European Council

STUDY GUIDE

1.The Impact of Recent United States Policy Changes on the European Union.

2.Evaluating the Effectiveness of the European Union's Green Policies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. LETTER FROM THE CHAIR BOARD 3
2. INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE 4
3. HISTORICAL BACKROUND 5
4. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS 7
5. CASE STUDIES 14
6. GUIDING QUESTIONS 27
7. PREPARATION GUIDE 28
8. RESEARCH GUIDE 34
9. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING 36

1. LETTER FORM THE CHAIRBOARD

Hello there, we are absolutely delighted to be your EC chairs at JASMUN 2026. We have been working tirelessly to deliver a truly exquisite study guide for you all so that you can have an amazing and professional experience at JASMUN. With that we would like to sincerely thank the JASMUN secretariat for granting us this prestigious opportunity to be your chairs.

This study guide, which you are reading right now, has been crafted by us with you, the Ambassadors in mind. Through many long calls and meetups we have consulted and written the study guide in order for you to have the most fun MUN experience yet, so that the debates not only fluster with knowledge about the topic, but also with passion for public speaking.

With that being said we are delighted to present the magnificent Study Guide to you, we hope that you enjoy reading this piece of art and we will be waiting to see your amazing performance in our lovely committee. Remember that this document shall not be the entire preparation for this conference but rather only the foundation of it.

Lastly we would like to welcome you to communicate with us via messenger if the need arises. We are fully open to help with each and every issue you come with during the research and preparation for the conference. It is important to remember that we are always open to helping you with any matter! We wish you a smooth preparation for JASMUN and a blooming read of the Study Guide.

See you all in Warsaw,

Magda and Piotrek.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE COMMITTEE

The European Council gathers the heads of state or government of EU Member States. It defines the Union's overall political direction. The European Council, while not so much a legislative body in the strict sense, is a document containing non-binding suggestions agreed upon by every Member. Its conclusions shape all future EU laws and negotiations, serving as guidelines for EU actions and combining Member States' stances.

In a Model UN context, this council works as a high-level political arena. Delegates represent their member states' leaders and must defend national interests while working toward a shared EU compromise.

Since JASMUN is a THIMUN style debate, the absolutely most important thing is the solutions, how would you solve the topic. Our advice is to have at least 5 solutions for each topic prepared beforehand, and preferably even more. They don't need to be written down or explained in any way. They need to be solutions that your country and the EU in general supports, and have an actual possibility of combatting the issue. In this study guide we will give you some aid by highlighting some parts which are in a significant need of solutions, but the rest is your Job. Throughout the reading of this Study Guide, do your best to try to spot an issue, and think of it, how would you solve it if you could do anything, does your country policy align with it (if not modify your solution), and then whether the EU policy aligns (once again if not then modify it). We will repeat it again, this is crucial not only for the work of the committee but also if you are aiming to get an award (which we assume all of you are).

3. HISTORICAL BACKROUND

Topic 1 - The Impact of Recent United States Policy Changes on the European Union.

Since the topic talks about “recent” changes, this part will be fairly brief, so please try to read the whole thing as it was made specifically for you and it can also ensure that since the topic is fairly broad, all delegates have at least the same foundation of knowledge.

The first official step in the EU-US relations was marked in 1990 with the Transatlantic declaration. It established bi-annual diplomatic summits and economic consultations between the US and the EU. This relationship was further expanded in 1995 under the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA). This framework created the core pillars of the EU-US relationship. It proclaimed joint action in areas such as free trade, democratic promotion and global security. The relationship grew with every year, so much so that in between 2013 and 2016 the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations were held. The goal was to completely eliminate tariffs and combat regulatory frictions, yet the negotiations were many times stalled due to the diversion in policies and completely terminated after Donald Trump first took office in 2017.

2016 marked a turning point in the EU-US relationship, for the first time in decades the relationship was worsening. Marked by the 2017 withdrawal of the US from the Paris Agreement. The relationship was further tainted when the Trump administration imposed 25% tariffs on steel and 10% tariffs on aluminium, justifying it as matters of national security, to which the EU responded with retaliatory tariffs on 2.8 billion $ worth of iconic US goods such as bourbon or motorcycles. The tariff conflict continued, in 2019 the WTO authorized a 7.5 billion $ retaliatory tariff on airbus subsidies, to which the EU responded with a 4 billion $ tariff on US goods (This conflict is way more complex than what we described, for those interested we recommend looking up Airbus-Boeing Dispute).

The situation turned around in 2021 when the Biden administration launched the Trade and Technology Council (TTC) with the EU. The council's task was to align

digital standards, secure supply chains and coordinate export control policies. The relationship was further smoothed in June 2021, when both sides agreed to a 5-year suspension of the Airbus-Boeing tariffs. In October, they settled another agreement under which US replaced the steel/aluminium tariffs with the Tariff-Rate quota system. Under the Biden administration, the relationship remained healthy, with minor clashes such as the 2022 Chips and Science act in the US which invested over 50 billion in semiconductor production, to which the EU had to respond with its own EU Chips act to prevent investors from choosing the US over Europe. Later in 2023 the EU introduced the Green Deal Industrial Plan which lightened the state aid rule to counter the US subsidy incentives (the US was financing green energy initiatives in the US and the EU started doing it too, once again to attract investors.

Nevertheless, in January 2025, after the inauguration of Donald Trump, the tariff threat rose once again, yet more on that in the recent developments section of this study guide.

Topic 2 - Evaluating the Effectiveness of the European Union's Green Policies.

The historical background of the EU green policies reveals a strong progression from voluntary, non-binding targets to legally enforced requirements.

The first frameworks regarding green policies began surfacing around 1990, yet none of them were enforceable but rather voluntary targets, to which each country could choose whether to adhere to. However, the first binding targets came soon after in 1997, under the Kyoto Protocol. The EU-15 committed to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 8% compared to the 1990 levels. A goal which they fully achieved by lowering their emissions by 11.7%, partly due to the industrial restructuring and fuel shifts in major powers such as Germany or the UK. The next step came in 2005, when the EU Emission Trading System (ETS) was launched. It capped emissions from power generation, heavy industry, and aviation. However, the implementation wasn't perfect, the industry suffered from over-allocation of free allowances, causing carbon prices to collapse to near €0.

Another major step was in 2008 when the '20-20-20' Climate and Energy package was introduced. These 3 numbers aimed for the EU to achieve: 20% Green House Gases (later referred to as the GHG) reduction below 1990 levels, 20% share of

renewables in final energy consumption, and a 20% improvement in energy efficiency, by 2020. In 2014, the GHG reduction goals were further developed aiming for a 40% reduction below 1990 levels by 2030. In 2019, EU's Market Stability Reserve (MSR) began operating, which successfully revived the ETS and drastically raised carbon prices from 10 euros/ton from 2017 to over 80 euros in 2022. It also increased the renewable energy targets to 32% in 2030.

In 2020, the first major evaluation year came, where the EU had to assess whether they achieved their ambitious targets. Fortunately, the EU confirmed that it had over achieved its targets by successfully reducing its GHG emissions by 31% compared to 1990 and the renewable energy production share reached 22.1%. Following that success, in 2021, the EU decided to raise its 2030 GHG emission reduction targets to 55% less than the 1990 levels. A much needed change in order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2050. In 2022, the Russian invasion of Ukraine forced the EU to act on the Energy front, in order to decrease its dependence on Russia but at the same time accelerate its green energy transformation, to do that it launched the REPowerEU Plan, that aimed to accelerate renewable deployment, energy efficiency, and LNG diversification. In 2024 the European Commission formally proposed a 90% GHG net reduction target for 2040. Shortly after the EU has released its progress evaluation showing a huge drop in GHG emissions, demonstrating that the levels dropped by 37% since 1990, while the EU GDP increased by 68% over the same period of time.

Interestingly the transportation sector remained one of the few sectors where emissions remained higher than 1990 levels through 2023 due to increased traffic volumes. Fleet CO2 standards accelerated Electric Vehicle (EV) adoption, but heavy-duty transport and aviation remained severely off-track, prompting the creation of ETS 2 which is currently scheduled to be fully operational in 2028.

4. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Topic 1 - The Impact of Recent United States Policy Changes on the European Union.

The topic we are addressing is huge, it's the change of the whole transatlantic relationship. Moreover, it's the contrast of two periods, the late Biden administration

and the Trump administration, starting January 2025.

The Biden administration can be characterized by being broadly cooperative on Ukraine, NATO, climate, technology and economic security, although there were already disputes over U.S. subsidies and EU regulation. While the Trump administration is much more transactional and protectionist, with major consequences for EU trade, defence, Ukraine policy, energy, climate policy, technology and forces the EU's push for "strategic autonomy".

Under Biden the U.S. have treated the EU and NATO as core partners and have heavily invested into collective defence, support for Ukraine, coordination against Russia, cooperation on technology, climate policy and rebuilding transatlantic alliances. While the Trump administration is completely different, following the 'America First' agenda. It reduced the U.S obligations to other countries and organizations, it demanded higher EU defence spending, it began many trade wars and fought for greater U.S. control over strategic industries.

The first topic we will address is the Media Famous Tariffs. Just a month after Trump took office, he implemented a 25% tariff on steel and aluminium, which he increased on June 4th to another 50%. In the meanwhile he removed every exemption the EU had negotiated with the previous administrations. This has resulted in lower EU exports to America and reduced profitability for European producers. It also strongly weakened the EU - U.S. relationship by starting an unofficial 'trade war'.

This trade war was also demonstrated during the introduction of the "reciprocal tariffs". On April 2nd 2025, Trump's administration introduced huge general tariffs, under the argument that America's trading partners were not treating the United States fairly. This has impacted the EU enormously as the EU exports huge quantities of: cars, machinery, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, industrial equipment, luxury products, food and aerospace products to the United States. While many economists argued that the tariffs would impact majorly the United States, the economic shock brought by them has had catastrophic impact on the EU, with some projections implying that it has reduced the EU GDP growth by 0.7 percent

and the Trump administration, starting January 2025.
The Biden administration can be characterized by being broadly cooperative on Ukraine, NATO, climate, technology and economic security, although there were already disputes over U.S. subsidies and EU regulation. While the Trump administration is much more transactional and protectionist, with major consequences for EU trade, defence, Ukraine policy, energy, climate policy, technology and forces the EU's push for "strategic autonomy".

Under Biden the U.S. have treated the EU and NATO as core partners and have heavily invested into collective defence, support for Ukraine, coordination against Russia, cooperation on technology, climate policy and rebuilding transatlantic alliances. While the Trump administration is completely different, following the 'America First' agenda. It reduced the U.S obligations to other countries and organizations, it demanded higher EU defence spending, it began many trade wars and fought for greater U.S. control over strategic industries.

The first topic we will address is the Media Famous Tariffs. Just a month after Trump took office, he implemented a 25% tariff on steel and aluminium, which he increased on June 4th to another 50%. In the meanwhile he removed every exemption the EU had negotiated with the previous administrations. This has resulted in lower EU exports to America and reduced profitability for European producers. It also strongly weakened the EU - U.S. relationship by starting an unofficial 'trade war'.

This trade war was also demonstrated during the introduction of the "reciprocal tariffs". On April 2nd 2025, Trump's administration introduced huge general tariffs, under the argument that America's trading partners were not treating the United States fairly. This has impacted the EU enormously as the EU exports huge quantities of: cars, machinery, pharmaceuticals, chemicals, industrial equipment, luxury products, food and aerospace products to the United States. While many economists argued that the tariffs would impact majorly the United States, the economic shock brought by them has had catastrophic impact on the EU, with some projections implying that it has reduced the EU GDP growth by 0.7 percent
in some industries such as energy production are already making small profit margins. Introduction of further competition could put those industries under so much pressure that some of them could fail completely. While this may seem like the EU is looking for problems,

(retaliatory measures were the main response to the U.S. tariffs), their indefinite suspension meant that the EU hoped not to have to use them again and served as an incentive for Washington to honour its own commitment. This move worked as until now there haven't been any major challenges since.

Now continuing on the tariff front, it is important to take into consideration the indirect effect of the U.S.'s increasing tariffs on China. You might be wondering why that is a problem, but in reality this has a significant impact on the EU. The U.S. has implemented much higher tariffs on China, which results in Chinese manufacturers finding it harder to sell their products in America, which makes the European market way more attractive. While this may seem good but in reality this brings huge competition for the EU producers, which in some industries such as energy production are already making small profit margins. Introduction of further competition could put those industries under so much pressure that some of them could fail completely. While this may seem like the EU is looking for problems, the EU imports from China increased from 20.8% to 22.1% of their total imports.
Once again this may seem like not much, but in reality it is a lot.

The next aspect that must be addressed is the defence spending. Trump has many times mentioned that it is thanks to him that NATO spending increased, which is simply not true. In 2024, the EU defence spending rose by over 15%,
23 NATO members were expected to reach at least 2% of GDP, while
European NATO members collectively reached approximately 2% of GDP. Mostly caused by Russia's invasion of Ukraine, however Trump has dramatically increased the political pressure behind the military spending, forcing some rushed steps.

However the NATO summit in June 2025, has greatly increased military spending, from the targeted 2% to 5%, with 3.5% on core defence and 1.5% on broader security including infrastructure, cyber, civil preparedness and defense-industrial capacity. While this had a very positive effect on the defense industry, the violently increased spending put pressure on national budgets and increased government-borrowing. Finally many trade-offs have to be made, for example healthcare, to achieve the ambitious targets. It is important to remember that the increased pressure, caused the creation of many programs such as the SAFE program, and generally increased the EU military spending and military cooperation.

Summit declaration, good for further reading:
The Hague Summit Declaration | NATO Official text

Focusing now on Ukraine, between February 2022 and January 2025, the U.S. military assistance totaled around 66 billion $, however as soon as Trump came into office, the goal drastically shifted towards ending the war, negotiations, burden-sharing by Europe, reducing the U.S. role and extracting economic returns from Ukraine. This forces the EU to contribute even more than before. Until now the EU assistance to Ukraine totaled around 220 billion €, with almost 90 billion € for the Ukrainian armed forces, and the rest in financial and humanitarian support.

The next part works very closely with our second topic, and it is the green policies. A few days after taking office, Trump began to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement. It also reversed many clean-energy policies introduced during the Biden era. After that the EU remained as one of the sole advocates for the Paris Agreement, emissions reduction and green energy. It also had to face many challenges with manufacturing green technologies after the U.S. practically abandoned the goal. The impact was huge but it is also explained below, so we will not repeat it here.

The last topic which we want to address here is information sharing and technology sharing. Under Biden the EU and the United States cooperated closely, intelligence sharing was common and the alliance was getting stronger. Trump decided that the United States was not getting a fair share and decided to terminate many intelligence sharing programs and generally lowered the cooperation. All this forced the EU to become more independent, which some say is a great thing, but at the same time it demanded more spending that could have been allocated elsewhere.

Topic 2 - Evaluating the Effectiveness of the European Union's Green Policies.

Picking up where the Historical Background left off is in February 2024, when the European Commission published a communication setting out its recommendation for a 90% GHG reduction target by 2040. In July 2025 the Commission proposed a formal amendment to

the European Climate Law, initially permitting up to 3% (later raised up to 5%) of net emissions reductions to be met via international carbon credits under Article 6 of the Paris Agreement, from 2036 onward. Parliament formally backed the deal in February 2026, and the Council gave final approval in March 2026, officially writing the 90% target with the requirement that at least 85 percentage points of the reduction must be achieved within the EU.

This was a significant step as right now the GHG emissions are only 40% lower than the 1990 benchmark. This means that in order to achieve the goal the EU would need to reduce its GHG emissions by an additional 50% by 2040 which at the current pace may seem impossible, as the current predictions hover at around a 70% reduction instead of 90%. To dive deeper into this topic, we strongly recommend this website as it is filled with data and graphs to help visualize it, it was one of the main sources of this Study Guide:

Total net greenhouse gas emission trends and projections in Europe | Indicators | European Environment Agency (EEA)

Moving away from the goals and rather focusing on how the EU plans to achieve them, we have to go back to February 2025 when the Clean Industrial Deal was launched. Its goal was to combine decarbonization with industrial protectionism, thus lowering energy costs. The idea was very broad, it included initiatives regarding: affordable energy, clean energy supply, public and private investments,access to materials and resources, global markets and international partnerships and many more.

This is incredibly important as THIMUN style debating relies on proposing solutions, and everything that we have just listed, is a possible solution that you can expand on. That really should be your main goal while reading this study guide, we describe issues the EU is facing and some measures they have been taking. It's your task now to analyse them, and think about more stuff that has to be done, or what you think should be changed about the things that were done already. To help you with that, here is the link that outline specifically every initiative that was part of the clean industrial deal. In our description we have only mentioned the broad sectors, here you have specific legislations that you can use as inspiration.

Carriages preview | Legislative Train Schedule

To aid the green transformation, in 2025 the EU updated the State Aid frameworks that Allowed its members to directly subsidize green transition technologies (this means to basically give grants or other forms of state resources). This is another aspect you should focus on, whether the EU

member states should finance private investments into green technologies and to what extent.

The next thing that the EU has done to continue its climate policy is the Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism (CBAM) implementation between 2023 and 2026. To understand this mechanism we have to take into account the Emissions trading system which we outlined beforehand, which meant that if a company in the EU produces for ex. steel, it has to pay for its CO2 emissions. However companies outside the EU were not bound by the same laws which resulted in import prices being way lower than the production itself. This has been so common that many companies were deliberately starting production outside of the EU, not only producing GHG but also weakening the EU economy. CBAM made it so that goods such as: Steel, Aluminium, Cement, Fertilizers, Electricity, Hydrogen and many more had to pay a carbon price depending on their emissions. Until 2025, importers only had to report their emissions, with no costs attached. Starting in 2026, financial obligations began. Importers now have to pay for the emissions in the goods they bring into the EU. However, free ETS allowances for EU manufacturers are being phased out, since CBAM is meant to take over the protective role.

In 2024 the ETS 2 program also began its rollout, it worked in the same way as the original ETS but it expanded it to road transport, real estate and other smaller industrial heating. When it comes to real estate heating it's important to remember that it is not the homeowners bound to buying allowances but the distributors and suppliers, who can avoid paying them by providing green alternatives. The EU simultaneously increased its support for green alternatives in this sector. The overall goal was to increase prices of fossil fuels due to the allowances and decrease prices of renewable energy due to grants to further promote the transformation.

At the same time the EU decided to address a different side of the issue, which was the ecosystem damage. Under the Nature Restoration Law, the EU committed to not only protecting the existing ecosystems but also restoring the damaged ones. The goal was to put restoration measures in place for at least 20% of EU damaged land areas by 2030, and successfully completing the restoration by 2050. The program includes restoring: wetlands, rivers, forests, marine habitats and many more.

The next two Acts that the EU has created is the Net-Zero Industry Act and the Critical Raw Materials Act. In order to achieve its goals, the EU is in need of a massive amount of

batteries, solar panels, wind turbines, heat pumps, electrolysers, grids and critical minerals. All of which for now the EU is mostly importing, which in the long term is not a viable option, therefore the EU passed an act which supports making clean technology in Europe. Nevertheless, the EU itself does not have a big enough supply of some materials needed to produce these items within its own borders. Therefore it passed the critical Raw Materials act, which supported diversification of import sources, increased extraction and recycling of materials such as: lithium, cobalt, nickel, copper and other rare elements.

One aspect that the EU tried to address but hasn't yet found a suitable solution was the Agriculture reform. In the past the EU tried to pass the Sustainable Use of Pesticides Regulation (SUR), but after strong political opposition and protests from farmers, they backed out of the idea. Since then the EU has undertaken dialogue with groups of farmers, agricultural organisations, environmental groups, food producers, researchers and other stakeholders. The farmers keep complaining that they are forced to meet increasingly strict environmental requirements, while costs are rising and their income remains under pressure. The goal is to reach a broad consensus, which the EU is looking to reach with the farmers, in order to reach its environmental goals while maintaining a healthy relationship with the farmers.

5. CASE STUDIES

Since the two topics are very broad, and there are two of them, we will not be able to cover all the information on all aspects of the topics in the case studies. That is why we picked the aspects that are most relevant to each country, and went into a bit more detail in each of them, to attempt to guide you through the topic and point the direction in which your country should look for solutions.

Australia

The relationship between Austria and the U.S. can be characterized as very strong. Back in 2024, it was its second largest export destination, equal to around 16 billion Euros, and equivalent to 8.5% of Austria's total exports. Moreover, while Austria's exports fell in 2024, its exports to the U.S increased by 10%.

Majority of those exports included machinery, pharmaceuticals and vehicles. As Austria follows the EU trade policy it cannot negotiate with the U.S. independently, however it's deeply affected by it. A hypothetical 25% tariff could lower the potential GDP by around 0.65% across 2025-2026. Additionally Austria's direct investment in the U.S. reached 25 billion $ in 2024. It is clear that Austria is heavily affected by the U.S. foreign policy and it is dependent on its exports there, therefore it's in its interest to avoid escalation and maintain predictable trade.

When it comes to green policies, Austria's targets are even more ambitious than the EU. They aim for climate neutrality by 2040 (10 years earlier than the EU). It also aims for 100% renewable electricity by 2030, to do that it plans to install 11 TWH of solar power, 10 TWH of wind power, 5 TWH of hydropower and 11 TWH biomass. These goals are extremely ambitious, but in 2023 alone Austria added a 2.5 GW capacity showing huge solar expansion, and getting closer to achieving the goal. Austria's largest obstacles to achieving carbon neutrality are transport and industry, together generating 57% of their total emissions. Additionally, researchers show that for now Austria is falling behind on their goal especially because of these two sectors. Austria's ambition remains huge, yet the economic side of the implementation holds it back.

Belgium

In 2023, Belgian exports to the U.S totaled around 34 billion $, with chemical and pharmaceutical products accounting for over half of that. After Trump took office in 2025, and implemented the first round of tariffs, the Belgian foreign minister heavily criticized him, stating that it will have a poor effect for both countries and underlined how no one wins in a trade war. While Belgium is strongly in favor of limiting tariffs, due to its big pharmaceutical sector, it would prioritize negotiations in that specific sector rather than attempting to lower the tariffs in general. Between 2020 and 2024, Belgium purchased 6.5 billion $ worth of U.S. defense equipment, including F-35s or MQ-9B drones. This shows how Belgium values the relationship with the U.S., both as a country committed to the EU, but also for its own benefit.

Belgium's emission progress is weaker than the EU average. Its GHG even slightly increased between 2023 and 2024; it is 6% behind the EU average. The country is progressing, but not at the desirable pace. Its largest emitting sectors were industry, maritime and aviation and domestic transport.

together accounting for over 60% of the emissions. The largest problem that Belgium is facing is the divide among the federal government and regions. What this means is that in many countries it is the centralized government which sets policies and then commits to implementing them, however in Belgium the implementation is more regional, which causes delays and makes the full scale implementation harder.

.

Czech Republic:

The Czech Republic's policy on the relationship with the U.S. is largely based on the fact that it entered a Czech-American Defence Cooperation Agreement before Trump's second term began. The agreement included military cooperation, NATO eastern flank defense and cooperations in sectors such as: logistics, infrastructure, interoperability and training. This is a big incentive to maintain a healthy relationship with the U.S. On the other side, Czechia was already barely reaching the 2% military spending goal, so the increase to 5% put it under heavy pressure. On the economic side, Czechia's trade with the U.S. isn't as big, just over 4 billion $ annually, therefore the military side is way more crucial for them.

Czechia struggles a lot with GHG emissions. It produces 10 tonnes of CO2 per capita compared to the EU average of around 7. Nevertheless between 2022 and 2023, they achieved a 15% reduction, which was a massive achievement. To counter the issue Czechia aims to use the EU Modernisation Fund, decarbonise the energy system, phase out coal and develop clean mobility. Czechia implemented some measures such as the National Action Plan for Clear Mobility or the CCS plan to improve carbon capture. Regardless, its projected emissions still fall 13% short of the EU goals.

Denmark:

The relationship between Denmark and the U.S. is considered to be very strong. In 2024, the U.S totaled for 18% of Denmark's total exports, equal to around 366 billion DKK, and the US was also Denmark's biggest source of income from investments. Denmark's investments in the U.S. was equal to around 94% of Denmark's GDP in 2024, this shows massive economic dependance. However, Denmark has a very strange position because of Greenland. Trump repeatedly expressed interest in acquiring Greenland, which Denmark strongly rejected,

underlining that Greenland's future should be decided by Greenlanders and that its sovereignty cannot simply be changed by the U.S. The conflict was very long and undoubtedly rusted the relationship between these two countries. Despite this, Denmark still wants a strong security relationship with the U.S, especially in the Arctic and through NATO. This shows how Denmark needs to present its policy carefully, ensuring its sovereignty over Greenland while keeping good relationships with the U.S.

When it comes to green policies, Denmark is one of the strongest examples of successful implementation in the EU. It aims for a 70% reduction in emissions by 2030 compared to 1990 and climate neutrality by 2045, 5 years earlier than the EU goal. In 2024 its emissions were already 54% below 1990 levels, and the government estimated that it could reach around 68% by 2030. To close the remaining gap, Denmark introduced a very unique livestock tax, starting at 300 DKK per tonne of CO2 in 2030 and increasing to 750 DKK in 2035, while also planning to create 250,000 hectares of new forest and convert around 140,000 hectares of carbon rich land. This is a response to the remaining struggles that Denmark faces, it is now at a step where it needs to counter the smaller things as they are approaching net-zero with decisive steps. Denmark shows that strong taxation, land-use reform and renewable expansion can make EU climate goals more achievable.

Estonia:

The relationship between Estonia and the U.S. is largely based on security rather than trade. Estonia exported around 708 million Euros worth of goods to the U.S in 2024, equal to 4.1% of its total exports, so economically, it is relatively small compared to other EU countries.. However, Estonia borders Russia and is heavily dependent on NATO and U.S. involvement for its security. Therefore, Trump's demand for higher European defence spending is much less controversial in Estonia than in many other EU countries. Estonia strongly supports increasing European defence capabilities, but it does not want this to replace the U.S. role in NATO. With this in mind Estonia strongly supports the ideas, but also wants a heavy U.S. presence in the region, which for now, under Trump has been decreasing. This is a very logical approach and it will be something that will always be crucial for Estonia.

Estonia's green policy is very different from its security position, as it has made huge progress in reducing emissions. Its emissions in 2024 were 64% below 1990 levels including land use. However, energy still accounted for 36% of emissions and transport for 22%, meaning these sectors are becoming more important as the country continues to decarbonise. Estonia aims for 65% renewable energy in final energy consumption by 2030 and 100% renewable electricity consumption on its national-balance definition. While this does mean that there are still significant steps ahead, the major challenge is now funding the change rather than convincing the people towards the change. The biggest challenge is the oil-shale sector, which has historically made Estonia one of the most carbon intensive economies in Europe. Regardless, Estonia remains one of the European and Global leaders of green policies and is on track to help the EU achieve its goals.

.

Finland:

The relationship between Finland and the U.S. is very strong both economically and militarily. In 2024, Finnish exports to the U.S reached around 14.8 billion Euros, equal to roughly 13% of Finland's total exports. Its major exports included machinery, pharmaceuticals, instruments, paper and electrical machinery. When Trump introduced his tariffs in 2025, the Finnish government warned that the trade war could significantly slow the country's already weak economic recovery. At the same time, Finland strongly supports increased European defence spending because of its proximity to Russia, while also maintaining a strong U.S. security relationship. Finland therefore supports Europe becoming more capable militarily, but still just like other countries who share a close border with Russia, consider the U.S. involvement much needed. For Finland, the most important priority is maintaining both economic cooperation and a strong transatlantic security relationship.

When it comes to green policies, Finland has one of the most ambitious targets in the EU, aiming for climate neutrality by 2035. This is 15 years before the EU targets and almost 10 years from now. Its EU-ETS emissions were 63% below 2005 levels. However, Finland has a major issue with its land-use sector. In 2024, Current projections show a gap of around 15 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent to its 2030 land-use target. This means that while Finland has a relatively clean energy system and very ambitious climate policies, the country's forests are making it much harder to reach climate neutrality. Finland shows that reducing industrial and energy emissions alone is not enough, but at the stage that Finland is right now, it can

majorly focus on the land-use target and it is probably something that they will advocate for in the committee.

France:

The relationship between France and the U.S is present both on the economic front and the military front. France and the U.S. had around 182 billion $ in goods and services trade in 2025, and cross-border investment stocks reached nearly 525 billion $ in 2024. This is why avoiding the trade war is so crucial for France, especially because aerospace, pharmaceuticals and machinery are an important part of its trade with the U.S. However, France differs from more pro-American EU countries because it believes Europe should become much more capable of acting independently. France supports stronger European defence, European defence industries and a stronger European pillar of NATO, but it does not want Europe to simply become more dependent on U.S. military power. France wants to use this 'separation' from the U.S. as an incentive to develop Europe's independent military capabilities so that they are not reliant on the U.S. while maintaining a healthy relationship with the Americans.

France's green policies are largely built around nuclear energy, making its approach different from many other EU countries. In 2024, France's emissions were 37% below 1990 levels. Its biggest emitting sectors were transport at 32%, industry at 18% and agriculture at 17%. France is continuing to expand solar and wind while also relying heavily on nuclear power, hydrogen and renewable heat. It aims to triple solar capacity by 2035 and install around 1.3 GW of new onshore wind every year, while also developing up to 8 GW of electrolyser capacity by 2035. France is therefore one of the stronger examples of decarbonisation in the EU, but transport remains its biggest obstacle. This is a common occurrence across the EU, a sector which as we explained in the recent developments, is hard to address due to protests from the farmers. Therefore this might be something that this committee may try to address.

Germany:

Germany is probably one of the countries most affected by recent U.S. policy changes because of its enormous trade relationship with America. In 2024, the U.S was Germany's largest trading partner, with total trade of around 253 billion Euros, while Germany

exported around 161 billion Euros worth of goods to the U.S, equal to 10.4% of all German exports. Important sectors include vehicles, machinery, pharmaceuticals and medical products, meaning that tariffs can have a very large effect on the German economy. During the first eleven months of 2025, German exports to the U.S fell by 9.4%, including a 17.5% fall in vehicle exports and a 9% fall in machinery exports. In the first quarter of 2026, German exports to the U.S fell another 12.1%. This makes Germany strongly interested in maintaining a healthy relationship. Naturally they also want military cooperation with the U.S., but due to their massive economic relationship with the States, they are likely to prioritize that front.

Germany has made significant progress in reducing emissions. In 2024, its emissions were 46% below 1990 levels and fell by 5.4% compared to the previous year. Its biggest emitting sectors were energy at 25% and industry at 21%. However, Germany still has very large absolute emissions because of the size of its economy, and its land-use sector produced around 51 million tonnes of net emissions in 2024. The main problem is ensuring that the climate policy progresses without compromising the competitiveness of energy intensive industries. Germany therefore shows that EU green policies can reduce emissions significantly, but the economic cost remains high if rushed. It is a hard task that Germany is faced with as an economic leader of the EU, but is one that they have to overcome.

Hungary:

Hungary's relationship with the U.S. used to be much more politically different from the EU mainstream than most other countries. Under Viktor Orbán's government, it had a particularly close relationship with Donald Trump, and Hungary strongly supported the Trump administration's position that the war in Ukraine should end through negotiations. This put Hungary at odds with many EU countries that support continued military assistance to Ukraine. Many EU countries believe that Russia should unquestionably respect Ukraine's sovereignty, territorial integrity and right to determine the terms of peace agreement, while Hungary believed that concessions should be made. Nevertheless, after Magyar won the elections earlier this year, Hungary's policy changed. It grew closer to NATO, EU and away from Russia and Trump.

Hungary's climate policy is also less ambitious in practice than many EU targets. Its emissions per capita were around 5.7 tonnes of CO2 equivalent in 2023, below the EU

average of around 7 tonnes, which on paper looks very good. Existing policies were projected to reduce emissions by only around 44% by 2030 compared to 1990, while additional measures could bring this to around 56%. Hungary's energy policy focuses heavily on nuclear power at Paks and rapidly expanding solar power, making its transition more focused on energy security than in some other EU countries. Hungary therefore shows that relatively low per capita emissions do not mean getting closer to achieving the EU goals. Hungary for now is falling behind and unless serious action is undertaken, then much won't change and it will not achieve the EU targets.

Ireland:

Ireland's relationship with the U.S is one of the strongest economically in the entire EU. In 2024, the U.S was Ireland's biggest export destination, receiving around 73.5 billion Euros worth of Irish goods, equal to 39% of all Irish goods exports. Around 53.6 billion Euros of those exports were medical and pharmaceutical products and organic chemicals, meaning that Ireland is especially vulnerable to U.S. tariffs on pharmaceuticals. After Trump introduced tariffs in 2025, Ireland strongly pushed for negotiations and established a special government trade forum focused particularly on the pharmaceutical industry. Ireland also welcomed the eventual 15% tariff framework because it reduced uncertainty for its most important export sector. Therefore Ireland strongly supports maintaining a healthy relationship with the U.S, and is in favor of any EU trade deals, as a huge part of their economy is dependent on it. Ireland lies closely with the EU, but in this topic it is in their personal interest that drive their policy.

Ireland's green progress is much weaker than its climate ambitions. Its target is to reduce emissions by 51% by 2030 compared to 2018 and reach climate neutrality by 2050. However, in 2024 its emissions were only 5% below 1990 levels, compared to around 37% for the EU. Agriculture was responsible for 32% of emissions, while transport accounted for 19%, making these the biggest obstacles to the transition. Its land-use sector was also a net source of emissions in 2024. This means Ireland has very ambitious targets, but agriculture and transport are preventing it from progressing at the same pace as the EU as a whole. Even though many are in favour of the transition and set goals, yet it lacks effective implementation, and not by a small margin. Unless serious steps are taken, Ireland may miss EU climate targets.

Italy:

Italy's relationship with the U.S is economically very important and politically quite close. In 2025, Italian exports to the U.S increased by 7.2% to around 69.6 billion Euros, this is a rare example of how the exports increased under Trump. Important Italian exports include machinery, pharmaceuticals, vehicles, food and luxury goods, meaning that tariffs could have a major effect on Italian industry. Italy generally supported negotiations with the Trump administration rather than confrontation, with Giorgia Meloni arguing that a trade war would be damaging for both sides. Italy also welcomed the eventual EU-U.S trade agreement as a positive development. Additionally, Italy remains way more cautious than other EU countries on the issue of Ukraine, and ensures that its policy does not come into conflict with the one that the United States is pushing for. This makes Italy a relatively pro-American and pragmatic EU country, supporting European defence and cooperation with the U.S rather than trying to turn European strategic autonomy into a rival to America.

Italy's green transition, like any other EU country, is moving forward, yet existing policies are projected to reduce net emissions by around 42% by 2030 compared with 1990, while additional measures could increase this to 53%. Even with additional measures, Italy's projected reduction by 2050 is only around 74%, meaning the country would still be far from climate neutrality. The biggest challenges include transport, buildings, industry and dependence on imported fossil fuels. Italy has expanded solar, energy efficiency, biomethane and electrification, but it is also increasingly focused on energy affordability and industrial competitiveness. This makes Italy different from some of the more ambitious EU green-policy leaders, as it supports decarbonisation but wants the transition to remain affordable and compatible with economic growth. Italy claims that it tries to balance the greens transition with economic growth, however they face difficulties with meeting set goals as their green transition is delayed.

Netherlands:

The relationship between the Netherlands and the U.S can be characterized as strongly based on trade and technology. In 2024, Dutch exports to the U.S were around 38.2 billion Euros, while medicines, semiconductor manufacturing equipment, machinery and petroleum products were among the most important exports. During Trump's tariff escalation, the Dutch government strongly argued against protectionism and emphasized that the Netherlands believes in free trade and that a trade war would hurt both sides. At the same time, the Netherlands strongly supports higher European defence spending and accepted the NATO target of 5% by 2035. The Netherlands wishes to continue cooperating with the U.S, but also sees the current situation as an opportunity to develop Europe militarily.

The Netherlands has made significant progress in green policy, but its economy creates several difficult challenges. In 2024, its emissions were 36% below 1990 levels. Its largest emitting sectors were international maritime and aviation at 25% and energy at 19%. However, agriculture remains a major issue, especially because of livestock and nitrogen pollution, while the country's role as one of Europe's largest logistics and industrial hubs makes decarbonisation more difficult. The Netherlands is investing heavily in offshore wind, hydrogen, grid expansion and industrial electrification. Its case shows that EU green policies can work while still being difficult to implement in a country whose economy depends heavily on transport, ports and intensive agriculture.

Poland:

Poland is actually one of the Countries which already has a defence expenditure close to 5% of GDP. It also sees the United States as a crucial security partner because of Russia and the current war in Ukraine. Currently Poland has the largest U.S. military presence of any EU country. Poland supports Trump's argument that Europe should increase its military spending, and stand against reducing the U.S. involvement. It also calls for EU rearmament to complement the U.S. power. Poland is also set to receive over 40 billion €, in low interest loans under SAFE, further filling its agenda. Donald Tusk called the February 2025 trade war a "Complete Mistake", and argued that a firm response is necessary, while naturally maintaining transatlantic unity.

Poland remains dependent on fossil fuels, and the transition is slowly underway,

however it is much slower than the EU preferred pace. Through existing measures, Poland is on track to cut emissions by only about 11% by 2030 (compared to 1990 levels). Adding planned future measures could push that up to about 24% (so roughly 13 percentage points more), but even that is way below the EU's target. The biggest challenge that Poland is facing is its dependence on coal, especially in Silesia. It is important to note that Poland does not reject the climate policy, yet for now it is definitely not its priority, especially given that the green transition spikes many controversies within its internal politics. Nevertheless, it will likely happen, but years after the deadline.

Portugal:

The relationship between Portugal and the U.S can be characterized as strong, especially because of Portugal's long Atlantic and NATO relationship with America. However, economically, it is less economically dependent on the U.S. compared to some other Member States, meaning the tariffs have a smaller direct effect on them. During Trump's tariff announcements, Portugal strongly supported negotiations and argued that protectionism would hurt both European and American consumers. This was also the general Portuguese position after the 2025 tariff escalation, as Portugal preferred a predictable trade relationship instead of retaliation. Portugal therefore remains strongly committed to both the EU and NATO, while also having an interest in maintaining good relations with the U.S. Because of its smaller economy, while Portugal is not massively affected by the trade war, its economy can still be affected.

Portugal is one of the stronger examples of successful green policy in the EU, especially when it comes to renewable energy. Portugal has rapidly increased renewable electricity, especially through wind and solar, while reducing its dependence on fossil fuels. Around 35% of its total final energy consumption came from renewable sources in 2024. The country is also using EU funds such as the Just Transition Fund and Modernisation Fund to support the transition. Its main problems are transport, buildings and climate related issues such as droughts and wildfires. Portugal therefore shows that EU green policies can be highly effective when renewable energy expansion and government policy are working together.

Romania:

Romania's relationship with the U.S is mainly based on security rather than trade. Because Romania is located on the Black Sea and borders Ukraine and Moldova, the U.S role in NATO and the eastern flank is extremely important for the country. Because of this Romania definitely advocates for American involvement and military presence in Europe, while also supporting greater European defence spending. The 5% NATO target puts Romania under financial pressure, but its security position makes the general idea of increasing defence spending much easier to support than in many Western European countries. On the economic side, Romania was also relatively positive about the EU-U.S tariff agreement because it removed some uncertainty for European exporters. Romania therefore generally has a position similar to Poland, where European defence should become stronger, but not by replacing the U.S. role in NATO. For Romania, the security relationship with America is much more important than the direct size of its trade with the U.S.

Romania has had very large long-term reductions in emissions, but its green transition is still developing. In 2024 its emissions were around 70% below 1990 levels, even though emissions increased by 19.3% compared to 2023. The country's biggest emitting sectors were transport and industry, together accounting for almost half of its emissions. Romania is also using a combination of nuclear power, hydropower, solar and wind, which generates it renewable energy sources but it is clearly not enough. Existing measures were projected to reduce emissions by around 82% by 2030 compared to 1990, with additional measures bringing this to 84%. Romania therefore has one of the strongest long term emission reductions in the EU, yet work in some sectors is still very much needed.

Spain:

Spain has developed one of the more complicated relationships with the U.S in the EU because of the disagreement over defence spending. Spain strongly supports NATO and the transatlantic relationship, however it refused to fully accept Trump's 5% defence spending target, arguing that around 2.1% of GDP was enough to meet its security commitments. This made Spain one of the clearest EU countries to disagree directly with Trump's demands. In 2026, the conflict became even more serious when Trump threatened Spain with economic measures because of its position on defence spending and other foreign policy issues. At the same time,

Spain remains committed to NATO and European defence, meaning its position is not anti-American but rather that every European country should be able to decide how much it needs to spend, instead of it being dictated by the United States. Spain therefore represents one of the clearest examples of a country where national policy does not completely align with the U.S approach, even while remaining committed to the overall transatlantic alliance.

When it comes to green policies, Spain is one of the strongest countries in Europe when it comes to renewable energy, especially solar and wind. However, its total emissions reductions are not as impressive as its renewable expansion. In 2024, Spanish emissions were only around 13% below 1990 levels. Transport was the largest emitting sector, making up 29% of emissions, while industry accounted for 18%. Spain is also facing difficulties with its land-use sector, where there is a projected gap of around 12 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent to the 2030 target. The country has huge potential in solar, wind and green hydrogen, but problems such as grid connections, transport emissions, droughts and water shortages make the full transition harder. Spain therefore shows that having a very successful renewable electricity sector does not mean the road to net-zero is easy, as other problems arise. Nevertheless, it's still fighting to achieve the EU goals and has potential to reach them.

Sweden:

Sweden's relationship with the U.S is strongly focused on security, especially since it joined NATO in 2024. Because of its position in northern Europe and the Baltic Sea, Sweden sees the U.S and NATO as extremely important for dealing with the Russian threat. Sweden strongly supports higher European defence spending, and in 2025 it agreed on plans to rapidly increase defence expenditure toward the NATO targets. At the same time, Sweden is one of the more free trade oriented countries in the EU and has strongly opposed the protectionist direction of U.S policy. In 2025 Sweden even suggested that the EU should consider joining the CPTPP in order to expand free trade and reduce its dependence on the American market. This policy differs from the rest of the EU and shows Sweden's preference for diversity in trade, while reducing dependence on external influence. Sweden therefore combines very strong transatlantic security cooperation with a significant preference for open global trade.

Sweden has traditionally been seen as one of the green leaders of the EU, however its recent data shows that even leading countries can struggle with the final stages of the transition. In 2024 its emissions increased by 23.5% compared to 2023, with transport making up 32% and industry 23% of total emissions. Its emissions excluding land use were still 33% below 1990 levels, showing that its low carbon energy system has helped reduce domestic emissions significantly. However, the land-use sector has become a major issue, with Sweden facing a projected gap of around 21 million tonnes of CO2 equivalent to its 2030 LULUCF target. Sweden is also legally committed to net zero by 2045, meaning these problems are becoming increasingly important. The country is continuing to invest in nuclear energy, hydropower, wind, electrification and green industrial projects such as fossil-free steel. Sweden therefore remains one of the EU's climate leaders, but its recent land-use and transport problems show that even strong green policies can struggle when the country moves closer to the final stages of decarbonisation.

United States

This study guide focuses mainly on the United States, since it is expected to be the key player on the first topic, while having little direct relevance to the second topic. For this reason, a case study on the second topic would be unnecessary. The first topic, by contrast, is already covered in detail in the Historical Background and Recent Developments sections.

6. GUIDING QUESTIONS

- Does your country have any regulations/laws that address the issue?
- What is your country's relationship with the US (theoretical and factual)?
- What is your country's stance on Green policies?
- Has your country implemented any measures to combat the issues ?
- What is your country's stance on creating a European framework?
- How does your country view increased EU involvement in the issue?
- Does your country prefer any local solution?
- Does your country have any funding programmes?
- Is your country more inclined to strengthen the framework or keep them as they are?

- In what ways has your country been addressing the issue in the
- How would you solve the issue? This is practically the most important. You hear that all the time but it actually is. You will come up with many amazing solutions as a committee, however it is important to at least have some ideas so you can always freely participate in mods.

7. PREPARATION GUIDE

In order to properly prepare for the conference every single one of you should prepare 2 important documents: position paper and policy statement. Below we have described what exactly those documents are and how to write them. Additionally before the conference we will provide you with examples of those documents on the facebook group.

Position Paper

What is a position paper:

As Ambassadors of the EC, the main document you must prepare for the conference is the Position Paper (can be referred to as the PP). A Position Paper is a document prepared by every member of the committee and is supposed to outline your country's general position on the topic. It should include information such as your country's policy, past actions, current developments and some solutions you propose. The position paper is usually around 800 words in length, however the lengths usually vary depending on your writing style or amount of preparation you have conducted. It is also important to keep in mind that you don't need to include all your preparation in the position paper, it is a great idea to leave some potential solution for the committee debates to maintain the element of surprise and prevent the countries opposing you from preparing counterarguments.

Additionally it is important to remember that you may not use personal pronouns (I) while writing your position paper, as you are not representing your personal view, but rather your country, organisation or company. You should address yourself as "The Ambassador" or just simply use we. This is a great practice as during the committee proceedings during the formal part of debates you will not be able to use personal pronouns too.

Main Parts of the Position Paper:

The Position paper is usually divided into 4 main sections:

1. Analysis of the issue, primarily it is important to understand what the issue is about. To do so, you must answer a few questions: Who are the key players in the topic? Are you one of them, and if not, how is your country/organization relevant to the issue? Try to understand the core issue of the topic, and present that information, directly from your country's/organization's perspective. This is important as you may use this part to present yourself as a key actor in the conflict, establish credibility and present the information in the way that suits you for future debates.

2. The past actions done by your country/organization. This not only shows your past approach and allows you to present your actor's actions in the most favourable manner. On top of that it allows you to introduce information which you may use to either defend your position or challenge other players. It is important to select which information you want to include, and while naturally it comes to mind to include only the good part, you may also use this opportunity to add a different spin to a situation that other Ambassadors may use to attack your position.

3. Stating and outlining the current position. This is a very important step as it allows other Ambassadors to understand which ideas you would support and which ones you would oppose. Make sure you are clear and clearly state what you oppose. Try to also add how your country is addressing the issue right now, this will further help you prepare for the debates.

4. Proposing solutions. This is undoubtedly the hardest and the most important part of the position paper. It is what you will be advocating for in the committee and is what you're trying to achieve in the committee. There are several ways to write this part as you may write as much as possible, or at the same time you can try to only write some, while leaving the rest for committee sessions. You need to plan your strategy, what do you want to share with other Ambassadors before the conference? It is also important to keep in mind that any countries which oppose you will have time to create arguments against these solutions.

Exemplary position paper:

Position Paper
Country: Central African Republic
Committee: Security Council
Topic: Discussing means to resolve the civil war in the Central African Republic.

On behalf of the only righteous government of the Central African Republic, led by H.E. Mr. Faustin-Archange Touadéra,

Throughout its post-colonial history, our beautiful and rich homeland has been suffering from exploitation, slavery and dictatorship. The ongoing civil war in our country shall be considered an apogee of European neocolonialism and their failure to fulfil the standards of their democratic values. Jean-Bédel Bokassa. André Kolingba. François Bozizé. What's common between these three names - all of them were the traitors of the Central African people, inglorious military dictators, who were put to rule the country by external powers and sold the freedom and natural resources of our country for incentives and personal benefit from the French. Manipulated like a marionette, they got their hands covered in the blood of Central Africans, whose only demand was to leave and develop in peace.

However, the main emphasis shall be put on the last aforementioned dictator - François Bozizé, whose actions in the current state are causing the prolongation of the civil war, putting more and more lives of our people at risk. When Bozizé seized power during the popular insurrection of 15 March, the first thing he did was surround Bangui with Chadian troops, which remained the main military force in the country at the time and had been committing atrocious human rights violations towards the civilians, including executions and looting every trapping of prosperity to transfer it to their homes to Chad. And when people started to show their protest - he asked Idriss Déby, the president of Chad back then, for more "help" to shut the demonstrations down, even creating a so-called Central Office for the Repression of Banditry, which violated the human rights of our citizens even more. Time went by, comprised of events that had a significant impact on CAR's history, such as the Central African Republic Bush War, the start of ongoing civil war, government takeover by rebels as well as its regaining by governmental structures and the transitional government with democratic elections after it, where Faustin-Archange Touadéra became a president.

Yet still, in the next elections, after the candidature of François Bozizé was rejected by the CAR top court, following the UN sanctions against him, and decided to turn to rebels, which at the time formed a joint coalition named "Coalition of Patriots for Change" (CPC) and ask for help in an attempted coup. Despite the arisen security issues, the G5 and the government in Bangui pursued a strategy of "elections at all costs." As a result, the December 2020 vote was on schedule, but it was not safe. Electoral convoys were attacked by the CPC - in some towns, armed groups destroyed ballot boxes. Still, in many areas, Central Africans turned out in surprisingly high numbers to voice their exasperation with armed groups and Bozizé's attempted coup. The fact that François Bozizé turned to armed groups to undermine the elections suggests that he doesn't have sufficient support among civilians to mobilize popular uprisings. Therefore, François Bozizé does not possess a single right to be a leader of the Central African Republic and tackle its internal and external affairs, and we firmly believe that this individual shall be brought to the International Criminal Court for his crimes against humanity.

Moving on to the CPC and setting a strong position regarding rebels - the government of Faustin-Archange Touadéra is not open to a negotiation process, considering the fragility of this coalition of terrorist groups as a whole - it is separated inside due to multiple armed groups being a part of it. CPC suffers from internal conflicts itself, and recalling the previous Anti-balaka and ex-Séléka cleanings on a religious basis - how can we negotiate with this group, if it does not even possess structured demands and just spreads terror among the country, destabilising the whole system and whose leader is currently under the UN sanctions? This question shall be left as a rhetorical one.

Back in 2017, when the country was still suffering from numerous attacks and was nearly taken over by rebels, our government had been respectfully asking for support, mainly military, from its partners. No country responded besides the Russian Federation and Rwanda, and we express our strong gratitude. Moreover, the CAR was left by France, which withdrew its forces in 2021, nevertheless keeping our economy under their influence. With the military support of the Russian Federation, Rwanda and the UN MINUSCA peacekeeping mission, currently, the governmental forces control the majority of the Central African Republic. We aim to continue the military cooperation with the aforementioned countries and seek cooperation with whomever interested in it, to finally free our homeland and set a lasting peace in the region.

After restoring peace in the Central African Republic, we are determined to improve its economic and geopolitical state. A few of the many actions that the Faustin-Archange Touadéra's government is currently working on and that are to be taken to restore the

economy concern i.a trade diversification and cooperation - opening Africa for a wider market under the Economic Community of Central African States and African Continental Free Trade Area and participating in the People's Republic of China's Belt and Road initiative, as well as support for local entrepreneurs and education settings to boost the economy, yet more means that could potentially benefit the CAR's economy we wish to discuss during the committee session. With the financial help of intergovernmental organisations such as the World Bank and the United Nations, we also aim to receive support with the decolonisation, fiscal and security sector reforms, to finally make the
Central African Republic and the whole continent a prosperous and stable land.
Unité, Dignité, Travail.

Policy Statement

The policy statement is another speech that you must prepare, however this one is supposed to address the issue at hand rather than being a general speech. You should focus on highlighting the most important parts of the Position paper and introducing new solutions, or elaborating on some you have created beforehand. Keep in mind that the specific topic of your speech is entirely up to you, and it may be the only time you get to address the certain issues, so use this opportunity to convince other players that issues that are important to your country should be addressed. This speech may also be a summary of your Position Paper, yet generally speeches which are a summary of the position paper rather than introducing new ideas, usually are not as effective.

Exemplary Policy statement:

Honourable Chairs, Fellow Ambassadors,

On behalf of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, we express our intense gratitude and appreciation for your eagerness to act and discuss today's highly
imperative topic, which is China's Belt and Road initiative.
Pakistan undoubtedly remains a strategically vital country within the BRI, with its joint cooperative with China named the "China-Pakistan Economic Corridor", which, throughout the years of its development, has proved to be extremely efficient for our economy and continues fostering the standards of living of our beloved citizens.

Nevertheless, although our economic ties with China are and will remain close, one must acknowledge, that the glorious state of Pakistan is independent and sovereign, thus, safeguarding our interests will always be our main priority. We believe that the negotiations upon the completion of the CPEC are not full and the provisions of the agreement can be changed in a way for them to be more advantageous to Pakistan and China respectively.

Pakistan opposes every form of neocolonialism and considers the policies of France, Germany and the US highly hypocritical, as the Chinese way of fostering world trade, which aforementioned countries dare to call "neocolonialism" cannot be compared to the atrocities conducted by French in Central Africa for the whole 60 years, as well as economic isolation and exploitation of South American states by the US.

Moreover, seeing their disadvantage in Southern Asia, these countries dare to further develop their trade relations with the terrorist state of India as a counterweight. And the fellow Ambassadors are willing to stand by these ideas?
We strongly encourage the world community to pick the right side. Let the Alla-ah guide us through our deliberations and ensure, that the agreement will be reached.

Glory to Pakistan. The Ambassador is open to any and all points of information and yields the floor.

8. RESERARCH GUIDE

As has been mentioned before, the Study Guide is not a PhD on the topic and should serve solely as a basis for further research. Ambassadors should possess knowledge personalised to the policy of their country, and the Study
Guide outlines only general information. We, the chairboard, have prepared a Further Reading section to help you with that. Furthermore, below you will find guidance for conducting research useful for any Model United Nations conference.

First and foremost, it is crucial to have elementary knowledge about the country an Ambassador is representing.

- What is the political system and governing body of my country?
- What is the classification of the economy (HIC, MIC, LIC, etc.) of my
country?
- What is the geographical location of my country?
- What is my country's foreign policy?

If you are an Observer, not all questions may apply. In the case of NGOs we recommend focusing on the aims and reason for its establishment, what strategies they undertake to solve problems, its funding, and areas of action. If you are representing a company, consider its primary interest when it comes to the topic.

In order to thrive during committee sessions, you need to understand the topic itself on a profound level. It is recommended to incorporate in your arguments statistics and be mindful of their source, but also causes and effects of a particular issue.

You have to have an idea of the policies and actions of other actors present in the committee. This is very important as it comes in handy during the General Speaker's List (GSL) (especially during Points of Information (PoI's)!), and during moderated caucuses. You want to research every wrongdoing they committed in the past, holes in their logic, their strange policies and actions – this will help you manipulate the rest of the committee to perceive their arguments as, essentially, nothing but a deflection, and for your ideas to be favoured. Take into account that this information should be credible, as any Ambassador is permitted to ask for the source of that information through raising a Motion to Cite the Source.

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND FURTHER READING

A Reliable Friend and Ally | FPS Foreign Affairs - Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation

Homepage - National Energy and Climate Plan

The Prime Minister signed the Czech-American Defense Agreement completing the ratification process | Government of the Czech Republic

Defence investment and NATO's 5% commitment | NATO Topic

Decision - EU - 2025/429 - EN - EUR-Lex

Analyses: Extensive Danish Trade and Investment Relations with the United

States - Statistics Denmark

Samtale med tiltrædende præsident Trump - Statsministeriet

US market overview

Energy Sector Organisation Act-Riigi Teataja

Sijoittajaesitys-2025_June_web.pdf

Trade ministers to discuss EU's trade relations with United States and China -

Finnish Government

France et États-Unis : Les échanges commerciaux atteignent un pic historique en 2025, portés par l'aéronautique et la pharmacie - ÉTATS-UNIS |

Direction générale du Trésor

24 % der deutschen Pharma-Exporte 2024 gingen in die USA - Statistisches

Bundesamt

Meeting of NATO ministers of Defence (13 February 2025, Brussels) - Permanent Delegation of Hungary to NATO, Brussels

Solar gives Hungary's power system vital cover from nuclear fallout | Reuters Top Trading Partners 2024 Ireland's Trade in Goods 2024 - Central Statistics Office

Tánaiste updates Ministers on EU-US trade negotiations
Italian exports to US rise 7% in 2025 despite Trump's tariffs | Reuters
Italy's trade surplus with US dropped to 34 billion in 2025 - Istat - Business - Ansa.it
Italy’s Meloni says it’s a ’positive’ trade deal was reached, calls for clarity By
Reuters
How much trade was there between the Netherlands and the US in 2024? -
The Netherlands in Numbers 2025 | CBS
The Netherlands supports NATO 5% target | Government.nl
Deputy Prime Minister Radosław Sikorski takes part in Defence24 Days - Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Poland - Gov.pl website
Portugal calls for deeper EU-US dialogue to avoid harmful tariffs | Reuters sahmcapital.com/redirect/news/content/romanian-pm-says-eu-us-tariffs-de al-eliminates-uncertainties-2025-07-28
Romania expects small growth hit from new US trade deal By Reuters
Spain agrees with NATO to skip 5% defence spending target | Reuters
Cross-party agreement on historic rearmament - Government.se
2f65f117-ea6c-468d-9d48-92c29766f8d2_en
OeNB Report 2025/5: Austrian economy to stabilize in 2025 - Oesterreichische Nationalbank (OeNB)
Austria - Market Overview