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Complexities of pre-negotiations

ISSUES
What (if anything) we want to talk about

CONTEXTS
How we each feel constrained by the external environment

PROCESSES
The way we negotiate

RELATIONSHIPS
Who we are vis-à-vis each other
Complexities of multi-stakeholder negotiations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>CONTEXTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>External dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradeoffs</td>
<td>Micro-contexts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESSES</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constraints</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures</td>
<td>Distrust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Image of a diagram showing the relationships between issues, processes, contexts, and relationships]
A different toolbox is necessary

Advocates for a particular solution
Arbiters of the final decision
Making a deal
Focused on our stakeholders

Honest brokers of information and options
Stewards of an inclusive process
Coming into alignment with each other
Joint systems architects

IMPLICATIONS FOR:
- Analytic needs
- Attitudes and behaviours
- Process design
- Coalition building
"I sure hope the negotiations go well."
Others parties’ perspectives, mandates, preferences, institutional logics, and constraints will be quite different from ours.
Perspective taking is crucial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGAGEMENT PLANNING TOOL – DIAGNOSTIC CHECKLIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR US</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PROBLEM:</strong> How would each party describe its primary goals? Its key challenges and roadblocks? What does each need and want from the other? What would be the headings in an eventual agreement? Which are most important to each?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PEOPLE:</strong> What is the status of the relationship and trust among the parties? How does each party see itself and the other party vis-à-vis its own key issues? What are its aspirations for the future, in particular vis-à-vis the other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PROCESS:</strong> What are the preferred approaches for each party to beginning any negotiation, reaching agreement, and moving to implementation? What timing or sequencing issues are there? What formal or informal rules need to be respected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PARAMETERS:</strong> Who are each party’s crucial stakeholders? What situation or factors does each party face – tangible and intangible – that will make it harder to get what it wants out of a negotiation? What are any lines that each party can’t cross?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement (BATNA):</strong> What is the best outcome without the cooperation of the other side?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the frame in which our negotiation counterparts see the context and the issues?

How does this compare to ours?

What does this mean for how we will need to proceed?

The difference between a successful and an unsuccessful negotiation lies all too often in the quality of parties’ preparation

JES SALACUSE, THE GLOBAL NEGOTIATOR
Iterative proposal design and testing is required to arrive at a sufficient consensus.
I've decided to escalate my anti-social behavior from not listening, to actively talking over other people.

How can you enjoy the conversation of others if you don't listen?

It all came together when I realized that listening isn't the fun part.
A collaborative mindset is key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR Perceptions</th>
<th>THEIR Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How we perceive our role vis-à-vis the key issues</td>
<td>How they perceive our role vis-à-vis the key issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we perceive their role vis-à-vis the key issues</td>
<td>How they perceive their role vis-à-vis the key issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How we experience them</td>
<td>How they experience us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we want from our relationship with them</td>
<td>What they want from their relationship with us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the relationship pursued according to:

- **Power** – “you better get on board”?
- **Right** – “we have the authority”?
- **Reciprocity** – “help us and we’ll help you”?
- **Partnership** – “we are jointly pursuing agreed goals to which we are committed”?

---

1. Adapted from Fischer, Schneck, Rogovitch & Gauzen. *COPING WITH INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT: A SYSTEMATIC APPROACH TO INFLUENCE IN INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION* (Prentice Hall 1997) by Brian Ganson for the Africa Centre for Dispute Settlement (2019). All Rights Reserved.
Persuasiveness is strongly correlated with certain behaviors

1. Ethical
2. Experienced
3. Personable
4. Rational
5. Trustworthy
6. Self-controlled
7. Confident
8. Agreeable
9. Realistic
10. Accommodating
11. Sociable
12. Fair-minded
13. Dignified
14. Communicative
15. Perceptive
16. Adaptable
17. Astute (about the substance)
18. Poised
19. Careful
20. Helpful

A. Schneider, “Shattering Negotiation Myths: Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Negotiation Style,” 7 HARVARD NEGOTIATION LAW REVIEW 143 (Spring 2002)
The most effective negotiators share certain key characteristics

- **Highly Empathetic**
  (focused on all the interests – especially THEIRS);
- **Experts at Option Creation**
  (adaptable, flexible, helpful to THEM)
- **Exceedingly Well-Prepared**
  (realistic, fair-minded, astute about THEIR issues)

A. Schneider, “Shattering Negotiation Myths: Empirical Evidence on the Effectiveness of Negotiation Style,” 7 HARVARD NEGOTIATION LAW REVIEW 143 (Spring 2002)
"All those in favor say 'Aye.'"
"Aye."
"Aye."
"Aye."
"Aye."
"Aye."
"No! No! A thousand times no!"
"Heaven forbid!"
"You've got to be kidding!"
"Perish the thought!"
"Say it ain't so!"
Multilateral negotiations are typically characterized by decreasing flexibility.

**EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES AS FLEXIBILITY DIMINISHES**

- **EXPLORE**
  - Build relationships
  - Build capacity
  - Engage in joint learning
  - Explore bridging principles

- **FRAME**
  - Develop the roadmap
    - Parties
    - Roles
    - Issues
    - Process

- **CONSTRUCT**
  - Explore options
  - Explore tradeoffs
  - Explore coalitions

- **AGREE**
  - Assemble and agree to the package that addresses parties’ key priorities

Time
The expectation that collaboration can occur without a supporting infrastructure is one of the most frequent reasons why it fails.

Complex negotiations frequently need not only “facilitation” but “secretariat” functions
“Never, ever, think outside the box.”
Changing the agent – principal relationship

- International Institution
- INGO Partner
- Funding or legislative mandate
Changing the agent – principal relationship

Funding or legislative mandate

INGO Partner

International Institution
Managing complex negotiations

**PROCESSES**
- Making a deal
- Coming into alignment with each other

**ISSUES**
- Advocates for a particular solution
- Honest brokers of information and options

**RELATIONSHIPS**
- Arbiters of the final decision
- Stewards of an inclusive process

**CONTEXTS**
- Expecting everyone to figure it out
- Joint systems architects
- Focused on our stakeholders
- Sponsors of a Secretariat

Arbiters of the final decision
Making a deal
Focused on our stakeholders
Expecting everyone to figure it out
Joint systems architects
Sponsors of a Secretariat
Advocates for a particular solution
Honest brokers of information and options
Arbiters of the final decision
Stewards of an inclusive process
Coming into alignment with each other
Closing thoughts on complex negotiations

COMPARED TO BILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS:

• “Integrative” or “win-win” activities (building relationships, joint framing, exploring interests behind positions, or developing creative options) have to happen very early — or they don’t happen at all

• The ability to systematically analyze, strategize, and shape processes in complex negotiation environments becomes a source of negotiation advantage

• Trust grows in importance — can I believe you and can you believe me when we say what we must have or what we can’t give up?

• Shifting the geometry (from each of us fighting to satisfy our own stakeholders to an inclusive team shaping a joint solution) enhances systems power
I've heard that when the Wright brothers argued, they periodically switched sides in the debate to try to encourage a more balanced conclusion.

We should try that in our relationship!

It's a neat idea, but I think treating personal issues like a debate will only engender hostility and hurt feelings.

No, I think it would help by forcing us to consider the other person's point of view.

Hmm, maybe you're right.

Am not, it's a bad idea.