. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon treaty, the rotating presidency of the Council of the EU no longer has the presidency of the European Council concomitantly, as the latter now has a permanent president nominated for 2.5 years (renewable once).

**European Parliament**

The European Parliament (EP) is the directly elected parliamentary institution of the European Union (EU). Together with the Council of the EU, it forms the legislative branch of the European Union and the budgetary authority. It comprises 751 Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), who are elected every five years. The EP is led by its President, and functions through

---

10 For a complete list of the Member states holding the rotating presidency of the Council of the EU please check here: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/presidency-council-eu/
committees, subcommittees and delegations covering third countries. Most MEPs are part of a political group. The Parliament acts as a co-legislator, sharing with the Council of the European Union the power to adopt and amend legislative proposals and to decide on the EU’s budget. It also supervises the work of the European Commission and other EU bodies, and cooperates with national parliaments of EU countries to get their input on the issues under its purview.

**Table 2. Institutions of the European Union**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
<th>Who are they?</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>28 (one per Member State, but act under the authority of the President)</td>
<td>Most are former national ministers</td>
<td>Mostly executive duties, but also including drafting legislation and overseeing policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of the EU (Council of Ministers)</td>
<td>28 (representing their Member state, with different voting rights). Most decisions are taken at qualified-majority</td>
<td>National ministers (with the support of the Member states Permanent Representatives to the EU)</td>
<td>Co-legislator, branch of the budgetary authority. Final decision-maker, in most cases with the EP, except for some areas like foreign and security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Parliament</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>Direct election (MEPs elected by country allotment)</td>
<td>Co-legislator (in most cases), branch of the budgetary authority or consultative role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Council</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Heads of state or government + European Commission and European Council Presidents.</td>
<td>Sets agenda/priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
European Court of Justice

| One appointee per member state |

Judicial court of the EU, interpreting EU legislation/case law and sanctioning infringements.


Simulations that involve the Council of the EU, the European Parliament, and the European Commission at the same time can be conducted in a wide variety of frameworks. They can be organized as class activities in undergraduate and graduate courses on such topics as European Union studies, international organizations, international relations, international security, conflict analysis and resolution, negotiation, mediation, and international law. A topic such as an EU legislative processes about anti-terrorism could also be well suited for a class on security studies or a comparative politics class focused on legislative processes in Europe. They can also be a beneficial learning activity for high-school students studying social studies or civics. Outside of course frameworks, they can be organized as competitions or as conferences, bringing together participants from a range of backgrounds or countries.


The ordinary legislative procedure (previously, co-decision)\textsuperscript{11} applies to most legislative areas of the European Union. As one main purpose of simulating the proceedings of the EU legislative process is allowing participants to experience and understand the proceedings of the Council of the EU, European Parliament, and European Commission, any issue requiring policy determination, however mundane, falling within the realm of the ordinary legislative procedure is suitable to be the topic around which to design a simulation. Of course, if an additional teaching goal is gaining in-depth understanding of any particular subject matter, that topic could be preferred. Designers can choose topics of special interest to them, or those they consider to be important to their intended participant group. Another way to approach topic-choice is to select an issue that is currently ‘hot’ in terms of media attention and public interest. This can serve to draw participants’ attention, as well as to provide them with motivation by giving them the sense that they are dealing with the weighty and crucial topics of their time.

4. Creating Material

Given that there are 751 MEPs in the European Parliament and 28 Member states in the Council of the EU, this simulation could play well with large and very large groups. For the purposes of this exercise, we suggest engaging groups of up to 84 participants, if one instructor is conducting the game on their own, to allow for oversight and monitoring of the proceedings (with a more robust training team, larger simulations can be conducted). This number incorporates the following roles (of which some can be dropped, or two students assigned to jointly play the same role together, depending on the precise number of participants):

- 56 roles for the Council of the EU (28 Member states’ ministers whose portfolio includes the topic under discussion + 28 Member states’ Ambassadors to the EU). The Presidency of the Council of the EU is held by rotation; to preserve realism, designate the participating minister of the Member states holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU in the real world, at the time of the simulation’s conduct, as the President of the Council of the EU in your simulation. A list of scheduled presidencies of the Council of the EU can be found here: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/07/26-council-rotating-presidencies-revised-order/

- 24 roles for the European Parliament - 4 MEPs for each of the following six European Parliament political groups: European People’s Party (EPP), Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D), European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), European Union Left - Nordic Green Left (GUE-NGL), and Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENL).

- 4 representatives from the European Commission, who have the role of facilitating/mediating dialogue within and between the legislative institutions (Council of the EU & European Parliament) in the Conciliation Committee.

Each player will require information allowing them to plan and act their roles as similarly as possible to how the Council of the EU, European Parliament, and European Commission members conduct themselves in the real world. Begin by providing some background information on the topic, on the events leading up to the legislative agenda focusing on this particular topic, and the scope of the legislative text negotiations. You might provide the same background information to all participants as we suggested on page 31. Next, sketch out each party’s main positions, interests and objectives, and provide it to that party as private information, for their eyes only (as we suggested from pg.41 to pg. 110). You may hint at other countries/political groups/institutions that might be aligned with their views or oppose them, or let participants figure this out on their own. Based on this information, each participant must plan

Note, that on security and defense policy, the Council meetings are chaired by the EU’s High Representative and not a minister from the rotating presidency. Thus, as instructor, always note that the topic determines the configuration of the Council, in terms of participants and chair.
their objectives, strategy, and tactics, on their own. In addition, provide participants with any maps or other documents that they will require for the simulation.

5. Reference Sources for Participant Preparation

Provide participants with other sources of information they require in order to function well in the simulation. These might include the following categories of resources:

- Sources on the structure of the EU, beyond what has been provided above;\(^{13}\)
- Sources on the role of the Council of the EU, in particular;\(^{14}\)
- Sources on the Council of the EU’s Justice and Home Affairs configuration;\(^{15}\)
- Sources on the Council of the EU procedure\(^{16}\);  
- Sources on the European Parliament\(^ {17}\)
- Sources on the Ordinary Legislative Procedure\(^ {18}\)
- Sources on the European Commission\(^ {19}\)
- Sources on the Conciliation Committee\(^ {20}\)
- Sources on EU concepts/jargon (e.g.: Schengen, Lisbon, Euro, subsidiarity etc.).\(^ {21}\)

In addition, you might also include sources on the particular subject-matter or topic to be turned into law by the Council of the EU and the European Parliament with the help of the European Commission.

\(^{13}\)For example, https://europa.eu/european-union/index_en


\(^{17}\)For example, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/aboutparliament/en/20150201PVL00002/Home


\(^{19}\)For example, https://ec.europa.eu/commission/index_en

\(^{20}\)For example, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/conciliation_committee.html

\(^{21}\)For example, http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/content/tips/words-style/jargon-alternatives_en.htm; http://en.euabc.com/
6. Time requirements

To conduct a full simulation of the proceedings of the Council of the EU-European Parliament-European Commission on a substantial topic, in the framework of an academic course, about 4 to 6 hours are required. These can be broken up over the course of several weekly sessions, as required. At the very least, this negotiation requires 2½ hours of run-time. It can be expanded to last for 1-2 days (10-14 hours of actual negotiation), such as a simulation conducted in the framework of a Model European Union conference. In addition to the aforementioned time requirements, calculate in additional time ahead of the simulation for participant preparation, and after the simulation for the process’ debrief.

7. Simulation conduct

Provide participants with their roles, and allow them adequate time to prepare. Designate a time for them to meet, in a room you have prepared for them. Announce the beginning of the simulation, and hand the floor over to the representatives of the European Commission. This negotiation has two phases: 1) separate negotiations on the legislative text within the Council of the EU and the European Parliament; 2) an assisted negotiation (mediation) in the Conciliation Committee between representatives of the Council of the EU and of the European Parliament with the assistance of the representatives from the European Commission.

The simulation ends with the representatives of the European Commission announcing an impasse or adopting an anti-terrorism legislative text. It can also end with the instructor announcing that time has run out.

8. Simulation Debrief

After the simulation is over, conduct a debriefing session, based on your learning goals.

9. Post-Simulation Learning Activities

In addition to a post-process brief, teachers can design other follow-on learning activities. These can include in-class activities, asking students to fill out reflection forms, or assigning them to write papers analyzing the exercise.
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1. Simulation Overview

Target audience: The Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation simulation-game is constructed as a teaching-tool for undergraduate and graduate courses on such topics as European Union studies, international organizations, international relations, international security, comparative politics, conflict analysis and resolution, negotiation, mediation, and international law. The simulation can be used successfully in introductory courses (e.g., Introduction to the European Union, Introduction to International Relations, Introduction to International Organizations) but it may reap higher benefits in a mid-level course targeted at 2nd or 3rd year students who have had some exposure to introductory courses on one or more topics such as European government, negotiation, international relations, or comparative politics. It can also be used to prepare, train, and test the negotiation and facilitation skills of groups of students in anticipation of their participation in Model European Union and Model United Nations conferences. This simulation can also be used for conducting a 1-2 day Model European Union conference.

Topic: The simulation focuses on the European Union legislative process with an emphasis on anti-terrorism legislation, but it can serve as a model for developing simulations on other policy areas for which ordinary legislative procedure is applied. (see Part I, above).

Simulation method: The simulation is set in a scenario that is primarily fictitious – yet still blends in and incorporates real events, history and detail, forming a “pseudo-reality”: a situation familiar and compelling enough to spark interest, motivation and identification, yet controlled and constrained through incorporating fictitious elements to allow for maximum learning and skill-building.

Simulation synopsis: The simulation comprises of two concurrent negotiation processes (separate negotiations within the Council of the EU and the European Parliament) and one mediation (assisted negotiation) process between representatives from the Council of the EU and the European Parliament in the Conciliation Committee. In more detail, these three processes involve:

- A multi-party negotiation at a meeting of the Council of the EU (Justice and Home Affairs) on a legislative text for an anti-terrorism EU law. This meeting is attended by the 28 ministers of interior, assisted by the 28 Member State ambassadors to the EU. The discussions in these negotiations are facilitated by the Minister of Interior of the Member
state holding the rotating presidency of the Council of the EU, in presence of the European Commissioner (assisted by a director general) who expresses the view of his/her institution. The European Commission, represented by the Commissioner for Home Affairs and the director general, tables and presents the draft legislation at the beginning of the meeting. Preparing the draft legislation should be a preliminary, preparatory assignment for the European Commission representatives, before the beginning of the simulation. The Commissioner and the director general then remain in the Council meeting, helping the chair of the meeting. Later on, in the Conciliation Committee, the European Commission representatives intervene as "honest brokers" to reach a compromise between the Council and the European Parliament. For this exercise, there are 30 parties participating in the negotiation (28 EU member states, plus the 2 representatives from the European Commission). All parties receive private information describing their separate interests and positions. The ministers and ambassadors representing a EU member state receive the exact same information. In deciding the legislative text in the Council of the EU, it is up to participants to decide whether they wish to act in a competitive manner - or if they prefer to use collaborative approaches seeking win-win, integrative solutions for overall benefit to the European Union.

- A multi-party negotiation in the European Parliament (Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee - LIBE) on a legislative text for an anti-terrorism EU law. In this negotiation four MEPs from each of the following six parties will participate: European People’s Party (EPP), Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D), European Conservatives and Reformists (ECR), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), European Union Left- Nordic Green Left (GUE-NGL) and Europe of Nations and Freedom (ENL). In addition to these 24 MEPs, the negotiation involves the European Commission. Represented by the Commissioner and the director general, the

22 To preserve realism, designate the participating minister of the Member state holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU in the real world, at the time of the simulation’s conduct, as the President of the Council of the EU in your simulation. A list of scheduled presidencies of the Council of the EU can be found here: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2016/07/26-council-rotating-presidencies-revised-order/. In reality, the Presidency is also assisted by the Secretary General of the Council (EU civil servants), but that role is not included in this simulation.

23 The exact same legislative draft text is introduced in both the Council of the EU and the European Parliament.

24 While you could assign highly knowledgeable students in these roles to prepare draft legislation of their own before the meeting, you should consider assigning them to review an existing proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating terrorism and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism (COM(2015)0625 – C8-0386/2015 – 2015/0281(COD)) (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52015PC0625&from=EN); this proposal contains EU draft legislation regarding counter-terrorism measures. The European Commission representatives can select several of the articles from the proposal (pages 24-36 of the document), alter them if they wish, and submit them in the meetings as the draft to be discussed. We recommend against submitting the full proposal included in the document as the draft for discussion in the meetings, as it is too extensive and to detailed to be developed and formed in the limited course of the simulation; still, if there is little time to prepare ahead, using the full text is an option.
Commission tables and presents the draft legislation\(^{25}\) at the beginning of the meeting. Preparing the draft legislation should be a preliminary, preparatory assignment for the European Commission representatives, before the beginning of the simulation.\(^{26}\) The Commissioner and director general will then facilitate the discussions in the committee.

- A mediation/assisted negotiation ("trilogue") in the Conciliation Committee between 6 representatives of the Council of the EU (in this simulation, the Minister of Interior from the Member state holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU helped by five other representatives chosen by the members of the Council of the EU) and 6 representatives of the European Parliament (rapporteurs and shadow rapporteurs designated by the LIBE committee). This mediation is conducted by 2 teams of 2 representatives of the European Commission. These 2 teams will rotate as needed in order to give all the mediators the chance to use their skills.

**Participants:**
The recommended number of participants for this simulation is 84: Council of the EU (28 Member states * 2 – Minister of Interior & Member state Ambassador to the EU = 56) + European Parliament (6 parties * 4 MEPs/party = 24) + Commission (4 representatives) = 84 participants. However, the simulation can be played well with as few as 13 roles (6 Council Member states; 6 European Parliament parties, plus one representative for the Commission). See Section 3(a) Game Variations, below.

*Learning goals:* Through taking part in this simulation, participants will:

- Deepen their understanding of the European Union and its legislative process
- Understand the dynamics of negotiation and alliance-building within the Council of the European Union;
- Understand the dynamics of negotiation and alliance-building between political groups within the European Parliament;

\(^{25}\) The exact same legislative draft text is introduced in both the Council of the EU and the European Parliament.

\(^{26}\) While you could assign highly knowledgeable students in these roles to prepare draft legislation of their own before the meeting, you should consider assigning them to review an existing proposal for a directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on combating terrorism and replacing Council Framework Decision 2002/475/JHA on combating terrorism (COM(2015)0625 – C8-0386/2015 – 2015/0281(COD)) (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52015PC0625&from=EN); this proposal contains EU draft legislation regarding counter-terrorism measures. The European Commission representatives can select several of the articles from the proposal (pages 24-36 of the document), alter them if they wish, and submit them in the meetings as the draft to be discussed. We recommend against submitting the full proposal included in the document as the draft for discussion in the meetings, as it is too extensive and to detailed to be developed and formed in the limited course of the simulation.
Experience the pathways to deciding the legislative text between the legislative institutions of the European Union

Apply negotiation skills in a multi-party setting; and

Apply mediation skills in a multi-party setting.

Roles - structure and balance: The roles given to the representatives of the Member states in the Council of the EU, and the MEPs in the European Parliament, represent as accurately as possible the views of their country/party ideology circa 2017. These reflect differences of opinion on several major issues, including security, privacy, civil liberties, appropriate sources of funding for tackling terrorism in Europe, and appropriate EU agencies which should be taking the lead on combating terrorism.

Simulation outcome: The decision making mechanism in the Council of the EU, for the purposes of this simulation, is accepting a legislative text through a process of qualified majority voting, following the rules laid down by the EU Treaties (see Section I). In the European Parliament, for the purposes of this simulation, the decision making mechanism is accepting a legislative text through a process consisting of a simple majority vote. During the mediation session in the Conciliation Committee, both parties (the Council of the EU and the European Parliament) have to agree for the legislative text to be adopted, following qualified majority for Council representatives and simple majority for Parliament representatives. Power imbalances and time pressure will require participants to create alliances and think quickly, with regards to protecting their country’s individual interests as well as promoting the EU’s interests as a whole.

Setting, timeframe, and interventions: This instructor's guide assumes that the simulation will be played in a face-to-face environment, with full monitoring by the instructor (for discussion of conducting the simulation online, see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below.) The instructors should provide time for preparation and debriefing, before and after the simulation, respectively, as discussed below. The simulation can be adapted to be conducted in 2 ½ hours, or played out over the course of two full days. One method for achieving this versatility involves the instructor intervening with ‘breaking news’ which require participants to either re-assess and prolong the simulation, in the unlikely situation that there is overly or artificially rapid agreement, or provide them with opportunities and assistance for moving past ‘stumbling blocks,’ speeding up the process. All these issues are detailed in Section 2 – Logistics, Setup and Simulation Management, below.

27 This exercise uses a modified legislative process as this type of role-play simulation does not allow for a full legislative process for the ordinary legislative procedure. For an actual EU legislative process please see here: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/external/html/legislativeprocedure/default_en.htm
2. Logistics, Setup and Simulation Management

*Number of participants:* As discussed above, this simulation is ideally designed for use with large classrooms. The simulation was created to be used with 84 participants. For smaller or larger groups, see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below.

*Physical surroundings and props:* The simulation requires two large rooms (or one very large room split into two areas), each of which should be able to accommodate participants’ sitting around two large rectangular tables (which can be formed of regular desks placed side by side), or in seats placed in two large circles. It would be helpful to have a map of Europe and its surroundings handy, as well as a whiteboard or flipchart. As negotiations between smaller groups are likely to develop, you may want to provide a second room, or an adjacent hallway (one in which the participants will not disturb other classes), for conducting such caucuses.

To add a sense of reality to the situation, teachers might consider asking participants to dress up formally for the occasion, and (as resources permit) add on touches to convey a sense of the real-life setting (such as by providing name tags for the countries, placards with countries’ flags printed on them, actual miniature flags on the table in front of the country’s seats, etc.). When teachers take this kind of initiative, students will often augment it through efforts of their own, such as by adding an element of national dress to their garb. For the Council of the EU, try to follow seating order dictated by protocol, which can be found here: [http://publications.europa.eu/code/pdf/370000en.htm](http://publications.europa.eu/code/pdf/370000en.htm). For the European Parliament, the seating order can be found here: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/hemicycle.html](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/plenary/en/hemicycle.html).

A phone call with a representative from the EU or a transatlantic expert, at some point during the game, may give an even more realistic dimension to the simulation.

*Time:* The recommended time for conducting the simulation itself is 4-6 hours. For considerations, variations and methods for adapting the simulation’s duration, see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below.

*Required / optional material:* To conduct the simulation itself, all that is strictly required are the roles to be handed out to each team, provided at the end of this instructor’s guide. Instructions to the group regarding procedural issues, decision-making, and timeframe can be imparted orally. Depending on preparation time and students’ previous studies, teachers can consider assigning students to review the material found on some of the websites provided in Part I: General Guidelines for Conducting Model Council of the EU-European Parliament-European Commission Simulations, above. Teachers might decide to add in material of their own, or ask students to conduct independent research; see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below.
Simulation setup role assignment, instructions and initiation: In this phase, you designate participants to their individual roles, and assign them the material they need to prepare. This can be done on the spot, by handing out roles to students and instructing them to be ready to begin the meetings in one hour, or in the following class session. When circumstances allow it, or, when you wish their preparation to go beyond the role material provided in this guide (see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below), assign the material at least one day (or, one lesson) before the simulation is to take place, allowing participants to prepare themselves fully. Announce precisely when and where the meetings are to take place, stressing that everybody must be present, prepared, and ready to begin the meetings at that time. Stress that absences will threaten the meetings’ success. Give any group instructions you feel necessary to the group. At the designated starting time, gather the group, and announce that the simulation has begun; all their behavior, from now on, must be in-role.

Council of the EU

The Council of the EU is chaired by the Minister (of Interior, for the purposes of this exercise), representing the Member states holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the European Union in the real world at the point in time that the simulation is conducted.28 The chair is helped by the European Commissioner in charge of Home Affairs (assisted by a director general) to facilitate discussions within the Council of the EU. The minister chairing the meeting will present the issue on the agenda, based on the individual role provided to them as representative of their country. The Minister/chair should introduce the representatives from the European Commission to the assembled representatives. The two representatives from the European Commission will introduce the draft legislation text to the Council of the EU. These three participants (the chair and the representatives from the European Commission) should have a short conversation before the simulation to decide a plan for how the chair will facilitate the dialogue and what roles the two representatives from the European Commission will take. The chair then proceeds to open the meeting for statements by those member states who wish to state their opinions. At this starting point of the meeting, the chair should ask that participants’ opening statements be limited to 2 minutes, and that speakers focus on substantive matters rather than issuing lists of demands. After opening statements, the chair can suggest structured or unstructured break-out meetings (to allow for informal negotiation) with just a few of the participants or full plenary meetings, as she/he sees fit in order to promote successful negotiations within the Council of the EU. The chair can facilitate dialogue, or allow participants to engage without facilitation/moderation. Instructors should be very mindful in assigning the role of the chair, and also that of the two representatives from the European Commission, as the way the simulation plays out depends to a certain extent on their ability to facilitate an effective group processes.

The proceedings can be as informal or formal as the instructor desires based on the learning goals of the simulation. If you want the group to follow more formal proceedings, prompt the chair to use the Council of the EU’s Rules of Procedure,\(^29\) of which the following are a part:

- “8. At the start of a meeting, the Presidency [the chair] shall give any further information necessary regarding the handling of the meeting and in particular indicate the length of time it intends to be devoted to each item. It shall refrain from making lengthy introductions and avoid repeating information which is already known to delegations.

- 9. At the start of a discussion on a substantive point, the Presidency shall, depending on the type of discussion which is needed, indicate to delegations the maximum length of their interventions on that point. In most cases interventions should not exceed two minutes.

- 10. Full table rounds shall be proscribed in principle; they may be used only in exceptional circumstances on specific questions, with a time limit on interventions set by the Presidency.

- 11. The Presidency shall give as much focus as possible to discussions, in particular by requesting delegations to react to compromise texts or specific proposals.

- 12. During and at the end of meetings the Presidency shall refrain from making lengthy summaries of the discussions and shall confine itself to concluding briefly on the results (substance and/or procedure) achieved.

- 13. Delegations shall avoid repeating points made by previous speakers. Their interventions shall be brief, substantive and to the point.

- 14. Like-minded delegations shall be encouraged to hold consultations with a view to the presentation by a single spokesperson of a common position on a specific point.

- 15. When discussing texts, delegations shall make concrete drafting proposals, in writing, rather than merely express their disagreement with a particular proposal.

- 16. Unless indicated otherwise by the Presidency, delegations shall refrain from taking the floor when in agreement with a particular proposal; in this case silence shall be taken as agreement in principle.”\(^30\)

**European Parliament (LIBE Committee)**

For the purposes of this exercise, the meeting of the European Parliament’s Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs Committee (LIBE) will be chaired by the two representatives


\(^{30}\)Ibid.
from the European Commission\textsuperscript{31}. The two representatives from the European Commission will introduce the draft legislation text to the European Parliament. These two participants should have a short conversation before the simulation to decide a plan for how they will facilitate the dialogue. The chairs then proceed to open the meeting for statements by those MEPs who wish to state their opinions. At this starting point of the meeting, the chairs should ask that participants’ opening statements be limited to 2 minutes, and that speakers focus on substantive matters rather than issuing lists of demands. After opening statements, the chairs can suggest structured or unstructured break-out meetings (to allow for informal negotiation) with just a few of the participants or full plenary meetings, as she/he sees fit in order to promote successful negotiations within the European Parliament. The chairs can facilitate dialogue, or allow participants to engage without facilitation/moderation. Instructors should be very mindful in assigning the role of the chairs (the two representatives from the European Commission), as the way the simulation plays out depends to a certain extent on their ability to facilitate an effective group processes. The proceedings can be as informal or formal as the instructor desires based on the learning goals of the simulation.

\textit{Conciliation Committee}

The instructor should set a time limit for the negotiations within the Council of the EU and the European Parliament, in order to allow the representatives from these two institutions to participate in a follow-on process of assisted negotiation (mediation) in the Conciliation Committee. The time limit should be communicated to the four representatives from the European Commission who participate in the meetings of the Council of the EU and of the European Parliament.

Once the two institutions have agreed on their versions of the legislative text, a Conciliation Committee is called upon by the four representatives from the European Commission. The Council of the EU will elect five representatives\textsuperscript{32} plus the chair of the Council, the Minister of Interior/Justice and Home Affairs holding the rotating presidency of the Council of the EU. The MEPs will elect six representatives from the LIBE Committee to participate in the Conciliation Committee. Agreements in the Conciliation Committee require simple majority from the MEPs and qualified majority voting from the representatives of the Council of the EU, following the Council of the EU’s voting rules mentioned in Section I\textsuperscript{33}. The Conciliation Committee is

\textsuperscript{31} In real life there is a chair of the LIBE committee elected for a 2 ½ years mandate, but such a role is not feasible for the purposes of this exercise. In addition, by assigning this role to the two representatives from the European Commission, these participants will get a chance to participate fully in all stages of the simulation, rather than just in the final mediation stage.

\textsuperscript{32} Using simple majority.

\textsuperscript{33} For the voting system in the Conciliation Committee please check: \url{http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/decision-making/ordinary-legislative-procedure/conciliation/}
chaired by a team of 2 representatives from the European Commission. In order to give all four representatives from the European Commission the chance to mediate the process, there should be 2 teams of 2 mediators each, rotating as the instructor sees fit. The participants from the two initial negotiations (in the Council of the EU and the European Parliament), with the exception of the chosen representatives from these two institutions who participate in the Conciliation Committee, should observe the proceedings of the Conciliation Committee from the sidelines, but not intervene. The observers should pay attention to the way their representatives represent the views of the two institutions, but also note the legislative process, and the mediation process.

*Participant-driven simulation conduct:* Make sure that the chairs of the meetings are aware of the point of time at which to shift into a meeting of the Conciliation Committee, and the simulation’s overall ending time. Other than that, the simulation design allows for the entire process to be driven, start to finish, by participants, without instructor guidance or intervention.

*Instructor interventions:* During the simulation’s run-time, the instructor’s task is largely to be attentive to the proceedings and discussion, noting interesting elements to raise for discussion in the post-simulation debrief session. There are three situations in which instructor intervention is desirable: Students will sometimes pose questions to the instructor – for example, about procedural rules in any of the settings (Council of the EU, European Parliament, Conciliation Committee), the simulation storyline, information they see as ‘missing,’ or how they should be playing their role. When possible, the instructor would do best to point participants towards sources for procedural rules or the information provided in their roles. Sometimes, however, the instructor needs to take on the responsibility of clarifying a point or explaining something in the instructions. To this end, teachers should review the simulation before engaging in it so they will be able to clarify or adjust details without upsetting the fundamental balance between participants. A second – fairly rare – trigger event for instructor intervention is disruptive behavior on the part of participants. This might be unusually inappropriate or abusive behavior by participants in-role, but will more likely be occurrences of participants suddenly slipping out of role during the course of the simulation, and engaging in discussion that bursts the ‘bubble’ of simulated reality. This often happens for short moments, with the simulation self-restoring; however, if things get out of hand in this regard, the instructor can encourage participants to regroup and restore the simulation bubble. Finally, instructors may intervene to add in news of new information or events that s/he wishes to introduce into the simulation (see Section 3(a) Game Variations, below).

*Final stages and simulation ending:* A non-intrusive intervention, such as a note to the chair of the meeting, or catching their eye whilst tapping one’s watch, should be enough to help participants keep their eye on the clock as the deadlines approaches. As the deadline approached in the first pair of meetings, the chairs of each meeting (the chair of the Council of the EU and the chairs of the European Parliament committee), together with leading Member state / political group representatives, should work on drafting the language of any agreement participants have come to. When there is a written draft agreement the chairs of the respective meetings should distribute it (or, at least, read it aloud or) to all participants, and call for a vote. If it passes both
institutions, the chairs of the respective meetings present the legislative text that will be then negotiated with the other institution in the Conciliation Committee. If it does not, and there is time remaining, negotiations can resume with the hopes of achieving agreement, drafting it and voting on it anew. If the allotted time for the negotiations in the Council of the EU and the European Parliament runs out with no solution being passed by vote in both institutions, you can allocate to the negotiations in these two institutions the time you have initially put aside for the Conciliation Committee. If still there is no solution passed in both institutions (or if it passes in one institution but not in the other one), then the legislative text negotiation fails and there is no Conciliation Committee needed. Of course, if parties realize they are not going to reach agreement on all the issues, they can attempt to carve out issues for which there is sufficient agreement to vote on, and agree to attempt to settle the rest at a later date.

Transitioning from simulation to debrief: If the meeting has ended with an agreement, or a successful vote, you might ask parties to sign it, or stage a group photo, in order to have a moment of celebration during which participants will shift slowly back into their natural selves. After the conclusion has been reached, announce that in a couple of minutes all representatives will be leaving back to their embassies, and they can use the time to say goodbye to other representatives. Then, announce the end of the simulation, and ask participants to return to their seats to discuss what happened.

---

34 For the Council of the EU the requirements to pass are: 55% of member states vote in favour - in practice this means 16 out of 28 the proposal is supported by member states representing at least 65% of the total EU population – see threshold for 65% in Table 1. above
The blocking minority must include at least four Council members representing more than 35% of the EU population. (Source: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/council-eu/voting-system/qualified-majority/).
For the European Parliament, simple majority voting is needed for it to pass.
3. Teaching Notes

3(a) Game Variations

This section will cover five areas in which instructors might depart from the basic simulation format detailed above.

3(a)1. Group size:

The group size for conducting the simulation works well with 84 participants: Council of the EU (28 Member states * 2 – Minister of Interior & Member state Ambassador to the EU = 56) + European Parliament (6 parties * 4 MEPs per/party = 24) + Commission (4 representatives). If you have additional students, you can add up more MEPs to each of the six parties, up to a total of 8 MEPs/party. This last possibility is somewhat artificial and unwieldy; on the other hand, it allows all participants to feel, think, and act as a primary player in the simulation, enhancing their learning process. This results in a maximum participant number of 108 participants.

If you have fewer students, the most balanced way to construct the roles is to remove roles of the Member State Ambassadors to the EU, and reduce the number of MEPs per party. If you are still missing participants, remove an additional role from each of the groups, and so on. At the very least, the simulation requires 13 participants to function:

- 6 Council Member states - You want to make sure that the country holding the rotating presidency of the Council of the EU is included in this group; otherwise you can choose the Member states that would best fit your goals for this classroom exercise, making sure that there are enough conflicting positions between the states by quickly reading the roles;
- 6 European Parliament parties – All parties would have one MEP.
- 1 representative for the Commission – the Commission representative will facilitate dialogue among the European Parliament parties, and use mediation to chair the Conciliation Committee.

3(a)2. Timeframe:

Instructors can set aside a substantial period of time for running the simulation in a single session. To this end, it is recommended to dedicate 4-6 hours to the actual playing of the simulation itself, aside from time for preparation and debrief. However, instructors might decide to conduct it in a shorter timeframe – providing some situational reason for why the Council of the EU and the European Parliament must reach a decision within 2½ hours. Alternatively, they can decide to run the simulation in multiple sessions, each of short duration; for example, dedicating an 1’15” of class time to the simulation in each of 2 consecutive class meetings, and running a debrief session in a 3rd class meeting.
3(a)3. Instructor interventions

The simulation is designed to be self-sustaining; once set in motion, it can be fully carried out without instructor intervention. However, instructors can intervene in the simulation, adding new events or facts, and thereby changing the simulation’s course. One reason to do so would be to slow down a group that is rapidly or artificially headed towards agreement without full engagement with the issues or with their differences. Conversely, instructors might wish to incentivize or aid a group that is not progressing, and seems to lack the motivation or skill to do so. Such interventions, thereby, essentially manipulate the timeline and pace of the simulation. Another reason for intervening would be in order to introduce real-world or seemingly real-world occurrences into the simulation, giving participants a taste of what it feels like to deliberate policy while real-world influences seep into the meeting room. While externally introduced events might be initially categorized as ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ in sense of their anticipated effect on parties’ capacity to collaborate, any event might be utilized by different parties to achieve different ends.35

Instructors can, of course, come up with their own intervention methods. Below, are four examples - two ‘positive’ interventions and two ‘negative’ interventions, for use in “Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation”. Instructors should stop the simulation for a moment, and announce that they have ‘breaking news’ for participants:

Examples of “Breaking News” Interventions

- In an investigative journalism report it was revealed that the massive ransomware attack that ‘plagued’ a major EU ally (feel free to fill in the blanks with a country of your choice from outside the EU), recently, was done by hackers using the surveillance tools of the state to spy on its citizens. This is an issue of concern for those groups interested to make sure the EU does not replicate the limits on privacy which have been set up in other countries, as a way to fight terrorism.

- Major terrorist attacks occurred in several EU Member states capitals. It seems that the attacks were coordinated and conducted by individuals who have come to the EU under the disguise of asylum seekers/refugees. It has been reported that the communication and coordination between terrorists was done through a communication app, which if the laws would have allowed for, it could have been easily tracked down and the terrorist attacks prevented.

3(a)4. Opening and updating the simulation

*Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation* captures, loosely, the real-world approach in the European Union, *circa* mid-2017. As such, it is most easily played as a historical and fictional simulation, using only the roles provided in this package, with no external material affecting parties’ interests, positions or alliances. Played this way, the game will run more or less as described in this package, given the internal balances incorporated in the roles creating the five major groups and positioning their information and interests vis-à-vis one another. If the primary goals of the exercise are to learn about how the EU legislative process functions, or to practice negotiation and conflict resolution skills in the context of an international policy-setting organization - as opposed to providing students up-to-date information on the substance of anti-terrorism legislation - it is recommended to play the simulation in this way.

Another way to play the situation is by handing out the roles, yet asking participants to conduct research on their own with regards to current events, policy changes, public opinion in their role-country regarding migration, etc. This method poses several advantages: student investment in the simulation at an early stage, enhancing participants’ identification with their roles, and engaging in a contemporary simulation. On the other hand, the method presents challenges to the simulation, in that significant shifts in countries’ positions might undermine the simulation’s internal balance; additionally, quite simply, participants might operate off of information that they have misunderstood or under-researched. If one of the exercise’s main goals is providing participants with an up-to-date understanding of the challenges of negotiating anti-terrorism legislation, you might consider running the game in this way. Here are some recommendations for preempting some of the aforementioned challenges this might entail:

*Advance preparation*: After assigning student their role, give participants a week or two in which to prepare. Ask them to learn from both media and governmental sources of their assigned countries about their assigned government’s interests, in order to have an enriched experience. Remind them that they are to conduct their own research and not to discuss the simulation with other parties. This is necessary in order to avoid participants engaging in pre-simulation negotiation. Assign them to write up a one-page summary of the information they have gathered that they see as affecting their role, and specifically, to note any divergences from the information provided in the original role information. Ask them to submit this report to you at a point several days before the simulation. Assign the European Commission representatives their preliminary legislation drafting assignment, as detailed above (pp. 20-21).

*Teacher review*: Review the notes students have provided you with. Focus on three elements: First, based on your own knowledge of current affairs, address factual inaccuracies. Second, consider whether the additional reports seem to significantly undermine the balance of conflict and cooperation between the major groups. If so – find a way to keep it balanced, either by telling one participant to ignore a particular fact or set aside a particular interest they have reported on, or by providing additional information or interests to a different party. Finally, keep an eye open for parties who have submitted a list of new information or positions that indicate that they might ‘go rogue,’ engaging in the simulation through an extreme departure from the
original role, current reality, or the norms of behavior of participants in the Council of the
EU/European Parliament/European Commission meetings, in such a way that could derail the
simulation as a learning exercise. In this event, respond to the participants’ report with
information or instructions aimed at bringing them into line.

Final preparation: Return students’ reports, together with your comments, allowing them enough
time to review and consider these before the simulation’s initiation.

3(a)5. Conducting the simulation online:

The simulation can be conducted online, in a variety of ways. One variation would be to conduct
it in a text-based environment. This can be created within any one of the learning management
systems (LMS) most universities employ. Instructors can create a discussion forum for
asynchronous participation by all parties, as well as provide private forums for groups or teams
requesting to caucus between themselves. Some LMS allow students to create forums on their
own, in which case participants can create a forum and grant access to particular others. Parties
can also caucus along the sidelines through other methods that are often embedded within LMS –
email, videoconferencing or instant messaging applications.

Another variation is to conduct the main part of the simulation via live, synchronous,
videoconferencing. For this purpose, instructors will require access to a videoconferencing
platform with the capacity for supporting a large number of participants at the same time. The
instructor might facilitate who has the floor (and the microphone and camera) for speaking at any
given point, or hand this capacity over to the chair of the respective meeting. As the forum
convenes on camera, parties can converse with one another through text-based synchronous
means – either those usually included in videoconferencing software, or other, separate,
applications.\footnote{For a full discussion of conducting negotiation and conflict resolution simulations online, see Matz, D. & Ebner,

3(b) Debriefing Guide

Providing a comprehensive map for debriefing \textit{Anti-Terrorism EU Legislation} simulation is
virtually impossible, due to the varied training goals it is designed to serve and the infinite paths
of unfolding it allows for. In this section, after suggestions for setting up and initiating the
debrief session, some recommendations for conducting it are provided. However, the topical questions – or the list of topics– provided in this section are is not in any way meant to provide an exhaustive list of questions or discussion-themes. Instructors using the simulation are encouraged to consider their own learning objectives, the context and framework in which the simulation is being conducted, participants’ learning habits and the teacher’s own style – and come up with questions and themes of their own.

3(b)1. Encourage Ventilation
The main challenge in debriefing a simulation such as this one, is that after investing so much time and energy in-role, it is difficult for participants to detach from the role they had been playing and adopt a learning stance towards themselves and their experience. Left to their own devices, they will continue to conduct some form of negotiation throughout the debrief process. In order to avoid this, you might allow a few minutes for free ventilation. While this is going on, stress that the game is over, the negotiation is over, and that they can let things go rather than carry the in-game negotiation into the debrief session.

3(b)2. Define Debriefing Goals
Open up the learning phase of the debriefing by calling the group’s attention to yourself, and briefly explaining the goals of the debriefing. Explain that debriefing is an opportunity to transform the participants' simulation-experience into practical lessons to take away. State clearly what you hope to gain from this experience (e.g., ‘Let’s try to understand how the EU legislative process really functions, particularly with regards to highly charged topics;’ or ‘Let’s aim for a clear picture of how we have improved our negotiation / problem-solving skills’.’) You may want to break the debriefing into two parts, but keeping the entire classroom together. Part 1 will deal with the negotiations in the Council of the EU and the European Parliament and part 2 will deal with the assisted negotiations (mediation) in the Conciliation Committee. The questions asked will be quite similar for each of the setting with variations for the specific institutions.

3(b)3. From Outcome to Process
Begin the debriefing by reviewing the legislative text decided by vote within the Conciliation Committee, if such an outcome has been reached. If no vote passed by the required majority, review the issues that seemed to be under wide consensus, those that were backed by smaller coalitions, and finally those that ultimately led to impasse. Use inclusive language, referring to the group as a whole (e.g., ‘We’ or ‘you all’) as you do so. Then, state that the debriefing will cast back in the process, in order to understand how the final outcome was reached. This is done

mainly to allow participants still engrossed in the game in their minds to mentally join the group, and to stress in general the joint-but-separate experience of the group and of each individual participant, transforming them back into one large learning-group. For most of the remainder of the debrief, focus will be less on the outcome and more on the process; it is helpful to touch on outcome - and then set them aside - right at the start.

3(b)4. Focus on Training Goals
Here are some suggestions for questions you may use in order to highlight the particular training goals you set for the simulation:

Training Goal: Learning about the decision-making procedures and processes of the Council of the EU and of the European Parliament

- What is your opinion of the protocol for conducting Council of the EU/European Parliament meetings? Is it helpful? Constructive? Fair?
- In your experience, what seemed to be the most effective times and forums for developing agreement? (e.g., plenary sessions, informal caucuses, formal caucuses, break-out groups, negotiations during the breaks)?
- What role did the chair of the Council of the EU (the Minister of Interior of the Member states holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU) play? The representatives of the European Commission in the Council of the EU/European Parliament committee? Was their work coordinated? Was it effective?
- Did time pressure play a role in your negotiation behavior? In reaching final agreement?
- Did coalitions try to apply any leverage in their communication with the chair?
- Did the chair try to promote their own agenda, in addition to facilitating the discussions?
- Did the impending vote tend to facilitate reaching broad consensus on issues during the negotiation phase? Or did parties seem to assume that they could pass measures through by voting without securing agreement?
- What other topics would you like to see negotiated within future Council of the EU-European Parliament-European Commission simulations?

Training Goal: Negotiation Skills
Consider asking some of these questions, focusing on the way the participants playing the country delegates handled their role. Choose questions and encourage discussion according to the level of competence and confidence of the parties, according to their performance and according to your pre-set targeted skill-set (e.g., analytical grasp of the situation, strategizing ability, trust- and relationship-building, creativity, interpersonal communication skills, ability to cope with ethical dilemmas, pie-expanding, etc.):

- How would the parties define their overall strategy, when they first walked in to the joint discussion (help participants frame a short strategic definition of their strategic state of mind, such as “working cooperatively” or “asking for as much as I can, and then asking for more”).
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• Did parties adhere to this strategy throughout the negotiation? If their strategy changed, was it done consciously, or as an intuitive / instinctive shift? What triggered such change?
• Did parties’ search for options (or the final agreement) focus on elements that were very much on the table, or were attempts made to expand the pie?
• What communication tools did the parties use throughout the discussions? Was it difficult to utilize these techniques? Why?
• Did any communication problems arise over the course of the negotiations? What was their source? How did the parties address them?
• Was an atmosphere of trust created between the parties? What contributed to this, or challenged this?
• Did use of particular communication tools assist trust-building?
• Did parties share information openly, or did they play their cards close to their chests?
• What behavior or circumstances proved conducive to information sharing, and what behavior or circumstances were inhibitive?
• Do parties feel that their relationship shifted at different stages of the negotiation? How would they describe these shifts? What do they think triggered and enabled them?
• Ask participants to name particular negotiation tactics they saw other participants employ successfully.
• What warnings, ultimate, or threats, did parties issue? What were their effects?
• In the event that an early vote failed to pass, and parties resumed negotiations: Were these subsequent negotiations different, in any significant ways, than the initial discussions?
• Based on the conversation that has developed around these questions, does it seem as if the negotiation in one of the meetings was significantly different – in tone, purpose, scope or outcome – from the negotiation in another? What do you ascribe the differences to?

Training Goal: Team Negotiation and Multiparty Negotiation

Coalitions:
• Did coalitions form between parties, or between groups of parties, to attain leverage vis-a-vis others parties or groups of parties? How did this come to be? How did parties go about looking for allies?
• Following up on the previous question: Did coalitions form on specific issues between two of the parties, and on others between different partners? What effect (if any) did this have on the negotiations?
• Did any party feel they had to try and break up a coalition formed by the other two parties?
Did members of any group of countries assume they were “all on the same team” going into the negotiation? Was this perception shaken up at a later stage of the negotiation process? What effect (if any) did this have on the negotiations?

Can participants identify tacit or explicit coalitions formed between two or more of their opposing countries? How did this affect the negotiations?

Did coalitions formed in the first-stage negotiation carry on into the Conciliation Committee meeting? Were new coalitions formed in this meeting? Did they cross over the lines, to include members of each group, or did they form on either side of the line?

Process Management:

Were process-management rules entirely dictated by the chair, or did parties seek to affect or alter them? Such rules include:

1. Ground rules: What are the seating arrangements? Are interruptions permitted? Can parties consult with others?
2. Communication Rules: What order do parties speak in? How long does everybody get to express him/herself? Can parties shout at each other?
3. Decision-making rules: How is the vote cast, and how are outcomes determined?

Leadership:

What challenges did the chair face, in shepherding this multiparty process?

Beyond the chair role - did any country representative take a conspicuously leading role in the negotiations? What gave him/her the legitimacy to do this, in the eyes of the other participants? What did this leader use this power for? Did other participants take the lead at different points during the process? If there had been a previously dominant player – did s/he relinquish control, or struggle to retain it?

Training Goal: Mediation / Conflict Resolution Skills:
Consider asking some of these questions, focusing on the way the participants playing the representatives of the European Commission and the chairs of the Council of the EU/European Parliament meetings, handled their roles. Choose questions and allow discussion according to the level of competence and confidence of those playing these facilitative roles, based on their performance and according to your pre-set desired skill-set (e.g., trust-building, relationship-building, grasp of the structure of the facilitating process, creativity, dealing with ethical dilemmas, confidence boosting, etc.). [Note that while the questions focus on the chair, they can include actions of the European Commission representatives]

Did the chair of the meeting explain the process to the parties in a clear manner? How did this affect the process?

What did the chair do in order to help parties get all the necessary information on the table?

Was the chair successful in building an atmosphere of trust around the table? How did they do this (or what might they have done, but did not)?
How did the chair react in challenging situations (such as: parties interrupting each other, parties attacking each other, parties attacking the chair, party walk-outs, etc.)?

Do parties feel that the chair acted in a neutral and impartial manner? Did the chair deal explicitly with issues of neutrality and impartiality? Can the chair comment on ways in which they felt parties were trying to win them over to their side?

What does the chair view as the largest obstacle they had to face during this simulation? What were some of the tools they used to overcome it?

Does the chair feel they managed the process ‘by the book’ – moving from one stage of the model they learned to the next in a conscious and controlled manner? Do they feel that the structured process they tried to manage sometimes got wrested away from them or ‘hijacked’ (by the parties or by circumstances)? How did they react?

What did the chair do in order to help parties face their problems constructively?

Does the chair feel their information and preparation posed challenges to their ability to maintain neutrality? Did parties experience a sense of neutrality from the chair?

How did the process of problem solving and searching for options begin? Did the chair take an active role in generating or evaluating options for agreement? What effect did this have on the process? What might have been done differently?

Did the search for options (or the final agreement) focus on the elements that were very much on the table, or were attempts made to expand the pie? What was the chair’s role in this?

Did the chair decide when to bring issues to a vote? If so, how was this decision made? If not – which countries brought about the vote and how did they convince the chair to do so?

In addition to the chair - did any of the country/political party representatives find themselves mediating between other countries or country groups/political groups’ representatives?

Training Goal: Understanding of Intra-European Union Conflict and Collaboration

How did your preparation for your assigned role help you during the negotiation?

What have participants learned regarding the complexity of trying to determine significant internal policy through legislation, by means of an internal negotiation and decision making process?

Did any participant enter the simulation with a predetermined solution to the anticipated conflict, or major elements thereof? Have they changed their minds, or reconsidered the applicability of their solution, as a result of participating in the simulation?

What do participants have to say regarding the effectiveness, the desirability and the long- and short- term effects of unilateral moves by one side to a conflict?

Do participants view the situation through a primary lens of power disparity? Did this view shift during the simulation?
• Did participation in the simulation enable participants to appreciate new ideas which might be transferable to real-life issues under debate in the real world of EU legislation? What ideas, in particular, piqued their interest?

• Have participants encountered a newfound appreciation for another party to the situation whom they might have felt (walking into the simulation) highly opposed to? Or, conversely, did they find that their preconceptions on this issue were strengthened by their experience? How would they portray and explain this transformation, or lack thereof?

**Training Goal: Understanding the Anti-Terrorism Legislation Issue**

• What were the major areas of dispute regarding anti-terrorism legislation?

• Were there elements missing in the negotiations regarding anti-terrorism legislation?

• Discuss some of the processes that Member states go through as they implement anti-terrorism EU legislation. What benefits do they reap, and what challenges do they encounter?

• What are some of the lessons you’ve learned about the complexity of negotiating anti-terrorism legislation within the EU? What are some comparisons between the European Union and the United States regarding anti-terrorism legislation?

• Did the discussion for anti-terrorism legislation tend to focus on issues of effectiveness? Human rights? Civil rights? Police procedure?

**3(b)5. Post-simulation learning activities**

Learning does not necessarily end with the debriefing, especially if the simulation is conducted in the framework of an academic course; instructors can assign follow-on work for further learning. In particular, teachers concerned that their students are not sufficiently familiar with learning through the experiential learning model, owing to practices of their field or cultural considerations, might supplement the simulation with a more “traditional” learning and/or assessment project. Teachers might assign participants to write a paper before the simulation, in which they will develop a plan for their activities during the negotiation. In addition, after the simulation, a reflection paper, or some other assignment, could be assigned regarding their experience or particular elements thereof.
4(a). General Background Information

This information is to be distributed to all simulation participants; it provides the same general information to all those participating in the meetings of Council of the EU and the European Parliament. It should be distributed, as well, to the European Commission representatives.

ISIS has been ousted out of Syria and Iraq by the Global Coalition’s military efforts, and no longer holds territory. ISIS, however, continues to pose a threat to Western countries, and seeks to recruit “homegrown terrorists” to conduct terror attacks in Europe and in the U.S.

Under mounting pressure to solve the immediate situation as well as provide a long-term solution, the Council of the EU and the European Parliament are debating legislation regarding a wide number of issues pertaining to combatting home-grown terrorism. This legislation aims to combat radicalization efforts, including online radicalization activity, to prevent people from turning to terrorism; to protect citizens from terrorist attacks; to investigate and pursue terrorists across borders; and to respond effectively to terrorist attacks. Specific issues that will be discussed at your meeting include, but are not limited to:

- EU-internal cross-border travel;
- Methods for detecting potential terrorists entering the EU;
- Powers of search and arrest for police, anti-terrorist units, and the military;
- Suspension of newspapers and of the right of assembly for specific groups that have affiliated with terrorists;
- Social media restrictions and other methods for combatting the spread of hatred online;
- Preventing radicalization as well as promoting de-radicalization and re-integration schemes;
- Identifying and neutralizing sources and channels of terrorism financing
- Sharing intelligence and exchanging information between EU Member states’ intelligence services, including through Europol
- Monitoring and restricting the buying, selling and trafficking of firearms within the EU; and
- Cooperation with 3rd countries from EU's neighborhood and from the Global Coalition against ISIS (including the U.S.).

The Council of the European Union ministers and the members of the European Parliament are meeting, separately, to discuss what legislation to adopt in order to successfully fight home-grown terrorism in the European Union. They will be aided in their discussions by representatives of the European Commission. Once each of these bodies have concluded their legislative process, their representatives will convene in a Conciliation Committee meeting, to jointly draft and vote on the legislation’s final form. The members of the European Commission
will chair, mediate, and moderate this meeting, helping parties come together while also promoting the overall the general interests of the EU.

The major areas of dispute between the participants at these negotiations are likely to include, amongst others:

- Acceptable levels of increased security (high levels/intrusive surveillance vs. moderate levels);
- Balancing security needs with civil rights and liberties;
- Balancing security needs with democratic oversight of security agencies
- Balancing security measures with the risks of racial/ethnic/religious profiling, which may end up helping recruitment efforts for terrorism
- Deciding on a national and all-European division of labor regarding anti-radicalization programs, intelligence gathering, and anti-terrorism activity

4(b). Private Roles Information (Council of the EU)

In addition to the General Background Information, each individual participant-representative should receive their private role information. Make sure that each participant receives a copy of the General Background Information and the private role information sheet, based on the country-representation role assigned to them.
Austrian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Austria, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country’s main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focusing on Islamic terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council Decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System, which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area; and
- Reject any legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, which will deny them the ability to defend themselves in the event of a terrorist attack.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and
complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on your country’s agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith in you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of your people.

Good luck!
Belgian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Belgium, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focusing on Islamic terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of Europol and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU's external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area;
- Strictly control firearms and munitions throughout the European Union, modeled on the strict Belgian laws that do not allow civilians to possess military weapons, automatic firearms or their ammunition; and
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing, so long as the financial monitoring rules do not impede the work of banks and financial institutions.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the
methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to your own.

Security has been one of the top items on the Belgian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith in you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Belgian people.

Good luck!
Bulgarian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Bulgaria, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, while making sure that Bulgaria's integration to the Schengen area is not compromised or postponed due to a set of new requirements to be met. You would like the conclusions to include a reference to the need to welcome Bulgaria in the Schengen area by next year;
- Have EUROPOL and FRONTEX position more personnel on the ground in Bulgaria, to help you manage your border with Turkey;
- Support very high levels of security screening at gateways into the EU (airports, train stations, bus terminals, ferryboat terminals etc.) and promulgation of a stronger version of Article 36(3) of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real time, information about potential terrorists;
- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record. Police forces and security services should receive adequate funds from the national governments to tackle terrorism; and
- Support limiting the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU; and
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing through EU directives harmonizing rules between Member states. In this respect, push for the implementation of anti-money laundering (AML) measures across the EU, as one way of tackling terrorism financing.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and
complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Bulgarian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Bulgarian people.

Good Luck!
Croatian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Croatia, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Step up security measures at EU level, while making sure that this doesn't have a negative effect on the tourism industry in Croatia. You want to ensure, in particular, that enhanced security checks at airports do not dissuade people from traveling to Croatia;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, while making sure that Croatia's integration to the Schengen area is not compromised or postponed due to set of new requirements to be met. You would like the conclusions to include a reference to the need to welcome Croatia in the Schengen area by next year;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Promote sharing of information between EU Member states’ police and security services with regards to potential terrorists, using EU institutions such as EUROPOL; and
- Oppose a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System, which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists; you are concerned that this will create major delays for tourists entering Croatia.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.
Security has been one of the top items on the Croatian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Croatian people.

Good luck!
As the Minister of Interior of Cyprus, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Promote cooperation between the law enforcement agencies of Member states, the interoperability of security databases, and the protection of EU’s external border;
- Minimize, on the other hand, the effect of such additional screening processes and controls on your tourism industry;
- Ensure that the new measures addressing the terrorist threat do not only apply to the Schengen area, but to the EU as a whole; and
- Strictly control firearms and munitions throughout the European Union, modeled on the strict laws of your country that do not allow civilians to possess handguns and rifles, military weapons, automatic firearms or their ammunition.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.
Security has been one of the top items on the Cypriot agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Cypriot people.

Good luck!
Czech Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Czech Republic, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Maintain independence in addressing security threats related to your country, but achieve better intelligence sharing between law enforcement authorities of Member states;
- Limit any temporary reintroduction of border controls between some Schengen countries to a strict minimum;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
- Promote your worldview, according to which the EU’s security, and that of its citizens and Member states, is paramount; civil liberties can and should be curtailed for security reasons; and
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks; conversely, impose bans on access to firearms on immigrants coming to the EU from specific countries.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.
Security has been one of the top items on the Czech agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Czech people.

Good luck!
Danish Minister of Social Affairs and Interior

As the Minister of Social Affairs and Interior of Denmark, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you want to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications;
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing, so long as the financial monitoring rules do not impede the work of banks and financial institutions.

With the Danish opt-out from justice and home affairs\(^\text{38}\), there is only a limited range of measures which you would like the EU to take. You do think, however, that the EU should reinforce its mechanisms to address the terrorist threat - and you are ready to share more intelligence with other Member States. You would also like to suggest an intergovernmental treaty specifically dealing with police and justice cooperation to address the terrorist threat, and oppose the creation of an EU Intelligence Agency;

---

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Danish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Danish people.

Good luck!
Estonian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Estonia, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Support efforts to intensify police, justice and military cooperation at the EU level. While you are not directly or primarily affected by the terrorist threat, you welcome steps that help move the EU towards a genuine defense and security union;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area; and
- Ensure that other threats to the EU, such as cyber-terrorism and external threats posed by countries to the EU’s east, are not forgotten owing to the current focus on terror; through voicing these concerns, you wish to ensure that Member states will continue to send troops to your country, as part of a NATO reassurance initiative and as part of an effort to bolster EU defense.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Estonian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Estonian people.

Good luck!
As the Finnish Minister of Home Affairs, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Ensure that other threats to the EU, such as cyber-terrorism and external threats posed by countries to the EU’s east, are not forgotten owing to the current focus on terror; through voicing these concerns, you wish to ensure that Member states will continue to send troops to your country, as part of a NATO reassurance initiative and as part of an effort to bolster EU defense;
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks; conversely, impose bans on access to firearms on immigrants coming to the EU from specific countries;
- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you want to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications; and
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing, so long as the financial monitoring rules do not impede the work of banks and financial institutions.
Security has been one of the top items on the Finnish agenda, and an issue that the public opinion follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Finnish people.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Finnish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Finnish people.

Good luck!
French Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of France, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Restrict the buying and selling of firearms throughout the EU;
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing, so long as the financial monitoring rules do not impede the work of banks and financial institutions.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the French agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the French people.

Good luck!
German Minister of Interior

As the German Minister of Interior, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Promote your long-held view is that security issues should be dealt by avoiding extreme measures and adopting moderate and to-the-point solutions, domestically and on the EU level. In fact, you consider the current situation as the outcome of previous debates in the EU, resulting in either extremely hardline positions, or extremely soft ones;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Adopt anti-terrorism solutions that fully respect civil rights and liberties and are not targeted at only one specific group, but rather that aim to reduce the radicalization of all
potential terrorists. You are very much opposed to curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;

- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict; and

- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the German agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the German people.

Good luck!
Greek Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Greece, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism;
- Oppose a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists, as you worry this will create major delays for tourists entering your country;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, and the interoperability of security databases. While preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area. You want to make sure that any new border screening processes and controls do not excessively affect your tourism industry;
- Have EUROPOL and FRONTEX send more officials to Greek islands and other migration hotspots to screen those who are applying for asylum in Europe and to help secure EU’s external borders; and
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks; conversely,
impose bans on access to firearms on immigrants coming to the EU from specific countries.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Greek agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Greek people.

Good luck!
As the Minister of Interior of Hungary, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Agree to some degree of inter-state information sharing regarding terrorists, whilst promoting your view that EUROPOL and the EU as a whole are not the best vehicles for anti-terrorism work; this challenge is better tackled by the national intelligence services;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between law enforcement agencies of Member states in the protection of EU's external border;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Ensure that Hungary preserves its sovereign right to protect its border with non-Schengen countries;
- Support effective measures to strictly control immigration and to end abuses of asylum policies. You believe that some of the terrorist attacks in Europe were perpetrated or inspired by illegal immigrants or individuals who abused EU’s asylum policies;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
➢ Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;

➢ Support the belief that security of the EU, its citizens, and its Member states should come first and civil liberties can and should be curtailed for security reasons.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Hungarian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Hungarian people.

Good luck!
Irish Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Ireland, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas.
- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you want to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications;
- Make sure that most measures taken to address the terrorist threat (and, in particular, those that you support) are not limited to the Schengen area but apply to all EU countries. Gain Ireland access to security databases such as the Schengen Information System.
- Maintain a good degree of cooperation on anti-terrorism issues with the UK after its withdrawal from the EU
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU as well as imposing stricter monitoring of terrorism financing

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Irish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Irish people.

Good luck!
Italian Minister of Interior

As the Italian Minister of Interior, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Promote your long-held view is that security issues should be dealt by avoiding extreme measures and adopting moderate and to-the-point solutions, domestically and on the EU level. In fact, you consider the current situation as the outcome of previous debates in the EU, resulting in either extremely hardline positions, or extremely soft ones;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Support, somewhat mildly, a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. You want to make sure that such a measure does not lead to further radicalization;
- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you wish to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications;
Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record; however, you wish to emphasize that these are not ‘silver bullets’ which will solve the problem comprehensively and on their own; and

Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Italian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Italian people.

Good luck!
Latvian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Latvia, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Support efforts to intensify police, justice and military cooperation at the EU level. While you are not directly or primarily affected by the terrorist threat, you welcome steps that help move the EU towards a genuine defense and security union;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area; and
- Ensure that other threats to the EU, such as external threats posed by countries to the EU’s east, are not forgotten owing to the current focus on terror; through voicing these concerns, you wish to ensure that Member states will continue to send troops to your country, as part of a NATO reassurance initiative and as part of an effort to bolster EU defense.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Latvian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Latvian people.

Good luck!
As the Minister of Interior of Lithuania, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Support efforts to intensify police, justice and military cooperation at the EU level. While you are not directly or primarily affected by the terrorist threat, you welcome steps that help move the EU towards a genuine defense and security union;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area; and
- Ensure that other threats to the EU, such as external threats posed by countries to the EU’s east, are not forgotten owing to the current focus on terror; through voicing these concerns, you wish to ensure that Member states will continue to send troops to your country, as part of a NATO reassurance initiative and as part of an effort to bolster EU defense.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Lithuanian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Lithuanian people.

Good luck!
Luxembourgish Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Luxembourg, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Promote your long-held view is that security issues should be dealt by avoiding extreme measures and adopting moderate and to-the-point solutions, domestically and on the EU level. In fact, you consider the current situation as the outcome of previous debates in the EU, resulting in either extremely hardline positions, or extremely soft ones;
- Adopt anti-terrorism solutions that fully respect civil rights and liberties. Such solutions would not target only one specific group, but rather aim to reduce the radicalization of all potential terrorists. You strongly oppose curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Support, if somewhat mildly, a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access in real time information about potential terrorists. You want to make sure that such a measure does not lead to further radicalization;
- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record; however, you wish to emphasize that these are not ‘silver bullets’ which will solve the problem comprehensively and on their own;
Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, provided that the costs for this new agency are divided equally between the Member states. National intelligence services should share more information with the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA; and

Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing through EU directives harmonizing rules between Member states. In this respect, push for the implementation of anti-money laundering (AML) measures across the EU, as one way of tackling terrorism financing.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Luxembourg agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Luxembourgish people.

Good luck!
Maltese Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Malta, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Promote your long-held view is that security issues should be dealt by avoiding extreme measures and adopting moderate and to-the-point solutions, domestically and on the EU level. In fact, you consider the current situation as the outcome of previous debates in the EU, resulting in either extremely hardline positions, or extremely soft ones;
- Adopt anti-terrorism solutions that fully respect civil rights and liberties. Such solutions would not target only one specific group, but rather aim to reduce the radicalization of all potential terrorists. You strongly oppose curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Support, if somewhat mildly, a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access in real time information about potential terrorists. You want to make sure that such a measure does not lead to further radicalization;
- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record; however, you wish to emphasize that these are not ‘silver bullets’ which will solve the problem comprehensively and on their own;
Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, provided that the costs for this new agency are divided equally between the Member states. National intelligence services should share more information with the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA; and

Have EUROPOL and FRONTEX send more officials to Malta and other migration hotspots to screen those who are applying for asylum in Europe and to help secure EU’s external borders.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to our own.

Security has been one of the top items on the Maltese agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Maltese people.

Good luck!
Dutch Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of the Netherlands, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information to the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Strengthen the EU’s capacity to limit the terrorist threat by stopping the expansion of the Schengen area and the EU for a couple of years;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area; and
➤ Prevent the imposing or prolonging of the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states, since those may heavily affect your economy.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Dutch agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Dutch people.

Good luck!
Polish Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Poland, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas; It goes without saying that police should be allowed to have access, in real-time, to information about potential terrorists;
- Agree to some degree of inter-state information sharing regarding terrorists, whilst promoting your view that EUROPOL and the EU as a whole are not the best vehicles for anti-terrorism work; this challenge is better tackled by the national intelligence services;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU's external border;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Ensure that Poland preserves its sovereign right to protect its border with non-Schengen countries;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
Support the belief that security of the EU, its citizens, and its Member states should come first and civil liberties can and should be curtailed for security reasons;

Support effective measures to strictly control immigration and to end abuses of asylum policies. You believe that some of the terrorist attacks in Europe were perpetrated or inspired by illegal immigrants or individuals who abused EU’s asylum policies;

Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism. National intelligence services should share more information with the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;

Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases; and

Strongly support promulgation of a much stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Polish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Polish people.

Good luck!
Portuguese Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Portugal, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas. It goes without saying that police should be allowed to have access, in real-time, to information about potential terrorists;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism. National intelligence services should share more information with the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area;
- Raise concerns about the possible extension of the reintroductions of border controls between Member states, as you fear that those controls may affect the tourism industry in your country; and,
- Oppose increasing the current levels of security screening at EU entry gateways (airports, train stations, bus terminals, ferryboat terminals etc.) as well as opposing promulgation of a stronger version of Article 36(3) of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists as you fear that these measures may affect the tourism industry in your country.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to your own.

Security has been one of the top items on the Portuguese agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Portuguese people.

Good luck!
Romanian Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Romania, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country’s main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, while making sure that Romania's integration to the Schengen area is not compromised or postponed due to a long set of new requirements to be met. You would like the conclusions to include a reference to the need to welcome Romania in the Schengen area by next year;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly dealing with the issue of religious and ideological terrorism. National intelligence services should share more information at the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Ensure that other threats to the EU, such as external threats posed by countries to the EU’s east, are not forgotten owing to the current focus on terror; through voicing these concerns, you wish to ensure that Member states will continue to send troops to your country, as part of a NATO reassurance initiative and as part of an effort to bolster EU defense.
- Support, if somewhat mildly, a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about
potential terrorists. You want to make sure that such a measure does not lead to further radicalization; and

- Strictly control firearms and munitions throughout the European Union, modeled on the strict gun laws of your country, which are amongst the toughest in the world.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Romanian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Romanian people.

Good luck!
Slovak Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of Slovakia, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country’s main interests and ideas;
- Ensure that your country maintains as much internal authority as possible when it comes to addressing the terrorist threat; however, you would agree to more intelligence sharing between law enforcement authorities of Member states;
- Raise concerns about the temporary reintroduction of border controls between some Schengen countries, and limit any reintroductions to a strict minimum;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Preserve Slovakia’s sovereign right to protect its border with non-Schengen countries;
- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
- Support the belief that security of the EU, its citizens, and its Member states should come first and civil liberties can and should be curtailed for security reasons;
- Support effective measures to strictly control immigration and to end abuses of asylum policies. You believe that some of the terrorist attacks in Europe were perpetrated or inspired by illegal immigrants or individuals who abused EU’s asylum policies;
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks; conversely, impose bans on access to firearms on immigrants coming to the EU from specific countries; and
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing through EU directives harmonizing rules between Member states. In this respect, push for the implementation of anti-money laundering (AML) measures across the EU, as one way of tackling terrorism financing.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Slovakian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Slovakian people.

Good luck!
As the Minister of Interior of Slovenia, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country’s main interests and ideas;
- Step up security measures at the EU level, while ensuring that this doesn’t have a negative effect on the Slovenian tourism industry. In particular, you want to prevent increased controls at airports, including enhanced checks which might dissuade people from traveling to Slovenia;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach. You think that one of the ways to achieve this objective is to stop the expansion of the Schengen area and the EU for a couple of years;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area;
- Minimize the increased costs incurred at the national level owing to new arrangements for interoperability and management of databases;
- Support very high levels of security screening as well as a stronger version of Article 36(3) of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists; and,
- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record – while clarifying, that you think these projects do not go far enough in order to successfully protect Europe from terrorism. You support granting higher funding to police forces and security services, from the national governments and from the EU, in order to tackle terrorism.
Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the Slovenian agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Slovenian people.

Good luck!
Spanish Minister of Interior

As the Spanish Minister of Interior, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Create an EU Intelligence Agency, predominantly focused on religious and ideological terrorism, and promulgate a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists. National intelligence services should share more information at the EU level through this agency, which would build on the work of EUROPOL and ENISA;
- Have EUROPOL and FRONTEX send more officials to your country and to other migration hotspots, to screen those who are applying for asylum in Europe and to help secure EU's external borders;
- Emphasize the need for cooperation between the law enforcement of Member states in the protection of the EU’s external border, while preserving free movement of people within the Schengen area;
- Raise concerns about the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states, as you fear that those controls may affect the tourism industry in your country; and
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating...
employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours. Security has been one of the top items on the Spanish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Spanish people.

Good luck!
Swedish Minister of Home Affairs

As the Swedish Minister of Home Affairs, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas;
- Support the temporary reintroduction of border controls between Member states (for those willing to do so), for the duration of the terrorist threat and the migration crisis; these controls can be relaxed or removed once the degree of police cooperation between Member states improves significantly;
- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. Those measures include the tightening screening procedures by allowing authorities to run background checks and access personal information on foreign nationals seeking to enter the EU, and the potential deportation of foreign residents suspected of promoting or supporting terrorist groups and ideas;
- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you want to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications;
- Support the belief that civil rights and liberties should not be compromised in the fight against terrorists. You strongly oppose curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating
employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;

- Strongly support the belief that EU Member states’ police and security services should share information on potential terrorists through existing EU institutions such as EUROPOL.
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours. Security has been one of the top items on the Swedish agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith on you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the Swedish people.

Good luck!
British Minister of Interior

As the Minister of Interior of UK, representing your country in the Council of the European Union, your objectives are to:

- Represent your country in the upcoming Council of the European Union, which is expected to shape EU domestic security policies for decades to come. As such, your main goal is to influence the outcome of the process in a way that reflects most, if not all, of your country's main interests and ideas; and

- Address the terrorist threat in a heavy-handed security approach, by stepping up efforts to eradicate this threat in Europe. You favor a strictly intergovernmental system, and want to make sure that the arrangements in place can continue after the withdrawal of the UK from the EU. Maintaining close cooperation between the British law enforcement and Europol will remain a strong priority.

- With the UK's opt-out from justice and home affairs\(^{39}\), there is only a limited range of measures which you would like the EU to take. You do think, however, that the EU should reinforce its mechanisms to address the terrorist threat and are ready to share more intelligence with other Member States. You would also like to suggest an intergovernmental treaty specifically dealing with police and justice cooperation to address the terrorist threat, and oppose the creation of an EU Intelligence Agency.

Although it is hard to predict where each Member state stands, you know that EU members vary significantly, both on how they perceive the situation and regarding the methods they prefer for resolving the problems. This means, on the one hand, that this will be a very challenging and complicated negotiation. On the other hand, the situation will provide you with the opportunity to form alliances with those EU members that hold views and ideas similar to that of yours.

Security has been one of the top items on the UK agenda, and an issue that the public follows quite closely. Your country and your government have faith in you, and believe that you will manage to protect the interests of the British people.

Good luck!
4(c). Private Role Information (European Parliament)

In addition to the General Background Information, each individual participant-representative should receive their private role information. Make sure that each participant receives a copy of the General Background Information and the private role information sheet, based on the country-representation role assigned to them.
Private Information for Member of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats in Europe (ALDE) in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee of the European Parliament

You are a member of the ALDE Party in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Maintain a good balance between privacy and capacity to investigate terrorist threats; you want to preserve a large measure of data privacy for your citizens and are concerned about the risks posed to this by mechanisms for controlling online content, monitoring financial flows, and screening digital communications;
- Support security measures in an overall sense, while also ensuring democratic oversight of all anti-terrorism measures at both the national and European levels;
- Take very strong measures against terrorist organizations;
- Support open borders within Schengen, whilst still supporting regular stop-and-search missions and even establishing check-points if specific threats are identified at internal EU/Schengen borders (e.g.: between Spain and France);
- Support the creation of a full-fledged European Intelligence Service, with responsibilities similar to those of the FBI in the U.S.;
- Promote the view that terrorism must be tackled at the EU level, rather than at the national level;
- Promote the establishing of a European Public Prosecutor Office with responsibilities for investigating terrorists;
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU;
- Impose stricter monitoring of terrorism financing through EU directives that will harmonize these rules across Member states;
- Support the view that the monitoring of the firearms trade and the financing of terrorism should be paid for by the European Union; to this end, you are willing to work with the European Commissioners to find the necessary support in the EP and the Council of the EU;
• Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland. You want to see clear, “heavy-handed,” criterion created and implemented by EU agencies for handling such foreign fighters;

• Support very high levels of security screening as well as a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, to information about potential terrorists; and,

• Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record. You strongly support providing adequate funding for the newly suggested European Intelligence Service, for EUROPOL, and for FRONTEX, in order to combat terrorism.
Private Information for Member of the European People’s Party in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee of the European Parliament

You are a member of the European People’s Party in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
- Support open borders within Schengen, whilst still supporting regular stop-and-search missions and even establishing check-points if specific threats are identified at internal EU/Schengen borders (e.g.: between Spain and France);
- Support security measures in an overall sense, while also ensuring democratic oversight of all anti-terrorism measures at both the national and European levels;
- Agree to some degree of inter-state information sharing regarding terrorists, whilst promoting the opinion held by MEPs from your own party and other European parties closely affiliated with your views, that EUROPOL or some other form of a ‘European FBI’ are not the best vehicles for anti-terrorism work; this challenge is better tackled by the national intelligence services;
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU;
- Impose stricter monitoring of terrorism financing through EU directives that will harmonize these rules across Member states;
- Support the view that the monitoring of the firearms trade and the financing of terrorism should be paid for by EU Member states;
- Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland. You want to see clear, “heavy-handed,” criterion created and implemented by EU agencies for handling such foreign fighters;
• Support very high levels of security screening as well as a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, to information about potential terrorists; and,

• Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record. You strongly support providing adequate funding for the newly suggested European Intelligence Service, for EUROPOL, and for FRONTEX, in order to combat terrorism.
Private Information for Member of the Europe of Nations and Freedom in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee of the European Parliament

You are a member of the Europe of Nations and Freedom Party (ENL) in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Support the security of your constituencies; if civil rights and liberties need to be adjusted, it is all for a greater cause – the survival of your country’s identity. Civil rights and liberties should only apply to your own citizens;
- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
- Assign blame to individuals arriving in Europe as part of the recent waves of migration for the current wave of terrorist attacks sweeping throughout the European Union;
- Promote the view that the European Union and state governments have not been effective in tackling the terrorist threat; propose that neighborhood patrols of vigilantes should take matters into their own hands in order to save lives;
- Oppose legislation curtailing access to firearms for citizens of EU Member states, denying them the ability to defend themselves in cases of terrorist attacks; conversely, impose bans on access to firearms on immigrants coming to the EU from specific countries;
- Re-implement Schengen border controls, in order to stop the free movement of immigrants throughout the EU;
- Agree to some degree of inter-state information sharing regarding terrorists, whilst reiterating the opinion held by MEPs from your own party and other European parties closely affiliated with your views, that EUROPOL or some other form of a ‘European FBI’ are not the best vehicles for anti-terrorism work; this challenge is better tackled by the national intelligence services;
- Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland. You want to
see clear, “heavy-handed,” criterion created and implemented by EU agencies for handling such foreign fighters; this rule would include, in your view, revoking the passport and citizenship of any EU citizen proven to have gone to fight in a civil war in the Middle East and North Africa;

- Support very high levels of security screening as well as a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, to information about potential terrorists; and,

- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record, whilst stressing that you think that these projects do not go far enough in order to successfully protect Europe from the threats posed by terrorism. Police forces and security services should receive adequate funds from the national governments and from the EU to tackle terrorism.
Private Information for Member of the European Conservatives and Reformists Party in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee of the European Parliament

You are a member of the European Conservatives and Reformists Party in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Promote a very high level of security through allowing intrusive surveillance of potential terrorists;
- Support effective measures to strictly control immigration and to end abuses of asylum policies. You believe that some of the terrorist attacks in Europe were perpetrated or inspired by illegal immigrants or individuals who abused EU’s asylum policies;
- Establish regular check-points near the borders to search for possible terrorists/foreign fighters/potentially dangerous illegal immigrants, when specific threats are identified at internal EU/Schengen borders;
- Voice and promote the worldview that security of the EU, its citizens, and its Member states should also come first and civil liberties can and should be curtailed for security reasons;
- Agree to some degree of inter-state information sharing regarding terrorists, whilst promoting the opinion held by MEPs from your own party and other European parties closely affiliated with your views, that EUROPOL or some other form of a ‘European FBI’ are not the best vehicles for anti-terrorism work; this challenge is better tackled by the national intelligence services;
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU;
- Support stricter monitoring of terrorism financing, so long as the financial monitoring rules do not impede the work of banks and financial institutions.
- Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland;
- Support increasing the current levels of security screening at EU entry gateways (airports, train stations, bus terminals, ferryboat terminals etc.) as well as supporting promulgation
of a stronger version of Article 36(3) of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists as you fear that these measures may affect the tourism industry in your country.

- Support implementing measures under which all people entering and leaving the EU must be checked “systematically” against security databases as all EU gateways;
- Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record; and
- Promote the provision of adequate funding for police and security services.
Private Information for Member of the European United Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Committee of the European Parliament

You are a member of the European Green Left/Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Voice and promote the worldview that by adopting tough security measures which curtail civil liberties, rights, and the democratic rule of law, countries only satisfy the goals of the terrorist organizations;
- Prevent a situation in which the effects of terror threaten to tear apart or otherwise comprehensively threaten a pluralistic and tolerant European Union;
- Adopt anti-terrorism solutions that fully respect civil rights and liberties. Such solutions would not target only one specific group, but rather aim to reduce the radicalization of all potential terrorists. You strongly oppose curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;
- Protect the right to privacy, the protection of data, and not to label vague concepts of “intention” or “suspicion” of potential terrorism activity as actual crimes (e.g.: reading radicalized literature or joining social media sites promoting radicalized materials);
- Invest money, time and effort in community-based initiatives to combat poverty, employment opportunities, social integration of minority groups, and promotion of human rights;
- Support open borders within Schengen;
- Support the sharing of information on potential terrorists between EU Member states’ police and security services, but not through EUROPOL;
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU;
- Impose strict monitoring of terrorism financing as well as heavy sanctions for non-complying banks and financial institutions;
• Ensure that the costs associated with monitoring firearms and financing of terrorism do not come at the cost of social programs which provide skills and social integration as a mechanism to prevent radicalization;

• Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland. Implementing social programs for de-radicalization and integration within their communities, in a peaceful way, are quintessential in your opinion. Such programs should also be created in prisons, which are known to be breeding grounds for radicalization;

• Oppose a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists – given that this comes at the cost of infringing on individuals’ civil liberties; and,

• Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record, whilst stressing that these are not solutions to the terrorism problem; terrorism is a societal problem which must be fought using social programs.
You are a member of the Socialists and Democrats (S&D) in the Civil Liberties, Justice, and Home Affairs Commission of the European Parliament. Your objectives are to:

- Voice and promote the worldview that terrorist attacks are crimes, first and foremost, and that such crimes must not be allowed to pull apart or otherwise challenge the pluralistic and tolerant European Union;
- Implement anti-terrorism solutions that are not targeted at only one specific group, but rather that aim to reduce the radicalization of all potential terrorists;
- Raise support for the notion that combatting terrorism must include positive steps addressing the root causes which allow terrorism to grow, both in the poorer neighborhoods of European cities and in 3rd countries: combatting poverty, creating employment opportunities, promoting social integration of minority groups, advancing human rights and pursuing the resolution of conflict;
- Strongly support open borders within Schengen;
- Support the belief that civil rights and liberties should not be compromised in the fight against terrorists. You are very much opposed to curtailing democratic oversight for anti-terrorism activities;
- Strongly support the sharing of information on potential terrorists between EU Member states’ police and security services using EU institutions such as EUROPOL;
- Limit the purchase and sale of firearms throughout the EU;
- Impose stricter monitoring of terrorism financing and as well as heavier sanctions for non-complying banks and financial institutions;
- Ensure that the costs associated with monitoring firearms and financing of terrorism do not come at the cost of social programs which provide skills and social integration as a mechanism to prevent radicalization;
• Raise concerns about the threat posed by “foreign fighters/terrorists” smuggled into the EU to provoke terrorist attacks. Many of these are EU citizens who went to foreign conflict zones – e.g. Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya - and you worry that, having returned home, they now intend to engage in terror against their European homeland. Implementing social programs for de-radicalization and integration within their communities, in a peaceful way, are quintessential in your opinion. Such programs should also be created in prisons, which are known to be breeding grounds for radicalization;

• Support, if somewhat mildly, a stronger version of Article 36 of the Council decision 2007/533/JHA on the second generation of the Schengen Information System which allows border control officers and policemen to access, in real-time, information about potential terrorists; and

• Support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record; however, you wish to emphasize that these are not ‘silver bullets’ which will solve the terrorism problem comprehensively and on their own;
4(d). Private Role Information (European Commission Representatives)

In addition to the General Background Information, each individual representing the European Commission should receive their private role information. Make sure that each participant receives a copy of the General Background Information and the private role information sheet, based on the role assigned to them.
Private Information for the European Commissioner for Home Affairs

You are the European Commissioner for Home Affairs. Your role as the representative of the Commission is:

- To protect the European Union as a whole, whilst ensuring that the voices of the Member states and citizens are heard, and their interests respected, within the larger framework of the EU.
- To facilitate dialogue, whilst reminding the Member states of the common European integration project which should not be endangered by the differences of opinion about how to best tackle the terrorism crisis.
- To work closely with the leaders of the parties in the European Parliament, and with the member-state holding the rotating presidency of the European Union in the Council of the EU, to facilitate discussions leading to commonly agreed-upon solution, whilst pushing for adoption of an overall EU approach rather than a patchwork of individual Member states’ approaches to the challenges they all face.
- To push for your own interests, which would allow for new, or existent, European agencies such as EUROPOL to be at the forefront of the fight against terrorism,
- To support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record.
- To strongly opposed the dismantling, or even temporary suspending, of any European integration achievement such as the Schengen Treaty.
- To ensure that both security and civil rights and liberties are respected, for as long as the EU integration process continues.
- To ensure that all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion or culture, feel welcome in the EU, in adherence to the goals of the European Union regarding “unity in diversity”, tolerance, democracy, respect for human rights, and rule of law.

You can promote these goals through setting the agenda towards issues that would end up benefiting you, or through steering the conversations in such directions. However, remember
that you are supposed to be an honest broker, an impartial mediator, between the Council of the European Union and the European Parliament.

Begin the legislative process with a plenary session in each meeting, with all the stakeholders present. It is your responsibility to draft and introduce the anti-terrorism legislation which will be debated and revised in both the Council of the EU and the European Parliament. After introducing the legislation in each institution, your role is to facilitate dialogue in each (in the Council of the EU, the Member state representative holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU chairs the meeting- your role in this institution is to support the chair; in the European Parliament, you are the chair of the meeting, for the purposes of this exercise). If both institutions come to separately agreed-upon language for anti-terrorism legislation, your next role is to then mediate a meeting of the Conciliation Committee, in which representatives of the two institutions meet to jointly create a commonly agreed anti-terrorism legislative text. Keep in mind, that this final negotiation is between the Council and the Parliament and it is your job as the mediator to figure out the best format for conducting it, with the aim of bringing participants’ views closer to each other. The format of the meeting is expected to be fluid; you may need to change it, mid-negotiation, to keep parties on a constructive track. You will have a team of commissioners who will observe all these meetings occurring, and help you co-mEDIATE them.
Private Information for the Director General Assisting the European Commissioner for Home Affairs

You are the Director General assisting the European Commissioner for Home Affairs. Your role as the representative of the Commission is:

- To assist the European Commissioner for Home Affairs in their responsibilities in the various meetings (assisting them to introduce the draft legislation to the EU institutions; assisting them to chair and facilitate discussion in the appropriate EU institutions; assisting them to mediate in the Conciliation Committee).
- To protect the European Union as a whole, whilst ensuring that the voices of the Member states and citizens are heard, and their interests respected, within the larger framework of the EU.
- To facilitate dialogue, whilst reminding the Member states of the common European integration project which should not be endangered by the differences of opinion about how to best tackle the terrorism crisis.
- To work closely with the leaders of the parties in the European Parliament, and with the member-state holding the rotating presidency of the European Union in the Council of the EU, to facilitate discussions leading to commonly agreed-upon solution, whilst pushing for adoption of an overall EU approach rather than a patchwork of individual Member states’ approaches to the challenges they all face.
- To push for your own interests, which would allow for new, or existent, European agencies such as EUROPOL to be at the forefront of the fight against terrorism,
- To support the Passenger Name Record, the European Finger Print Dataset, and the European Criminal Record.
- To strongly opposed the dismantling, or even temporarily suspending, of any European integration achievement such as the Schengen Treaty.
- To ensure that both security and civil rights and liberties are respected, for as long as the EU integration process continues.
• To ensure that all people, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion or culture, feel welcome in the EU, in adherence to the goals of the European Union regarding “unity in diversity”, tolerance, democracy, respect for human rights, and rule of law.

Begin the legislative process with a plenary session in each meeting, with all the stakeholders present. It is your responsibility to draft and introduce the anti-terrorism legislation which will be debated and revised in both the Council of the EU and the European Parliament. After introducing the legislation in each institution, your role is to facilitate dialogue in each (in the Council of the EU, the Member state representative holding the rotating Presidency of the Council of the EU chairs the meeting- your role in this institution is to support the chair; in the European Parliament, you are the chair of the meeting, for the purposes of this exercise). If both institutions come to separately agreed-upon language for anti-terrorism legislation, your next role is to then mediate a meeting of the Conciliation Committee, in which representatives of the two institutions meet to jointly create a commonly agreed anti-terrorism legislative text. Keep in mind, that this final negotiation is between the Council and the Parliament and it is your job as the mediator to figure out the best format for conducting it, with the aim of bringing participants’ views closer to each other. The format of the meeting is expected to be fluid; you may need to change it, mid-negotiation, to keep parties on a constructive track. You will work closely with the European Commissioner for Home Affairs, whom you will help by observing the meetings as they play out and by co-mediating as necessary.