SEMMUNA

Southeast Michigan Model United Nations Association

CRISIS COMMITTEE

The Global Race for Critical Resources

Character Guide

November 14, 2026 • West Bloomfield High School

How to Use This Guide

This guide gives you a starting point for understanding your actor's position in this committee. It is not a script. It is not a checklist. It does not tell you what to say or how to vote. What it gives you is context, questions, and directions.

This committee is different from a General Assembly or a Specialized Task Force. You may be representing a national government, a multinational corporation, a development bank, or an advocacy organization. Each type of actor has different sources of power, different tools, and different vulnerabilities. Your first job is to understand which type of actor you are and what that means for how you operate in the room.

What you will find for each actor is a brief overview of their position in the global critical resource system, followed by three categories of guidance:

- **Things to Consider** - background context and factors worth keeping in mind as you prepare.
- **Questions to Think About** - open questions that do not have single right answers, but that are worth working through before you walk in.
- **Possibilities Worth Exploring** - directions your actor might go. Starting points, not instructions.

Crisis committee moves fast. The actors who do the most preparation before they walk in the door are the ones who have the most capacity to adapt when things change inside the room.

> **A note on playing a non-government actor:** *If you are representing a corporation, a financial institution, or an advocacy organization, read your character carefully and think hard about what that type of actor actually wants and how it actually operates. Corporations do not make speeches. They make deals. Financial institutions do not take positions. They allocate capital. Advocacy organizations do not have leverage. They create it. Understand your tools before you try to use them.*

Actors in This Committee

This committee includes 25 actors across five categories. All 25 are listed below.

Resource States

Australia • Bolivia • Chile • Democratic Republic of the Congo • Indonesia • Namibia

Industrial and Regional Powers

China • European Union Representative • India • Japan • South Korea • United States

Multinational Corporations

Aurora Strategic Capital • BlueStrait Logistics • Helios Materials Group • NexTrade Global • Synapse Grid Technologies • TerraCore Extraction International • Voltaris Energy Systems

Financial and Institutional Actors

Global Development Bank • International Monetary Fund (IMF) • World Bank

Advocacy and Normative Actors

Global Development Equity Coalition Representative • Global Environmental Coalition Leader • International Labor Rights Federation Representative

The Crisis Context

Before you read your actor's profile, understand the world your actor is operating in. A major resource-producing nation has suspended its export agreements for cobalt and nickel. Markets are volatile. Corporations are scrambling. Consumer nations are issuing statements. And every actor in this room is deciding right now what their first move is.

The pre-conference updates you received (posted on the SEMMUNA website) described the signals that led to this moment. If you read them carefully, you are not surprised. If you did not read them, you are starting behind. Either way, the question is the same: what does your actor do now?

As you read your character guide, keep four questions in front of you:

- What does my actor need most in the next 24 hours?
- Who in this room has the most to gain or lose from the same things I care about?
- What can I offer in exchange for what I need?
- What is my first directive, first conversation, or first public action going to be?

> **The bottom line:** *Crisis committee rewards actors who come in knowing what they want and who can help them get it. That knowledge comes from preparation. Everything else follows from there.*

RESOURCE STATES

Democratic Republic of the Congo | Resource State

You control the largest cobalt reserves in the world. That is not a small thing. Roughly 70% of the cobalt that goes into every battery, every electric vehicle, every critical technology system on earth comes from the ground beneath your feet. That gives you leverage that most countries in this room would trade almost anything to have. And yet the DRC has watched that leverage fail to translate into prosperity, decade after decade, as foreign corporations extracted wealth and left communities bearing the environmental and social costs. This committee is a chance to change that dynamic. The question is whether you use your leverage wisely, and whether the rest of the room is willing to negotiate in good faith.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Your cobalt reserves are your greatest asset and your most complicated problem simultaneously	What does a fair investment deal actually look like for the DRC - specific terms, not just principles?	Building a coalition with other resource states around the principle that extraction must produce lasting local benefit
Political instability within the DRC is real and affects how much leverage you can exercise in practice	How do you use cobalt leverage without triggering responses that hurt the communities your resources are supposed to benefit?	Demanding specific investment commitments from corporations - processing capacity, infrastructure, community development - as conditions for supply
Foreign corporations and consumer nations need your cobalt more than they want to admit publicly	Which actors in this room have interests that genuinely align with yours - and which ones are here to manage you rather than partner with you?	Using your relationship with the Global Development Bank and the World Bank to create leverage against corporate actors who assume they can bypass your government
The gap between the value of what leaves the DRC and what stays in the DRC is the central injustice this committee is here to address	If the crisis escalates and the DRC suspends exports, who in this room hurts most? And how does that shape your negotiating position?	Connecting the DRC's cobalt situation to the broader moral argument that the clean energy transition cannot be built on exploitation

Indonesia | Resource State

Indonesia has already done what other producer nations are still debating. You imposed export restrictions on raw nickel. You forced foreign companies to invest in domestic processing facilities. You captured more economic value from your own resources. The results have been real and imperfect simultaneously - Indonesia has new industrial capacity and new leverage, but also new friction with trading partners and new questions about whether the model can be sustained. You walk into this committee as the country with the clearest proof of concept for resource sovereignty in action. How you use that experience, and what you advocate for other producer nations, is one of the most consequential choices in this committee.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Your export restriction policy is both your greatest strength and your most contested position in this room	What has your export restriction policy actually produced - and how honest are you willing to be about its costs alongside its benefits?	Sharing Indonesia's practical experience as evidence that resource sovereignty is achievable, not just aspirational
Your domestic processing strategy requires sustained foreign investment to work - and those investors have interests that do not always align with yours	How do you position Indonesia's approach as legitimate sovereignty rather than market manipulation to actors who are hostile to it?	Building a formal producer coalition with the DRC, Chile, and Bolivia around shared terms for investment and processing
Other resource states are watching Indonesia closely and drawing their own conclusions about whether this model works	Which corporations and industrial powers can you genuinely partner with, and which ones are simply trying to manage your leverage down?	Negotiating with Voltaris Energy Systems and Aurora Strategic Capital as partners in domestic processing rather than as extractors to be managed
The tension between asserting sovereignty and maintaining the trade relationships your economy depends on is real and ongoing	What do you owe other resource states who are considering similar policies - and what does a producer coalition actually need to be effective?	Proposing international frameworks that explicitly protect the right of producer nations to impose domestic processing requirements

Chile | Resource State

Chile is one of the world's most stable and credible lithium producers, which is both an advantage and a constraint. You attract investment because you are reliable. You have influence because you are trusted. And you face pressure precisely because everyone needs what you have. The Atacama Desert holds lithium reserves that are simultaneously Chile's greatest economic asset and one of the most environmentally sensitive ecosystems on the planet. The tension between economic development and environmental protection is not abstract for Chile. It shows up in every investment negotiation, every export agreement, and every conversation about what responsible resource development actually looks like.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Chile's political stability and institutional credibility give it influence that less stable producers cannot access	How does Chile use its credibility as a stable, democratic producer to advocate for producer rights in ways that authoritarian producer nations cannot?	Using Chile's reliability to demand better terms rather than simply offering stability at whatever price the market will bear
The environmental pressure on lithium extraction in the Atacama is genuine and growing, and ignoring it is a strategic mistake	What is the relationship between environmental protection in the Atacama and Chile's long-term economic interests - are they in conflict or alignment?	Coordinating with Bolivia on a joint position that gives the Lithium Triangle collective leverage neither country has alone
Chile's position in the Lithium Triangle alongside Bolivia and Argentina creates coalition opportunities that individual negotiations cannot replicate	Does Chile benefit more from bilateral deals with individual industrial powers or from coordinating with the producer coalition?	Working with the Global Environmental Coalition to propose sustainability standards that Chile can already meet, raising the bar for competitors
The Global Environmental Coalition has relationships with Chile that could be assets or constraints depending on how you engage with them	What does the European Union's regulatory agenda mean for Chile's export relationships - constraint or opportunity?	Building a relationship with Aurora Strategic Capital around investment terms that include meaningful environmental and community protections

Bolivia | Resource State

Bolivia has something that almost everyone in this room wants: enormous lithium reserves that have barely been developed. You are sitting on potential power. The challenge is that potential is not the same as actual leverage, and turning one into the other requires partners, infrastructure, and capital that Bolivia does not yet have on its own. That creates a difficult dynamic: you need outside help to develop your resources, but the outside actors who want to help are the same ones you are most wary of exploiting you. How Bolivia navigates that tension, and which partners it chooses, may define its economic trajectory for a generation.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Bolivia's lithium reserves are enormous but largely undeveloped, which means leverage is potential rather than current	What specific terms would make a development partnership genuinely beneficial to Bolivia rather than just to the partner?	Coordinating with Chile and Indonesia to present a unified producer position on investment terms
Every partnership Bolivia considers requires giving something up - the question is what terms are acceptable and what crosses the line	How do you exercise leverage when your leverage is primarily potential rather than proven?	Negotiating with Aurora Strategic Capital for infrastructure investment that includes domestic processing requirements from the beginning
Bolivia's caution about foreign exploitation is historically well-founded, and other actors in this room know it	Which actor in this room do you trust least - and which actor, despite Bolivia's general caution, might actually offer something fair?	Using Bolivia's undeveloped reserves as deliberate leverage - actors who want access must meet specific terms to get it
India and Aurora Strategic Capital are among the actors most interested in Bolivia's resources - understanding their actual interests is essential preparation	What does Bolivia need from the World Bank or Global Development Bank to develop processing capacity domestically rather than just exporting raw ore?	Aligning with the Global Development Equity Coalition on the principle that developing nations must benefit equitably from their own resources

Australia | Resource State

Australia is the producer nation that consumer economies trust most, and that trust is both your greatest asset and a constraint on how assertively you can act. You are politically stable, institutionally credible, geologically rich in rare earth elements and lithium, and deeply integrated into supply chains serving the United States, Japan, and the European Union. That integration is valuable. It is also a form of dependency that limits how far Australia can deviate from the preferences of its key partners. In this committee, the question for Australia is not whether to cooperate - you will - but on what terms, and whether those terms actually reflect Australia's interests rather than just the interests of the countries that depend on you.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Australia's political stability and Western alignment give it access to partnerships that less stable producers cannot secure	Is Australia getting fair value for its stability and reliability, or is it underselling itself to maintain relationships?	Using trusted-partner status to advocate for producer rights within the Western alliance rather than simply accepting the terms offered
The close relationship with the U.S. and Japan creates real economic benefits but also real constraints on independence	How does Australia balance its Western alliance obligations with the interests it shares with other producer nations?	Building a coalition of stable, democratic producers - Chile, Australia, Indonesia - whose collective credibility changes the negotiating dynamic
Australia has more room to advocate for producer nation rights than most Western-aligned countries realize, if it chooses to use it	What would a coalition of resource-producing democracies look like, and could Australia lead it?	Working with Japan and the United States on supply agreements that include genuine technology transfer and processing capacity development in Australia
BlueStrait Logistics controls shipping routes that are essential to Australian exports - that relationship is a dependency worth examining	If the crisis creates pressure to choose between allied relationships and producer coalition solidarity, which way does Australia go?	Proposing transparency and environmental standards that reflect Australian practices, raising the baseline for the entire system

Namibia | Resource State

Namibia is the newest and least established player among the resource states in this committee, which creates both freedom and risk. You are not locked into existing agreements or established relationships. You can choose your partners deliberately and set terms that more established producers cannot renegotiate. At the same time, you have less leverage to fall back on if negotiations go badly, less infrastructure to rely on, and less history of dealing with the kind of pressure that larger actors in this room will apply. Namibia walks into this committee with options - and the challenge is making smart choices among them before someone else makes them for you.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Namibia's emerging status means its negotiating position is less constrained but also less powerful than established producers	What does Namibia actually need from a development partner - and how do you tell the difference between an actor offering that and one offering something that looks similar but benefits them more?	Using Namibia's uncommitted status as deliberate leverage - let multiple actors compete for access rather than accepting the first offer
TerraCore Extraction International and China have both identified Namibia as a target for rapid expansion - their speed creates pressure to decide quickly	How do you use your flexibility as a relatively uncommitted actor to gain leverage in the early stages of committee?	Aligning with the Global Development Equity Coalition to amplify Namibia's voice on fair development terms
The Global Development Equity Coalition has explicitly aligned with Namibia's interests - that relationship is an asset that could amplify your voice	TerraCore and China are both offering fast deals. What makes a fast deal dangerous for a country like Namibia?	Setting specific conditions for investment - infrastructure, processing, employment, environmental protection - before any extraction agreement is signed
The risk of choosing the wrong partner early is significant; Namibia's agreements will shape its trajectory for years	How do you build relationships with the World Bank and Global Development Bank as alternatives or complements to corporate partnerships?	Building a relationship with Chile and the established producer states to learn from their experience before committing to terms

INDUSTRIAL AND REGIONAL POWERS

United States | Industrial and Regional Power

The United States is one of the most powerful actors in this committee and also one of the most constrained by its own stated values. The U.S. has the capital, the technology, the market access, and the institutional weight to shape almost any outcome in this room. It also has a record of prioritizing its own supply chain security over the interests of the resource-producing nations it depends on - and the other actors in this room know that record. How the U.S. uses its power in this committee, whether as a genuine partner to producer nations or as a dominant consumer managing its dependencies, will determine whether it can build the coalitions it needs and whether those coalitions will hold.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The U.S. needs critical resources for its technology, defense, and energy transition industries in ways it cannot easily substitute	What does genuine partnership with resource-producing nations look like from the U.S. side - and is the U.S. willing to offer it in this committee?	Offering specific technology transfer and investment commitments to producer nations as part of genuine supply partnerships
The gap between U.S. rhetoric about fair partnerships and the actual terms it has historically offered is visible to every producer nation in this room	How does the U.S. counterbalance China's influence in producer nations without resorting to the same extractive dynamics it criticizes?	Working with Australia and Japan on a coordinated allied approach that includes real benefits for producer nations
Australia and Japan are close allies, but the U.S. relationship with producer nations like the DRC and Bolivia is more complicated and contested	What is the U.S. willing to put on the table in terms of technology transfer, investment, and market access commitments?	Engaging with the Global Development Bank on infrastructure investment that creates U.S. influence without the extractive dynamic
Voltaris Energy Systems has strong U.S. ties - understanding how corporate interests interact with U.S. government positions matters for your strategy	How does the U.S. build coalitions that include the Global South rather than just Western allies?	Proposing transparency frameworks that apply to all actors' supply chain behavior, including U.S. corporate activity

China | Industrial and Regional Power

China's position in this committee is structurally unique. You are simultaneously a major consumer of critical resources, the world's dominant processor of those resources, a significant investor in resource-producing nations, and the actor that every other industrial power is most worried about. That combination gives China leverage at every stage of the supply chain - and also means that every governance framework proposed in this committee is partly designed to limit China's influence. How China navigates that dynamic, whether through confrontation, strategic engagement, or finding genuine areas of common interest, is the most consequential strategic choice in the room.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
China's processing dominance is a real asset but also the primary reason other actors are investing in alternatives	What does China gain from a more stable and transparent global resource system versus the advantages of its current dominant position?	Proposing long-term processing partnerships with producer nations that include genuine technology transfer and local capacity building
Helios Materials Group has strong ties to China's supply chain - understanding that relationship and using it strategically matters	How does China engage with producer nations in ways that are genuinely beneficial to them and not just strategically convenient for China?	Finding areas where Chinese interests in supply stability genuinely align with producer nation interests in fair development
China's relationships with the DRC and Namibia are framed publicly as South-South cooperation, and how genuinely that framing holds up matters	Which frameworks being proposed in this committee would China actually benefit from - and which ones is it opposing out of habit rather than genuine interest?	Offering transparency in Chinese processing operations as part of a broader framework China helps design
The more China is seen as coercive, the faster other countries build around it; the more it is seen as cooperative, the more it shapes the frameworks being built	What is China's best offer in this committee, and is it willing to make it?	Using China's relationships with the DRC and Namibia to anchor deals that other actors cannot easily replicate

India | Industrial and Regional Power

India is one of the most consequential voices in this committee, and one of the most interesting to play. India is large enough that its demand genuinely matters to producers and processors. It has relationships across the Global South that give it diplomatic reach beyond its current economic weight. And it occupies a distinctive position: neither fully aligned with the Western bloc nor fully aligned with China, India has room to build coalitions that more rigidly aligned actors cannot. The challenge is translating that potential into specific outcomes in a room where larger actors have more immediate leverage. Bolivia is a key relationship. Aurora Strategic Capital and the Global Development Bank are key institutional partners. Use them.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
India's scale means its resource needs are real and growing fast, which gives it credibility in negotiations with producers	How does India use its size and its relationships to build influence in a room where the U.S. and China have more immediate economic leverage?	Building a partnership with Bolivia that serves as a model for fair development investment from a non-Western perspective
India's non-aligned positioning is a genuine diplomatic asset if used strategically rather than just rhetorically	What does India's development experience teach it about what fair resource partnerships actually require from the investor side?	Using India's Global South relationships to broker coalitions between producer states and institutional actors
Bolivia's resources and India's capital and technology create a natural partnership that benefits both - but only if the terms are right	Is India's non-aligned position a strategic advantage in this crisis - and if so, how does it use it concretely?	Positioning India as the actor that bridges the Western bloc and the producer coalition, capturing influence from both sides
India's relationship with the Global Development Bank can amplify what India can offer to resource-producing nations	What is India willing to offer Bolivia and other developing producers that neither the U.S. nor China can match?	Working with Aurora Strategic Capital and the Global Development Bank on infrastructure investment that advances Indian interests while genuinely benefiting producer nations

Japan | Industrial and Regional Power

Japan is the most import-dependent major economy in this committee and has been managing that vulnerability with exceptional precision for decades. You have no meaningful domestic mineral production. Everything your technology and manufacturing sectors need comes from somewhere else. Japan has responded to this through supply chain diversification, strategic stockpiling, long-term bilateral relationships, and technological efficiency. You are very good at managing dependency. The question this committee asks is whether that management approach can survive the kind of crisis that is currently unfolding - and what Japan is willing to offer to build the more stable system it genuinely needs.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Japan's near-total import dependence is not going away - it shapes every decision this delegation makes	What does Japan offer producer nations that other consumer economies cannot match - and how does Japan make that offer explicitly?	Offering Japanese technology and long-term investment as genuine partnership with producer nations rather than purely transactional supply deals
BlueStrait Logistics controls shipping networks Japan depends on - that relationship is both an asset and a vulnerability	How does Japan build supply security that does not simply recreate dependence on a different set of suppliers?	Working with Australia and South Korea on a coordinated allied consumer approach that includes real benefits for producers
Japan's relationships with Australia and the United States are strong but those relationships do not insulate Japan from supply disruption on their own	What is the connection between Japan's technological leadership and its ability to contribute to domestic processing development in producer nations?	Proposing supply chain transparency and early warning mechanisms that serve all actors rather than just Japan
Japan's technological expertise and capital are real assets it can offer producer nations in exchange for supply security	If BlueStrait logistics routes are disrupted, what is Japan's contingency?	Building on existing bilateral relationships with Australia to anchor a broader network that can absorb shocks

South Korea | Industrial and Regional Power

South Korea built one of the world's great industrial economies without meaningful natural resources, through technology, investment, and sheer discipline. That achievement also created a fundamental vulnerability: South Korean battery and semiconductor manufacturing depends entirely on stable imports of the materials this committee is about. Synapse Grid Technologies is a key corporate partner. Indonesia is a critical supplier. Japan is a close ally with overlapping interests. In this committee, South Korea has strong incentives to support supply stability, and genuine technological assets to offer in exchange. The question is whether South Korea uses those assets boldly or defensively.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
South Korea's battery and semiconductor industries are among the most directly and immediately exposed to the current supply disruption	What does South Korea's manufacturing leadership allow it to offer producer nations that other consumer economies cannot provide?	Offering South Korean battery technology and manufacturing expertise as part of genuine processing partnerships with producer nations
Synapse Grid Technologies is competing directly with Voltaris - understanding how that corporate competition affects South Korea's diplomatic position matters	How does South Korea navigate the tension between needing Indonesian supply and supporting Indonesian sovereignty over that supply?	Working with Japan to coordinate consumer positions that include real development benefits for producer states
Indonesia is a critical nickel supplier - and Indonesia's assertive resource nationalism creates real tension with South Korea's supply needs	What is the relationship between South Korea's technology sector and the processing capacity development that producer nations need?	Engaging Indonesia directly on terms that respect its domestic processing agenda while addressing South Korea's supply needs
South Korea's relationship with Japan creates coalition opportunities but also potential competition for the same supply sources	How does South Korea avoid being caught between U.S. and Chinese supply chain pressures?	Using Synapse Grid Technologies as a vehicle for technology transfer agreements that serve both corporate and diplomatic goals

European Union Representative | Industrial and Regional Power

You represent one of the most complex delegations in this committee. The European Union is a bloc of nations with different economic interests, different relationships with resource-producing regions, and different levels of willingness to accept the costs that its stated values - sustainability, labor rights, fair trade - actually require. You have strong regulatory credentials and genuine institutional weight. You also have historical relationships with African resource-producing nations that are complicated and sometimes exploitative. Your challenge is to be the actor you say you are rather than the actor your history suggests you might be. That is a harder assignment than it sounds.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The EU's regulatory framework gives it real leverage over corporations that want access to European markets	How does the EU use its regulatory power as a lever for fair treatment of producer nations rather than just as a market access condition?	Using EU market access as leverage to require labor and environmental standards from corporations importing into European markets
EU member states do not always agree - the internal compromise required to maintain a unified position is part of your role	What does the internal EU compromise process look like - which member state interests are most in tension, and how do you manage that?	Building a relationship with Chile and Indonesia around regulatory frameworks that reward responsible resource development
Chile has a relationship with the EU that includes both trade partnerships and regulatory pressure - that dual dynamic is worth understanding	How does the EU engage honestly with its historical relationships with African producer nations in a way that builds credibility rather than resentment?	Working with the International Labor Rights Federation to propose specific, enforceable labor standards with EU market access as the enforcement mechanism
The International Labor Rights Federation and Global Environmental Coalition share values with the EU's stated positions; how genuinely the EU engages with them matters	Is the EU willing to accept supply chain costs - higher prices, more complex sourcing - to actually achieve the standards it advocates for?	Negotiating with NexTrade Global and BlueStrait Logistics on supply chain transparency requirements as a condition of European market participation

MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Helios Materials Group | Multinational Corporation

Helios is the established giant of this committee's corporate world. You have large-scale extraction operations across multiple continents, deep relationships with governments and logistics partners, and the kind of institutional inertia that comes with being the dominant player in your sector. Your relationship with the DRC is central to your operations and central to this crisis. Your relationship with China is central to your processing capacity. BlueStrait Logistics moves your materials. You have a lot to protect - and that is both your strength and your constraint. The most important strategic question for Helios is not how to gain more power, but how to protect what you have while the system around you changes.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Helios's dominance in mining makes it a target for regulatory pressure and a source of anxiety for competitors and advocacy actors	What does Helios offer to the DRC government that justifies its current position - and what would it need to offer to justify a better one?	Proactively offering community investment and environmental commitments in the DRC as a way to protect operating licenses
The DRC relationship is your most important asset and your most complicated liability simultaneously	How does Helios respond to regulatory pressure from the EU and advocacy actors without triggering the kind of scrutiny that could disrupt operations?	Working with China on processing partnerships that give Helios preferred access in exchange for supply security
TerraCore is moving into markets Helios considers its territory - how you respond to that competitive pressure shapes your committee position	What is the relationship between Helios's current market dominance and the governance frameworks being debated in this committee?	Proposing industry transparency standards that Helios can already meet and that disadvantage less established competitors
BlueStrait controls logistics that Helios depends on - that dependency is worth examining	If TerraCore wins deals that Helios loses, what is the downstream consequence for Helios's supply chain position?	Negotiating with the World Bank or Global Development Bank on infrastructure investment that creates favorable conditions for Helios operations

TerraCore Extraction International | Multinational Corporation

TerraCore is the aggressive challenger. You move fast, take risks that established players avoid, and have built your business model on getting into emerging markets before the competition.

Namibia and Bolivia are your targets in this committee. Aurora Strategic Capital is your financial partner. You compete directly with Helios for access and with Synapse for downstream customers. Your speed is your advantage and your exposure is your risk. In a committee that is already in crisis mode, the actors who move first on deals tend to define the terms that everyone else has to respond to. TerraCore should be moving.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
TerraCore's competitive advantage is speed and risk tolerance - use both, but understand what you are exposing yourself to	How does TerraCore move fast in emerging markets without triggering the exploitation narrative that could derail negotiations?	Offering Bolivia and Namibia specific, concrete development terms - not just extraction rights - as a way to differentiate from Helios
Namibia and Bolivia are both cautious about exploitation - coming in fast without addressing that concern directly will produce resistance	What specific terms - employment, processing, environmental - would make a TerraCore offer acceptable to Bolivia or Namibia?	Moving before other corporations to lock in regional agreements in the crisis environment when speed creates advantage
Aurora Strategic Capital can provide the financial backing TerraCore needs, but Aurora has its own strategic interests that may not always align	How do you manage the relationship with Aurora Strategic Capital when your interests diverge?	Building a visible partnership with Aurora Strategic Capital that signals financial credibility to skeptical producer nations
The crisis environment creates opening for deals that would not be available in stable conditions - identify and pursue them	If Helios is the establishment, what does TerraCore gain from positioning itself as the alternative that producer nations actually prefer?	Proposing to Synapse Grid Technologies a supply partnership that serves both corporations' interests and gives TerraCore downstream market security

Voltaris Energy Systems | Multinational Corporation

Voltaris makes batteries. That means you are directly and immediately affected by every supply disruption, every price spike, and every governance decision that changes how critical minerals

flow through the system. You depend on lithium, cobalt, and nickel more directly than almost any other actor in this committee. Your relationship with Indonesia is a critical supply partnership. Your relationship with the United States is both a business relationship and a source of political support. And Synapse is coming after your market share aggressively. In a crisis, Voltaris has to make a choice: hunker down and protect what you have, or use the disruption as an opportunity to lock in terms that give you an advantage when things stabilize.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Voltaris's supply dependence means every hour of crisis is a real cost to your operations and your customers	What is the most important supply agreement Voltaris can lock in right now, and who do you need to negotiate with to get it?	Offering Indonesia long-term supply agreements with specific domestic processing investment commitments as a way to secure preferential access
The relationship with Indonesia is valuable but Indonesia's domestic processing agenda creates ongoing tension with Voltaris's sourcing preferences	How does Voltaris engage with Indonesia's domestic processing agenda in a way that serves both parties rather than creating ongoing conflict?	Working with the United States government on supply chain security frameworks that include Voltaris's interests by design
Synapse is a direct competitor for both supply and customers - the crisis may create an opening to gain advantage over them	Is there a version of the crisis that actually benefits Voltaris by disadvantaging Synapse - and how do you pursue that without being seen as making the crisis worse?	Proposing industry-wide ethical sourcing standards that Voltaris can already meet and that raise the bar for competitors
The U.S. relationship provides political support but also creates expectations about domestic sourcing that constrain your options	What commitments on ethical sourcing can Voltaris make that address reputational risk without compromising supply security?	Initiating direct negotiations with Helios on a supply partnership that gives Voltaris preferred access in exchange for downstream market commitments

Synapse Grid Technologies | Multinational Corporation

Synapse is growing fast in electric vehicles and energy infrastructure, which means you need the same materials as everyone else and you need them at the pace your expansion requires. You are

competing directly with Voltaris for supply and for customers. You have a strong relationship with South Korea and a partnership with NexTrade Global for logistics and trading. TerraCore is a natural ally on deals that established players will not pursue. In this committee, Synapse benefits from the crisis to the extent that you can secure supply agreements your competitors cannot. The risk is that the crisis creates instability that disrupts the growth trajectory your entire business plan depends on.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Synapse's direct competition with Voltaris means every supply deal you win and they do not is a strategic win on two dimensions	What is the most important supply advantage Synapse can establish in the first phase of this crisis?	Moving quickly with TerraCore on emerging market supply deals before Voltaris can respond
South Korea's manufacturing expertise and Synapse's technology create a partnership with real complementary value	How does Synapse use the TerraCore relationship to access supply without taking on TerraCore's reputational risks?	Building a technology partnership with South Korea that gives Synapse market and political backing for supply negotiations
NexTrade Global can give Synapse logistics flexibility that Voltaris lacks - that is a competitive advantage worth developing	Is there a version of the crisis where Synapse comes out with a stronger supply position than it entered with - and what does that path look like?	Offering NexTrade a preferred logistics partnership that gives Synapse flexible routing options during supply chain disruptions
TerraCore's willingness to move fast in emerging markets could give Synapse access to supply channels Voltaris cannot easily access	How does Synapse engage with South Korea on terms that reflect genuine partnership rather than simple extraction of Korean market access?	Proposing a consumer coalition with South Korea and Japan to coordinate supply access strategies across allied manufacturers

BlueStrait Logistics | Multinational Corporation

BlueStrait controls the shipping routes and transportation infrastructure that moves critical resources around the world. In normal times, that is a profitable but unremarkable position. In a

crisis, when supply chains are disrupted and every actor is scrambling to secure reliable transport, BlueStrait becomes one of the most powerful actors in the room. You can prioritize certain shipments over others. You can offer preferred routing to preferred partners. You can slow or accelerate the movement of materials through decisions that look operational but are functionally political. The question is how openly you use that power and which relationships you build it around.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
BlueStrait's power in a crisis is real but must be used carefully - openly prioritizing one actor over another creates enemies	How does BlueStrait use its logistics control as diplomatic currency without being seen as holding the system hostage?	Offering Japan and Australia preferred routing as part of broader supply security partnerships
Japan depends on BlueStrait's routes in ways that give BlueStrait significant leverage over a major industrial economy	Which actors would benefit most from preferential routing, and what do they offer in return?	Negotiating with Helios on logistics exclusivity in exchange for investment in BlueStrait's infrastructure
The relationship with Helios Materials Group is your largest single client relationship - and the one most at risk if the crisis disrupts production	How does the crisis change BlueStrait's business model - does instability hurt you or create opportunity?	Proposing a supply chain transparency framework that BlueStrait helps design and therefore benefits from
NexTrade Global operates in overlapping space with BlueStrait - that competitive dynamic is worth understanding before it becomes a conflict	What does BlueStrait offer to advocacy actors and institutional players who are pushing for supply chain transparency?	Using the crisis to establish long-term preferred routing agreements with the actors who are most dependent on your services

NexTrade Global | Multinational Corporation

NexTrade operates at the intersection of logistics and commodities trading, which makes you one of the most information-rich actors in this committee. You see what is moving, where it is

going, what it costs, and who is paying. That market intelligence is enormously valuable in a crisis. NexTrade competes with BlueStrait for logistics contracts and operates in commodity markets where your trading activity can affect the prices that everyone else pays. The European Union is a major customer. Synapse is a key partner. The uncomfortable truth about NexTrade's position is that you benefit from exactly the kind of volatility that is causing everyone else problems - and navigating the perception problem that creates is part of your challenge in this committee.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
NexTrade's information advantage is real and should be deployed strategically rather than given away for free	What information does NexTrade have that other actors would pay to access - and what do you want in exchange?	Offering market intelligence and logistics expertise as a contribution to coordination mechanisms in exchange for preferred access and regulatory protection
The perception that NexTrade profits from volatility creates a credibility problem that requires active management	How does NexTrade manage the perception that it benefits from crisis without addressing underlying stability?	Proposing industry transparency standards that NexTrade helps design, capturing the reputational benefit while shaping what transparency actually requires
The EU relationship gives NexTrade access to European regulatory conversations - that is an asset if used well	Is there a version of this crisis where NexTrade plays a genuinely constructive role - providing market intelligence to support coordination - that also advances NexTrade's interests?	Working with Synapse on a logistics partnership that gives NexTrade preferred access to a high-growth customer
Competition with BlueStrait for logistics contracts means every deal BlueStrait wins is one NexTrade does not	How do you use the EU relationship to shape regulatory frameworks in ways that favor NexTrade's business model?	Positioning NexTrade as the broker that makes deals happen between actors who cannot directly negotiate - and capturing value from every deal facilitated

Aurora Strategic Capital | Multinational Corporation

Aurora is the actor with the most flexibility in this committee and potentially the most quiet influence. You do not mine, process, ship, or manufacture. You fund the people who do. And

whoever you fund becomes more powerful. Whoever you do not fund has to find alternatives or slow down. Bolivia and Indonesia are current targets. TerraCore is a portfolio company. In a crisis where infrastructure investment determines who can actually develop their resources and who cannot, Aurora's choices are consequential in ways that do not always make the front page. The question is what Aurora is optimizing for - maximum financial return, strategic influence, genuine development impact, or some combination of all three.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Aurora's power comes from capital allocation decisions that look financial but are functionally political	What are Aurora's actual investment criteria in this crisis - and how do social and governance considerations factor against financial returns?	Offering Bolivia and Indonesia investment terms that include domestic processing requirements, framing it as both responsible and strategically sound
Bolivia and Indonesia are both seeking investment - the terms Aurora offers shape what kind of development actually happens	How does Aurora manage the TerraCore relationship when TerraCore's approach creates optics that Aurora may not want to be associated with?	Using Aurora's relationships across the producer and corporate blocs to broker deals that no single actor could arrange independently
TerraCore's aggressive approach creates reputational risk for Aurora if TerraCore's deals are seen as exploitative	Is there a version of Aurora's investment strategy that genuinely aligns financial returns with development outcomes for producer nations?	Proposing investment standards that differentiate responsible capital from extractive capital, positioning Aurora favorably in both
The World Bank and Global Development Bank are both potential partners and potential competitors for the same investment opportunities	Which governance frameworks being debated in this committee would Aurora prefer - and how does Aurora shape them?	Working with the World Bank and Global Development Bank on co-investment frameworks that give Aurora access to development finance relationships

FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ACTORS

International Monetary Fund (IMF) | Financial and Institutional Actor

The IMF's power in this committee is indirect but substantial. You do not control resources or production. You control access to emergency financial support when economies face crisis - and in a resource supply disruption, the economies that suffer most are often the ones that can least afford it. Your ability to attach conditions to financial support gives you real influence over the policies of countries that need your help. In this committee, the IMF occupies an interesting position: you genuinely want stability, your tools are designed to produce it, and the conditions you attach to support often produce conflict with the actors who need that support most.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
IMF financial support comes with conditions that can shape policy in ways recipient countries do not always welcome	How does the IMF use its financial leverage to support outcomes that are genuinely good for resource-producing nations rather than just financially stabilizing?	Offering emergency support to smaller economies being squeezed out of resource access on conditions that address long-term governance rather than just short-term stability
The resource crisis is creating financial pressure on smaller economies that may need IMF assistance - that creates leverage and responsibility simultaneously	What conditions attached to crisis support would actually address the structural problems the resource crisis has exposed?	Proposing IMF monitoring frameworks for resource market transparency that give the institution an ongoing role in crisis prevention
The IMF's relationship with the United States creates perceptions about whose interests it actually serves	How does the IMF manage the perception that its conditions benefit wealthy countries more than developing ones?	Working with the World Bank and Global Development Bank on coordinated institutional responses that present a unified development finance position
Global Development Bank is a partner and sometimes a competitor for the same development finance space	What is the IMF's relationship with producer nation sovereignty - and where does financial conditionality cross a line?	Using the IMF's convening power to bring industrial nations and producer nations into structured dialogue on the financial dimensions of the crisis

World Bank | Financial and Institutional Actor

The World Bank focuses on long-term development and infrastructure, which makes you one of the actors most directly relevant to the structural questions this committee is here to address. Extraction without processing capacity, investment without local benefit, and infrastructure that

serves foreign corporations rather than domestic economies - these are the patterns the World Bank's development mandate is supposed to interrupt. Whether it actually does depends on how the World Bank uses its institutional power in this specific committee. Namibia and Bolivia are priority relationships. Aurora Strategic Capital is a private sector partner. The question is whether the World Bank shapes the terms of development or simply ratifies the terms that more powerful actors have already set.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The World Bank's development mandate gives it a legitimate role in shaping investment terms for emerging producer nations	What specific infrastructure investments in Namibia and Bolivia would change those countries' resource development trajectories most significantly?	Offering Namibia and Bolivia infrastructure investment on terms that include domestic processing requirements and community benefit standards
Namibia and Bolivia both need infrastructure investment that the World Bank can provide on terms that private investors will not always offer	How does the World Bank ensure its investments produce local benefit rather than primarily serving the interests of corporate actors who are also involved in the same projects?	Building a coordinated institutional position with the IMF and Global Development Bank that presents a unified development finance voice
Aurora Strategic Capital moves faster than the World Bank - coordination or competition between them will significantly affect outcomes for producer nations	Where does the World Bank's relationship with Aurora Strategic Capital become complementary, and where does it become competitive?	Working with the Global Environmental Coalition and Labor Rights Federation to develop investment standards that the World Bank applies to all its resource sector lending
The Global Development Equity Coalition shares the World Bank's stated goals; how the Bank engages with advocacy actors matters for its credibility	How does the World Bank use this crisis to advance governance frameworks that make the next crisis less severe?	Using the crisis to establish precedents for what responsible resource development finance looks like that outlast the immediate emergency

Global Development Bank | Financial and Institutional Actor

The Global Development Bank is a fictional but functionally important actor in this committee - a multilateral development institution designed specifically to fund large-scale industrial and resource projects in partnership with governments and private investors. You sit between the

World Bank's development mandate and the private investment world of Aurora Strategic Capital, which gives you flexibility that neither has alone. India is a key shareholder. The DRC and TerraCore are priority relationships. You can move faster than the World Bank and with more development focus than Aurora. In a committee where infrastructure investment determines who can develop their resources, that combination makes you consequential.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The Global Development Bank's flexibility between public mandate and private capital is your most distinctive asset	How does the Global Development Bank use its flexibility to fund projects that the World Bank is too slow for and that Aurora is too commercially focused to support responsibly?	Offering DRC co-investment in processing infrastructure as a way to create local value capture that changes the cobalt extraction dynamic
India's role as a key shareholder creates both influence and expectations about where investment flows	What safeguards does the Bank apply to TerraCore's projects to ensure they meet development standards rather than just financial return metrics?	Coordinating with the World Bank and IMF on a unified institutional response that gives development finance a coherent voice in the crisis
TerraCore's aggressive approach creates a due diligence challenge - the Bank needs to distinguish between productive investment and extractive deals dressed up as development	How does the Bank use India's shareholder role to advance both India's interests and broader development objectives simultaneously?	Using the India relationship to build investment pipelines that advance South-South cooperation in real rather than rhetorical terms
The DRC's infrastructure needs are enormous and well-documented - the Bank's engagement there has moral weight and strategic significance	What would a flagship investment in the DRC's processing capacity look like - and who would the Bank need to coordinate with to make it happen?	Establishing investment standards for resource sector projects that distinguish development finance from extractive capital

ADVOCACY AND NORMATIVE ACTORS

Global Environmental Coalition Leader | Advocacy and Normative Actor

The Global Environmental Coalition has moral authority, documented evidence, and genuine relationships with governments and corporations who are sensitive to reputational pressure. What it does not have is direct economic leverage. In a committee full of actors who control resources, capital, and logistics, your influence depends entirely on how effectively you use the tools available to non-economic actors: information, coalition-building, public pressure, and the ability to make other actors' behavior visible. Chile has a relationship with your coalition. The EU shares your stated values. The World Bank has a development mandate that overlaps with your concerns. The question is whether you use those relationships to produce specific, enforceable outcomes, or settle for expressing concern.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The environmental costs of critical mineral extraction are real, documented, and directly relevant to every decision this committee makes	How do you make the environmental case in a way that builds alliances with producer nations rather than putting them on the defensive?	Proposing certification standards for environmental compliance that the EU requires as a condition of market access
Chile's relationship with the Coalition is an asset - but only if the Coalition engages with Chile's economic constraints honestly rather than just applying pressure	What specific, enforceable mechanisms would actually improve conditions in mining regions - not just express concern about them?	Building an alliance with the International Labor Rights Federation that combines environmental and labor concerns into a single advocacy position with more collective weight
The EU's regulatory framework is a potential enforcement mechanism for environmental standards - building that relationship matters	How do you use the EU's market access leverage as an environmental enforcement tool?	Using documented evidence from DRC and Indonesian mining operations to make abstract standards debates concrete and unavoidable
Corporate actors like TerraCore and Helios are your most challenging targets, but also the ones where change would matter most	Which corporate actor is most vulnerable to reputational pressure - and how do you apply that pressure effectively?	Working with the World Bank to develop environmental standards for resource sector lending that apply to every project the Bank funds

International Labor Rights Federation Representative | Advocacy and Normative Actor

Labor rights in the mining sector are not abstract. Child labor in cobalt mines. Unsafe conditions in nickel extraction. Workers in resource-rich nations bearing the physical costs of a global supply chain they cannot afford to participate in as consumers. The International Labor Rights Federation exists to make that visible and to push for enforceable protections. Your

relationships are with the EU as a regulatory partner, the DRC as the most urgent site of concern, and Helios as the largest corporate actor whose practices matter most. Like the Environmental Coalition, your influence depends on strategy and coalition rather than direct leverage. But the moral case you are making is not abstract - and in a committee of actors who are sensitive to how their behavior is perceived, that matters.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
The labor abuses documented in critical mineral supply chains are real, specific, and verifiable - that specificity is your greatest tool	What specific, verifiable labor standards would make a meaningful difference in mining communities - and who needs to agree to them for them to be enforceable?	Proposing specific labor standards tied to EU market access as an enforcement mechanism corporations cannot ignore
The DRC relationship is simultaneously your most urgent concern and your most complex relationship	How do you advocate for workers in the DRC without undermining the DRC government's negotiating position in ways that ultimately hurt those same workers?	Building a joint advocacy position with the Global Environmental Coalition that combines environmental and labor concerns
Helios is your most important corporate target - what Helios commits to sets standards that other corporations have to respond to	What does Helios's commitment to labor standards look like in practice, and what would it take to get that commitment?	Working directly with the DRC on a labor protection framework that the DRC can use in its own negotiations with corporations
The EU's regulatory framework and market access leverage is the most powerful enforcement mechanism available to your goals	How do you build a coalition with the Environmental Coalition and the Development Equity Coalition that is more powerful than any of the three alone?	Targeting Helios specifically with a public commitment request - a company of Helios's size making a public commitment creates pressure on every other corporate actor

Global Development Equity Coalition Representative | Advocacy and Normative Actor

The Global Development Equity Coalition represents the argument that the clean energy transition cannot be built on the same extractive model that previous industrial transitions used - taking resources from the world's poorest communities while the wealth flows elsewhere. You advocate for developing nations, particularly producer states, in negotiations where those nations often lack the leverage to advocate for themselves effectively. Namibia and Bolivia are

your priorities. The Global Development Bank is a key institutional partner. Your coalition gives voice to the principle that fairness is not just a moral position - it is a prerequisite for the long-term stability that every other actor in this room says they want.

Things to Consider	Questions to Think About	Possibilities Worth Exploring
Namibia and Bolivia are the producer states most vulnerable to exploitative deals in the current crisis environment - your advocacy for them is most urgent there	What specific protections in investment and supply agreements would make a meaningful difference for Namibia and Bolivia in this crisis?	Proposing specific minimum standards for development agreements - local content requirements, processing commitments, community benefit funds - that apply to all resource investments
The Global Development Bank's investment mandate creates a genuine institutional partner for your goals	How do you make the fairness argument in terms that resonate with actors who are primarily motivated by economic and strategic interests rather than equity?	Building an alliance with the Global Environmental Coalition and Labor Rights Federation that gives advocacy actors a unified position with more collective weight
The argument that fairness produces stability is genuinely persuasive to institutional actors who are primarily motivated by stability	Which institutional actors - World Bank, IMF, Global Development Bank - can you genuinely move, and what do they need from you to engage?	Working with Namibia and Bolivia directly to help them identify and negotiate better terms rather than just advocating on their behalf from the outside
Your coalition's credibility depends on whether it produces specific outcomes for developing nations, not just better-sounding rhetoric	How do you prevent the Coalition's position from being co-opted by actors who want to claim development credentials without changing their actual behavior?	Using the Global Development Bank relationship to establish institutional precedents for what equitable resource development finance looks like