

# 2018 MIDWEST MODEL EUROPEAN UNION



## Preparing for the Simulation

### Faculty Guide

As a faculty member in charge of delegates to the Midwest Model EU, your job is to ensure that your students have knowledge of the tools and instructions necessary for successful participation in the MMEU as delegates. Some things to keep in mind are to make sure students:

- understand the workings of key EU institutions
- understand the position(s) of the country they are representing
- write clear, concise and coherent draft directives
- understand when and where they can use technology when participating in the MMEU: only in the Directors General for researching proposals; otherwise they should focus on the debate and interactive aspects of the simulation
- are *active* participants in the meetings of the simulation itself.

You, as a faculty advisor, are there to offer guidance and direction, but it is ultimately UP TO STUDENTS to be properly prepared for the Model EU. While this is a simulation of “real world” institutions, the closer we can mimic the actual institutions and procedures of the EU, the more instructive will be the simulation. Students will learn more and have a more enjoyable time doing it the better prepared they are. Here are some tips to help them do that.

**RESEARCHING THE EU:** The starting point for research the EU is the EU website ([http://europa.eu/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/index_en.htm)). Here students will find links to all of the major institutions and issue areas covered by the EU. The Publication page links to a wealth of background material. The website for the EU Delegation to the US (<http://www.euintheus.org/>) is also helpful. Note that the simulation involves the European Council, various configurations of the Council of the European Union (formerly the Council of Ministers), and the European Commission, including the Directorates-General. There are other institutions that are crucial to the functioning of the EU – especially the European Parliament and European Court of Justice – that are not represented in the simulation. Students should, nevertheless, be familiar with the functioning of these bodies and their relation to other EU institutions.

**RESEARCHING YOUR COUNTRY:** For most students, the goal in the simulation is to represent the actual policy positions of their member state, and - as far as possible - the background, party affiliation, duties and powers of their real-life counterpart, and come to MMEU prepared to play the appropriate role. In preparing, they should take into account the history of the EU, public opinion in their member state, the political leanings of their

government, and their delegation's national interests. Each university involved in the simulation is representing a different country (or countries), so the best research resources vary from country to country. Good places to start are with the websites of that state's foreign ministry, prime minister or president, and their Embassy in the US. Beyond this, the most useful websites are those for the specific ministry students are representing in the simulation. If, for example, they are the economics minister for the United Kingdom, it is useful to review the HM Treasury website.

**WRITING A DRAFT DIRECTIVE:** Except for the European Council (see below), the majority of activity in the Midwest Model EU revolves around discussing, debating, revising, and voting on draft directives submitted in advance by the delegates.. Directives should be **NO MORE THAN ONE PAGE** and follow the format laid out in **Sample Draft Directive** below. Draft directives can be original or can be copied from actual directives of the EU. These can be found at <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/index.htm>. (Actual EU directives can run to dozens of pages; students will want to condense or paraphrase.)

Draft directives are gathered by the simulation organizer and channeled to the appropriate body for deliberation. As such students are not “presenting their directive” at the Model EU. Nevertheless, students’ directives form the foundation for the simulation. The better quality the directives, the better the simulation. Draft simulations should be submitted in advance of the simulation. There is no specific goal in terms of workflow for the model; passing more directives is not inherently better. The purpose is to understand the opportunities and challenges or organizing effective collective action through a body such as the EU. (***NOTE: Deadline for submission to IU is March 23.***)

**Specifications for style of draft directive: ALL DRAFT DIRECTIVES MUST:**

- Be drafted (and uploaded to Dropbox) as a Word file
- Have Font: Times New Roman, 12 pt
- Have Margins: Standard (1" on margins on every side)
- Be of Length: One page
- Have a file name that follows this structure: CATEGORY COUNTRY Title
  - Example: ECON AUT Corporate Tax Transparency
  - Categories are:
    - ECON (Economic Proposals)
    - ENVR (Environmental Proposals)
    - FOAF (Foreign Affairs Proposals)
    - JAHA (Justice and Home Affairs Proposals)
  - COUNTRIES Are:
    - AUT (Austria)
    - BEL (Belgium)
    - BGR (Bulgaria)
    - HRV (Croatia)

- CYP (Cyprus)
  - CZE (Czech Republic)
  - DNK (Denmark)
  - EST (Estonia)
  - FIN (Finland)
  - FRA (France)
  - DEU (Germany)
  - GRC (Greece)
  - HUN (Hungary)
  - IRL (Ireland)
  - ITA (Italy)
  - LVA (Latvia)
  - LTU (Lithuania)
  - LUX (Luxembourg)
  - MLT (Malta)
  - NLD (Netherlands)
  - POL (Poland)
  - PRT (Portugal)
  - ROU (Romania)
  - SVK (Slovakia)
  - SVN (Slovenia)
  - ESP (Spain)
  - SWE (Sweden)
  - GBR (United Kingdom)
- Be reviewed for compliance by the faculty advisor before they upload them to Dropbox
  - Be uploaded to the correct folder on DROPBOX

IMPORTANT: Faculty may not download or read the submissions by other teams, or share those submissions with their students. Students should only be familiar with their own policy drafts and the perspective of their own country.

**MECHANICS OF WRITING A DRAFT DIRECTIVE**: All proposals should be in one of the following areas: foreign policy, economic/ financial affairs, justice and home affairs, and the environment. Each directive has the following component parts – title, background, rationale, and content. The **title**, as with any title, should quickly and concisely convey to the reader the content of the directive. The **background** should explain the nature of the problem or issue being addressed in the directive. The reason for undertaking action through EU institutions should be elaborated in the **rationale** section. Finally, the **content** should elaborate the details of policy change being proposed in the draft directive. Remember that a directive must *direct* some actor to do something. Directives that merely express general goals or interests are not terribly useful. Neither are directives that, for example, promise large spending commitments without specifying the source of the resources. The more specific students can be as to exactly what body is

expected to do what with which resources from what source, the better their directive will be. Keep in mind that these are directives intended to cover the Union as a whole. Optimally students should write directives relevant to the committee to which they are assigned. That increases the prospect that delegates will be debating “their” directive during the simulation.

**EUROPEAN COUNCIL:** The European Council, representing the Heads of Government and Heads of State of EU Member States, provides the strategic direction for the Union. In terms of the simulation, the major topics for discussion are determined by the delegation representing the country that currently holds the Presidency of the European Council. The European Council does not review draft directives, even though student participants are expected to submit draft directives just like everyone else. Deliberations in the European Council are more open and free flowing. The final product of the European Council is to be the Presidency Conclusions, which will be read out at the final plenary assembly of the model.

**COUNCIL(S) OF MINISTERS:** The Council of Ministers (or the Council of the European Union) consists of ministerial representatives from each of the member states. Although the Council of Ministers is a singular institution, its composition changes depending on the issue being discussed, with each country sending the appropriate representative, e.g., the environmental ministers for the environmental matters, thus making it the “Environmental Council”. The Midwest Model EU runs four concurrent meetings of the Council: Foreign Affairs Council; Economics and Finance Council (or ‘EcoFin’); Environmental Council; and the Justice and Home Affairs Council. These bodies deliberate on the draft directives submitted for the simulation. Each student’s job is to represent their counties interests in cooperation with other member states in that issue area.

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION/DIRECTORATES-GENERAL:** The European Commission is the permanent bureaucracy of the EU. It is run by the President of the European Commission. Each member state appoints a representative to be a Commissioner and is appointed to oversee specific policy areas by the President. Collectively they are known as the College of Commissioners. The various departments which the Commissioners oversee are known as the Directorates-General. Those individuals representing them are the DGs. In principle and in practice, all of these figures work for the greater interest of the EU. Unlike those on the Council of Ministers, they are not intended to be a representative of national interest. For the simulation, the area of responsibility for an EU commissioner is dictated by the country they are representing. The DGs effectively have no national affiliation. Both bodies review and consider draft directives before sending them on to the appropriate Council.

## **SAMPLE DRAFT DIRECTIVE:**

### **Directive to promote the advancement of technologies derived from patented inventions to market throughout the Community by means of coincident intellectual property rights protections**

**Background:** Intellectual property in the form of useful inventions is important for economic development. As an economy becomes more technology and information oriented, as in the developed economies of the European Union, the ensuring of rights to the use and distribution of intellectual goods by their respective creators becomes ever more critical to continuous innovation and economic standard of living.

**Rationale:** While each Member State does have a justifiable interest in protecting the intellectual property of its own citizens for the reasons above, the expansion of technologies based on inventions patented in one Member State into the Internal Market may be discouraged by the existence of a substantially similar patent in another State. This situation hinders free movement within the Internal Market and creates an environment that is not conducive to beneficial competition.

**Content:** To ensure continuous innovation, economic progress, and homogeneity of the Internal Market, Member States shall each adopt and enforce a coincident intellectual property protection system. The patent enforcement system in each of the several Member States shall:

- Accept from any inventor his or her patent that would otherwise have been seen as similar enough to some existing domestic patent to stop the filing of the former, according to the standards of said Member State (henceforth “substantially similar”), and;
- File and enforce said patent within Member State’s national jurisdiction upon patent’s meeting the requirements [that are not affected by this Directive] of the Member State to which it is filed; On the condition that said patent:
  - Is on file by the government of any other Member State, and;
  - Was filed in said other Member State before the date of filing of any domestically enforced substantially similar patent.

For example, a patent filed in Germany by its inventor shall be accepted for filing in Italy (if submitted by the inventor) even if it is substantially similar to an invention already patented in Italy, provided that the filing date in Germany was before the filing date of the Italian patent. Inventors each holding one of the two or more substantially similar patents when issued in accordance with this Directive shall not have legal recourse against one another for infringement. This Directive does not require any Member State to issue a domestic patent which is substantially similar to a patent previously issued domestically.