



E-PARCC

COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

Syracuse University

Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs

Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration

Converging!

Teaching Note

Converging! is a simulation-game paralleling the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Participants are set in a scenario that blends real and fictional events, forming a "pseudo-reality." It is a situation familiar enough to spark interest, motivation and identification, yet controlled and delineated to allow for maximum learning and skill-building.

At its core, the simulation's framework is familiar: two disputing parties and a third-party intervener, all possessing both shared and private information. Parties must choose whether to fall into familiar patterns of competition and coercion, or endeavor to construct a collaborative process and achieve cooperative outcomes with their perceived enemies.

Certain elements in the simulation's setup dictate that careful attention must be paid to the early stages of the simulation's initiation (for example, each party is composed of several members, each having personal information and interests that may be divergent from those of other team members, necessitating careful thought to role assignment). The introduction of trainer-initiated changes and interventions in the scenario necessitates special attention to the simulation's management. To this end, a detailed Simulation Setup and Management Guide has been provided. Additionally, an extensive Debriefing Guide is provided to address the wide variety of training goals this simulation can achieve.

This simulation was an honorable mention winner in our 2007 "Collaborative Public Management, Collaborative Governance, and Collaborative Problem Solving" teaching case and simulation competition. It was double-blind peer reviewed by a committee of academics and practitioners. It was written by Noam Ebner and Yael Efron of Tachlit Mediation and Negotiation Training, Israel, and edited by Laurel Saiz. This simulation is intended for classroom discussion and is not intended to suggest either effective or ineffective handling of the situation depicted. It is brought to you by E-PARCC, part of the Maxwell School of Syracuse University's Collaborative Governance Initiative, a subset of the Program for the Advancement of Research on Conflict and Collaboration (PARCC). This material may be copied as many times as needed as long as the authors are given full credit for their work.

Designed for dedicated and committed participants, Converging! engrosses participants in the simulated environment for a long period of time, ranging from one to three days, or from about six to twenty hours. This investment engenders two major learning outcomes:

- In-depth understanding of the complexities of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict
- Advanced skill-building in conflict resolution, negotiation and mediation skills

While it can be employed with participants at an introductory level, the simulation is particularly suited for participants with some background in (at least) either the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or conflict resolution, e.g., students of conflict resolution or professionals working in the region.

The background scenario depicts the political and social realities in Israel and Palestine today, weaving in a fictional element: the planned evacuation of an Israeli city located in the West Bank. While this plan (and indeed, the city of Dan itself) is fictional, contemplating such an evacuation is inevitable in any future negotiations, lending value to the exercise. For example, the inter-relatedness between the Palestinian city of Jenin and Dan might loosely mirror the proximity between the real Israeli city of Ariel and the Palestinian city of Nablus, located some 20 miles to the south.

Additional themes woven against this background include the internal struggle on the Palestinian side between Hamas and Fatah, the building of a disputed Wall between Israel and the Palestinian territories, and an Israeli military operation in the area. Political and social motives depicted in the scenario have led both parties to send unofficial delegates to talks held in Cyprus, under the unofficial auspices of a team of UN mediators, in an attempt to reach a local, negotiated settlement.

Rather than replicate the oft-tried--and well-exhausted--method of throwing participants into the calamitous pond of the entire Israeli-Palestinian conflict and instructing them to solve it, this simulation offers an alternative method to learn these issues by dealing with them on a smaller scale. Participants are given the opportunity to focus on the immediate realities in the northern West Bank, on the big-picture realities of the conflict as a whole, or on both. Through trainer intervention, participants are constantly moved between these two foci, mirroring the real-life complexity of trying to negotiate any isolated or localized issue in the Israeli/Palestinian conflict in the shadow of the larger conflict.

The simulation is designed for maximum versatility. The storyline can be updated easily and regularly to allow for any changes in the regional political reality. The roles of the UN mediators can be stressed in mediation skill-building training, or dropped altogether in order to allow participants to flex their unassisted negotiation skills. New roles can easily be developed (or the provided roles adapted) to allow for participants' real-life preferences and experiences.

Logistics, Setup and Game Management Instructions

Number of Roles: 10-20 (up to 8 Israeli roles, 8 Palestinian roles and 4 UN mediator roles) [Optimal group size is 12-13 participants, with 5 players each on the Palestinian and Israeli teams and 2-3 UN mediators. This allows for maximum individual participation and group management. However, roles are provided for up to 20 players. In still larger groups, several simulation-groups can work concurrently, with the trainer either rotating between them or employing training assistants.]

Setup and Preparation Time: 1-2 hours

Running Time: 6-20 hours

Level: Intermediate to Advanced

Debriefing Time:

One hour for debriefing is recommended for every four hours of simulation running time. In addition to a post-game debriefing session, trainers might choose to conduct impromptu or pre-planned debriefing sessions during the game's running time. See Teaching Guide below.

Background Preparation:

When this simulation is used with groups with little knowledge of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, trainers might choose to assign reading material before handing out the simulation information packs, or to provide participants with time to conduct independent background research in the library or on the Internet.

Role Assignment:

- a) Divide participants into three teams: Israeli, Palestinian and UN.

While the trainer can consider personality, experience or participant-preference in role assignment, or opt for random selection, it is vital that one member of the Israeli Team be assigned the settler role (role #2), and that one member of the Palestinian Team be assigned the role of Hamas representative (role #5). These roles are key for ensuring the formation of internal and external opposition (and, occasionally, surprising coalitions).

- b) Hand out the following material:

To each member of the Israeli team:

- Public Information
- Private Instructions for the Israeli Team
- A copy of the map
- One "Personal Role Information" from the Israeli characters.

To each member of the UN team:

- Public Information
- Private Instructions for the UN Team
- A copy of the map
- One "Personal Role Information" from the UN characters.

To each member of the Palestinian team:

- Public Information
- Private Instructions for the Palestinian Team
- A copy of the map
- One "Personal Role Information" from the Palestinian characters.

Participant Instructions:

Instruct participants to read their information carefully, and to try and flesh out their instructions with their own knowledge, emotions and experience. Explain that through their “owning” of the role in this manner, the simulation will not only become more lifelike, it will also enable them to understand what parties to conflict truly experience. The resulting insights will, therefore, be highly transferable to real-life situations.

Role Preparation:

Once roles have been allotted, allow students at least one hour’s time for reading and individual preparation. You might even consider giving the material out the evening before. Ask all members of each team to stay in the same room during the individual preparation period. This will avoid participants getting "lost" during this extended period, and will also encourage a natural transition to the group discussion period.

According to the scenario information, participants meet with their own team before meeting the other. Announce that once the individual preparation period is up, each team will meet as a group for 45 minutes or an hour before meeting the other group. This time is to be used for the team getting to know each other "in-role," allowing them to do such things as discuss issues, interests and priorities, and divide labor. The UN team will use this to discuss their intervention strategy, and perhaps to arrange the meeting room. This time will serve as a transition period during which participants will try on and try out their new roles, and get used to addressing each other in-role, as colleagues.

Room Setup:

Allow participants to set up the meeting room as they wish, or specifically assign this task to the UN team. Preferably, the room should have a whiteboard and/or a flipchart and comfortable seating. (Remember the duration of the simulation!) The group may periodically opt to break out of the meeting for consultations. Try to have a couple of rooms available adjacent to the primary meeting room for this purpose.

3rd Party Intervention:

According to the instructions given to the parties, the UN mediators are expected to be relatively passive observers at the beginning, taking a more active role when this is requested by the parties or dictated by circumstances. The participants in the UN roles might be a bit uncertain regarding their authority and timing at first. This is part of the process: they are expected to identify situations and process-points suitable for their intervention, and earn the parties' trust and acceptance through their words and behavior rather than these being dictated by instructions. You might choose to stress this to them during the team preparation time. The UN team's intervention will usually begin to be increasingly necessary after the first "situation" temporarily halts the talks (see below). Of course, the UN role can be written to be more intervening or directive (in order to make the 3rd party role clearer), or can be written out altogether (in order to stress unassisted negotiation skills).

Gametime:

Once the time for team preparation is up, "Gametime" begins. If a party takes more time to discuss things among its members, they need to be aware that the other party is already waiting for them in the meeting room, and there will be a "process-price" to pay. Parties arrive and are seated, and spend some time on formalities such as introductions, although some groups might quickly jump to conflict on procedural issues ("How come they have one representative more than we do?") or make early demands ("If the Jenin attack is not halted immediately, we will not sit at the same table with the Israelis!"). After some time has passed, parties will usually, but not always, reach a point where they intuitively try and set a general agenda for the talks, or perhaps even plunge into an in-depth negotiation on one of the issues.

Interruption: Targeted Assassination Situation

At Gametime +1 (1 hour after the joint session has begun), break in on the group's discussion, regardless of what they are doing or discussing. Hand the teams envelopes containing their instructions for Situation: Targeted Assassination (below). This causes an instant disruption of the talks and a Palestinian walkout. The negotiations are put on hold, parties will caucus to discuss their next move, and the UN team will probably try to persuade the parties to return to the table. This incident not only shakes the process up, it also introduces participants to the complexity of negotiating in an environment subject to the impact of real-time external events. Participants will now be aware of the possibility of trainer-initiated scenario changes, causing a sharp dynamic change: enhanced awareness and reduced complacency.

Converging!
(September 2007 in Israel / Palestine)

Situations

Targeted Assassination

(Hand this announcement to members of the Israeli team.)

Message from the Israeli Coordinator

A targeted killing of a Palestinian terrorist leader took place this morning in Jenin. Helicopters were able to target Sheikh Ali Kamal, whose speeches called on terrorist groups to kill every living Israeli, and whose mosque – the largest and most influential in Jenin – served to shield Islamic Jihad terrorist cells.

(Hand this announcement to members of the Palestinian team.)

Message from the Palestinian Coordinator

Sheikh Ali Kamal, a religious leader and orator in Jenin's largest mosque, has been killed in a rocket attack launched on his car by Israeli helicopters while he was on his way to prayers. His wife and two sons, accompanying him in the vehicle, were seriously injured. You cannot continue, under these circumstances, to negotiate with the Israelis. Get up, make a scene, let them know how you feel and leave the negotiation room for at least 15 minutes. Since holding these talks is critical, you may return to the room no later than 30 minutes from now, but only after the UN neutrals intervene and request you to reconsider your walkout.

(Hand this announcement to members of the UN team.)

Message from the UN Chief of Mission:

Israel has targeted and killed Sheikh Ali Kamal, a religious figure in Jenin known for encouraging and shielding militant activities. His family was also injured. This may be your chance to intervene. In fact, perhaps you should be leading this dialogue from now on. Prepare to do so.

Situation: Trapped Child

(Hand this announcement to members of the Israeli team.)

Message from Israeli Coordinator

Palestinian and Red Cross sources report a three-year-old girl trapped under the ruins of a home destroyed by the IDF. The world media have also picked up and are publicizing these reports. The IDF chief of staff ordered a cessation of military operations in that sector of the city and has sent engineers and heavy equipment in rescue the child.

As the rescue team moved in, they came under heavy fire from terrorists in the buildings on either side, suffering several casualties. Broadcasting the team's mission in Arabic on megaphones has not helped. Trapped in a courtyard halfway to the target, the team didn't try to break out, as this would involve extremely heavy damage to the residential neighborhood. For similar reasons and out of concern that the engineering equipment might be damaged and decrease the possibility of a successful rescue, the IDF has not yet sent in a relief force. Instead it is broadcasting an ultimatum insisting that the terrorists cease fire within an hour. Nobody is sure the girl has that much time.

You have half an hour, at most, to find an agreed solution.

(Hand this announcement to members of the Palestinian team)

Message from Palestinian Coordinator

The Israelis have mowed down an apartment building with their huge bulldozers, burying little Hiya, three years old, under the rubble. Her mother insists she's still alive, and her pleas for help are being broadcast all over the world.

The Israelis moved another bulldozing unit into the city, which was immediately attacked by Hamas fighters. Trapped in a courtyard and surrounded, the Israelis suddenly claimed they had come to save the child. Not trusting a word the Israelis say, Hamas believed this was a ploy, and that once permitted to pass, the equipment would be used to further destroy the city. Caught up in the heat of a successful battle, the fighters have surrounded the Israeli group and are now wiring explosives round the entire courtyard, scoffing at an Israeli ultimatum to disperse within one hour. The Governor of Jenin has put his foot down, forbidding an attack on the Israelis, so as not to have Hiya's blood on his hands. Hamas has agreed to wait for an hour for the Israeli ultimatum to pass and let the Governor figure this one out. Afterwards, they've let it be known, they will attack the Israeli force and wipe it out. Nobody is sure the girl has that much time.

If you can work out an agreement that saves the girl, protects the city and doesn't cause

Hamas to lose face, the Governor will be able to persuade them to let him implement it. You have half an hour, at most, to find an agreed solution.

(Hand this announcement to members of the UN team.)

Message from the UN Chief of Mission

A critical situation has erupted in Jenin. A little girl is buried alive under a bulldozed building. Israel claims it sent a rescue team of engineers, but it was attacked by militants and is unable to advance. Hamas, whose militants have surrounded the Israeli team, claims it is just another force sent to demolish buildings and they intend to destroy it.

You feel this may be a make-or-break event for these talks. They might not survive the death of the child and a potential hostage situation. Each team has given the other a one-hour ultimatum.

Nobody is sure the girl has that much time.

You have half an hour, at most, to help the teams reach an agreed solution.

Situation: Ambulances

(Hand this announcement to members of the Israeli team.)

Message from the Israeli Coordinator

Palestinian and Red Cross sources report that at least 20 people have been critically wounded in Jenin, far beyond the treatment capacity of the local medical center. In order to avoid unnecessary fatalities, and avoid adverse media attention, you are authorized to suggest they be treated at an Israeli hospital in Afula, 15 minutes away. Keep the following interests in mind:

- In the past, such gestures have been used to smuggle terrorists and bombs into Israel.
- Learning the names of the Palestinian wounded can help intelligence efforts, as the army would be able to determine if it has neutralized people on its list.
- Treatment of these wounds is a very expensive matter.

(Hand this announcement to members of the Palestinian team)

Message from the Palestinian Coordinator

Palestinian and Red Cross sources report at least 20 people have been critically wounded in Jenin, far beyond the treatment capacity of the local medical center. You must arrange for their evacuation to an Israeli hospital in Afula, 15 minutes away. This treatment is a minimal duty of the occupying army. You believe there should be no unnecessary delays, such as with ambulance searches, as every single minute could mean life and death.

Situation: Hostage Soldier

(Hand this announcement to members of all teams)

An IDF soldier has been kidnapped while patrolling on the outskirts of Jenin, and is being held somewhere in the city by a splinter cell affiliated with Hamas. The group is demanding release all of the Palestinian prisoners held in Israeli jails in return for his safe release.

A spokesman for the Israeli government has rejected the demand, warning that if the soldier is not immediately released, the Jenin incursion will continue with unprecedented intensity. "We will ensure the welfare of our kidnapped soldier," he said, "even if we have to dismantle every house in Jenin in order to find him."

(September 2007 in Israel / Palestine)

Setbacks & Incentives

(Either pass these announcements in as updates from the teams' coordinators, or announce them as if they were radio broadcasts.)

Setbacks:

- A 15-year-old suicide bomber from a village near Jenin blew himself up inside a crowded Hadera mall. Thirteen Israeli civilians were killed. Security forces think the bomber infiltrated into Israel in the Um El-Fahm area.
- A pregnant Palestinian woman was stopped at an IDF checkpoint on her way to a hospital in Israel. She went into premature labor, and the baby was stillborn.
- In the Arabuna region northeast of Jenin, a stray rocket fired by an Israeli helicopter set hundreds of acres of farmland on fire, destroying this year's crops, as well as hundreds of olive trees.
- Marwan Barguti, a West Bank Fatah leader sentenced by Israel to life imprisonment, has been killed in prison. Israeli sources say a prisoner identified with Hamas killed him.

Incentives:

- A German consortium is willing to invest \$10,000,000 in developing a joint Palestinian-Israeli industrial park, providing the park itself is located on the Palestinian side of the Green Line.
- The UN has announced its willingness to deploy troops as observers or peacekeepers in the implementation stage of any Israeli-Palestinian agreement.
- Ford has announced its intentions to open a production line in the Middle East. Although Ford is also considering building the factory in Jordan and Egypt, the company announced that in keeping with Ford's policy of promoting peace and prosperity worldwide, it would build the factory in a stable area in the West Bank – if one was to be found.

Continued Game Management:

The Palestinian Team's instructions dictate that they return to the table after no more than half an hour, although sometimes they might stretch this, or the Israeli Team might stage a counter walk-out. After some rocky minutes, usually involving the formation of some declaration by the Israeli Team or by both Teams jointly, the negotiations usually resume.

From this moment on, game management, from the trainer's point of view, is entirely a balance between the amount of time available and the parties' progress. On the one hand, one

wants to avoid an artificial rush to settlement, such as, "Let's hurry up and reach agreement on everything before lunch so we can have the day free." On the other, a trainer might desire to avoid a situation in which parties approach the final deadline without any headway at all. Although this might indeed go a long way towards introducing participants to the reality of protracted peace talks, it results in disheartened and de-motivated participants. To allow the trainer to change the game's dynamics and pace, two different types of interruptions or interventions are provided:

- Incentives & Setbacks are meant to have minor effect, throw in a bit of optimism or pessimism, trust or distrust, acceleration or deceleration.
- Situations are mini-scenarios in their own right, which demand that the participants drop whatever was previously engrossing them and focus on an emergency situation demanding their immediate attention. The outcome of a Situation can have great effect on the continuing negotiation dynamic: parties who worked together to solve the Situation's crisis might bring that sense of collaboration with them back to the "main" negotiation table, while a Situation crisis handled badly will lead to continuing attitudes of distrust and blame.

It should be stressed that the trainer need not use all of the Situations, all the Incentives & Setbacks--or any of them--beyond the "Assassination" Situation. Trainers can pick and choose, judging which might be best utilized to fine-tune the game dynamic in any desired direction. Trainers can improvise their own interruptions, whether on the spot or based on recent or predicted events in the news.

This fine-tuning aside, it is the amount of time available for the simulation that will usually dictate the flow of the game and the frequency of trainer interventions. As a rule of thumb, it is suggested that the trainer intervene again at least at the following two points:

- One hour before the end of the first half of the time allocated for the simulation, the trainer should announce that the coordinators for all parties have requested that by "halftime" the parties will have reached an agreed on agenda for the remainder of the negotiations, if they have not already done so. This will serve to focus participants on what they came here to do, nudging them gently, albeit a bit artificially, away from the play-acting that the first few game hours allows. This encourages them towards application of conflict resolution skills in a decidedly non-conductive atmosphere.
- One hour before the end of the time allocated for the simulation, the trainer should announce that the coordinators for all parties have requested that the participants write up any agreements they have reached. Participants might ignore this at first, especially if no or little agreement has been achieved, and the trainer should repeat this instruction 15 minutes later, stressing that "agreements" can relate not only to sealed issues but also to an agreed upon agenda for future talks, a joint declaration or any other joint statements or agreed principles. When the allotted time is up, help parties break out of character, take a deep breath, and

move on to debrief (See “Teaching Guide” below). Beyond debrief sessions, consider using forms for participant self-assessment before, during and after the simulation, as well as for receiving participant feedback on the simulation or the workshop, such as the sample forms for these purposes provided below (See “Teaching Guide” below).

Use of Props:

Imaginative trainers will find many ways to develop and employ props during this simulation. Here are a few possibilities:

- Provide nametags for participants, each with an Israeli, Palestinian or UN flag on it.
- Provide place cards for each participant. These can also be in the national colors. Players will often color or decorate them, or perhaps create a game-name for themselves suitable to their personal role.
- When initiating a trainer-intervention such as a Situation or a Setback, do so in a way that startles and shakes people up. Inflate a balloon and pop it behind everybody’s backs, or set off a small confetti bomb to stress the explosive nature of the news.
- Consider providing a transparency of the map included in the scenario, for participants to project on a whiteboard and draw on.
- Consider providing additional maps, pictures, relevant cuttings from today’s newspaper headlines, and other pertinent materials.

Providing a comprehensive map for debriefing the Converging! simulation is virtually impossible, due to the varied training goals it is designed to serve and the infinite paths of unfolding it allows for. In this section, some recommendations for managing the debrief session are provided. However, this is not in any way meant to provide an exhaustive list of questions or discussion themes:

1. Encourage Ventilation

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

If several simulation-groups were playing concurrently, hold this session in the original group before joining up with the other groups.

2. Define Debriefing Goals

Open up the learning phase of the debrief by gathering the entire group and, if several groups played concurrently, in a general forum comprised of all the groups. Focus attention on yourself, and shortly announce the goals of the debrief. Explain that debriefing is an opportunity to transform the participants' simulation-experience into practical lessons to take away. State clearly what you hope to gain from this experience (e.g., "Let's aim for a clear picture of how we improved our negotiation/problem-solving skills," or "Let's aim at summarizing the new aspect of the conflict that this simulation has brought to light."

3. Grab Focus

Begin the debrief by asking how many of the groups reached agreement. Ask a couple of groups for the main points of their agreements. This is done mainly to allow participants still engrossed in the game to join the group, others to vent a bit, and to stress in general the joint-but-separate experience of the groups and of each individual participant, transforming them back into one large learning-group.

4. Focus on Training Goals

Here are some suggestions for questions you may use in order to highlight the particular training goals you set for the simulation:

Training Goal: Mediation / Conflict Resolution Skills:

Consider asking some of these questions, focusing on the way the participants playing the UN delegates handled their role. Choose questions and allow discussion according to the

level of competence and confidence of the mediators, their performance, and to your pre-set desired skill-set, such as trust-building, relationship-building, grasp of the structure of the mediation process, creativity, dealing with ethical dilemmas, and confidence boosting.

- Did the mediators explain the process to the parties in a clear manner? How did this affect the process?
- What did the mediators do in order to help parties get all the necessary information on the table?
- Were the mediators successful in building an atmosphere of trust around the table? How did they do this, or what might they have done, but did not?
- How did the mediators react in challenging situations, such as parties interrupting each other, parties attacking each other, parties attacking the mediators, and party walk-outs?
- Do the parties feel that the mediators acted in a neutral and impartial manner? Did the mediators deal explicitly with issues of neutrality and impartiality? Can the mediators comment on ways in which they felt parties were trying to win them over to their side?
- Was the mediation process addressed through any frames, such as “a security issue,” “an argument about borders and territory,” or “mistrust”? Did these framings prove to be conducive to negotiation and settlement? Did they affect the degree to which parties were able to come to grips with the past and look ahead to the future, or transform elements of their relationship with one another?
- Did the mediators’ feeling that they were familiar with the conflict? For example, "This has been done before" or "A thousand mediators have failed at this conflict." If so, did this affect the way they handled the case? How so?
- What do the mediators view as the largest obstacle they had to face during this simulation? What were some of the tools they used to overcome it?
- Do the mediators feel they managed the process “by the book” – moving from one stage of the model they learned to the next in a conscious and controlled manner? Do they feel that the structured process they tried to manage sometimes got wrested away from them or "hijacked" by the parties or by circumstances? How did they react?
- Do the parties feel that their relationship shifted at different stages of the mediation? What was the mediator’s role in bringing this about, if any?
- What did the mediators do in order to help parties face their problem constructively?
- Did the conversation focus on defined problems (“The location of the wall”), or did the topics widen to include different relational issues? What was the mediators’ role or orientation with regards to the parties’ adoption of this narrower or wider focus?
- How did the process of problem solving and searching for options begin? Did the mediators take an active role in generating or evaluating options for agreement? What effect did this have on the process? What might have been done differently?
- Did the search for options--or the final agreement--focus on the elements that were very much on the table, such as an agreement to build half the originally decided-upon length of the Wall? Or, were attempts made to expand the pie? For example, agreeing to erect the Wall while ensuring expedited safe-passage, with joint security arrangements for local inhabitants. What was the mediators’ role in this?

Training Goal: Negotiation Skills

Consider asking some of these questions, focusing on the way the participants playing the Palestinian/Israeli delegates handled their role. Choose questions and encourage discussion according to the level of competence and confidence of the parties, according to their performance and according to your pre-set targeted skill-set, such as an analytical grasp of the situation, strategizing ability, trust and relationship-building, creativity, interpersonal communication skills, the ability to cope with ethical dilemmas, and pie-expanding.

- How would the parties define their overall strategy, when they first walked in to the joint discussion? You can help participants frame a short strategic definition of their strategic state of mind, such as “working cooperatively” or “asking for as much as I can, and then asking for more.”
- Did the parties find they adhered to this strategy throughout the negotiation? If their strategy changed, was it done consciously, or as an intuitive/instinctive shift? What triggered the change?
- Did the parties’ search for options or the final agreement focus on elements that were very much on the table, or were attempts made to expand the pie?
- What communication tools did the parties and the mediators use throughout the discussions? Was it difficult to utilize these techniques? Why?
- Did any communication problems arise over the course of the negotiation? What was their source? How did the parties address them?
- Was an atmosphere of trust created between the parties?
- Did parties share information openly, or did they play their cards close to their chests?
- What behavior or circumstances proved conducive to information sharing, and what behavior or circumstances were inhibitive?
- Did use of particular communication tools assist trust-building?
- Do the parties feel that their relationship shifted at different stages of the mediation? How would they describe these shifts? What do they think triggered and enabled them?
- Ask participants to name particular negotiation tactics they saw other participants employ successfully.

Training Goal: Team Negotiation and Multiparty Negotiation

Forum:

- Did the forum switch between three-way meetings and private sessions between parties and the mediators (caucusing)? Whose initiative was this? Did the national Teams ever decide to meet without the UN mediators? Were there any other types of meetings? Were there disagreements regarding use of a different forum?
- Which types of forum seemed more conducive to information sharing, collaboration or problem solving? Which were ultimately more productive? Why?

Coalitions:

- Did coalitions form between two of the parties against the third, e.g. between the national Teams against UN intervention? Between the UN Team and a national Team against the other national Team?
- Following up on the previous question: Did coalitions form on specific issues between

two of the parties, and on others between different partners? What effect, if any, did this have on the negotiations?

- Did any party feel he or she had to try and break up a coalition formed by the other two parties?
- Did members of each Team assume they were “all on the same team” going in to the negotiation? Was this perception shaken up at a later stage of the negotiation process? What effect, if any, did this have on the negotiations?
- Did any participants, besides the UN Team, feel they assumed the role of middleman, positioning themselves as the one trying pull their own team, as well as the other, to bring them closer to understanding or agreement? How did this affect the negotiations?
- Can participants identify tacit or explicit coalitions formed between two or more members of opposing teams? How did this affect the negotiations?

Process Management:

- Did the parties discuss process management rules (or reach unspoken agreements on them), such as:
 1. Ground rules: What are the seating arrangements? Are interruptions permitted? Are mobile phones allowed in the room? Can parties consult with others?
 2. Communication Rules: What order do parties speak in? How long does everybody get to express him or herself? Can parties shout at each other?
 3. Decision-making rules: Who decides the final outcome? Is it decided by majority vote, or must everybody agree?
- How were these explicit or implicit dynamics or decisions affected by the multiparty/team setting of the situation, as opposed to a two-party setting?
- Did one of the participants take a conspicuously leading role in the negotiations? What gave him or her the legitimacy to do this, in the eyes of the other participants? What did the leader use this power for? Did other participants take the lead at different points during the process? If there had been a previous dominant player – did the person relinquish control or struggle to retain it?

Training Goal: Understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

- What have participants learned regarding the complexity of trying to solve protracted social conflict through negotiation? What have they learned regarding this issue in the particular context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
- Did any participant enter the simulation with a predetermined solution to the conflict, or opinion on any of the major elements? Have they changed their minds, or reconsidered the applicability of their solution, as a result of participating in the simulation?
- What do participants have to say regarding the effectiveness, the desirability and the long- and short-term effects of unilateral moves by one side to the conflict?
- Do participants view the conflict in terms of an extreme power disparity? Did this view shift during the simulation?
- Did participation in the simulation enable participants to appreciate new ideas for the resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, or related elements? What ideas, in particular, piqued their interest?

- Have participants encountered a newfound appreciation for a party to the conflict they had previously felt was more to blame? Or, conversely, did they find that their preconceptions on this issue were strengthened by their experience? How would they portray and explain this transformation, or lack thereof?

5. Provide for further learning activities:

Trainers might assign participants a paper to write regarding their experience or particular elements of the simulation. They might provide forms for self-assessment for participants to fill out before, during, and after participating (See sample below). Finally, trainers can administer a simulation feedback form (See sample below) in which participants make general comments regarding the simulation and its management. Beyond providing input vital for the trainer's growth and development, this also encourages participants to view their experience through a new critical lens, leading to new insights into their own experience and learning.

Before Game Begins –

When negotiating/mediating, I feel my strongest quality or ability lies in using the following skills:

The skills I would like to improve or enhance are:

At Game's Mid-point:

Describe a point in the negotiation/mediation where your strongest quality or ability was best demonstrated. How did the use of this specific tool advance the negotiation/mediation?

Describe a point of difficulty in the negotiation/mediation. What skill or tool you might have used to advance the negotiation/mediation? Focus on yourself, rather than on others!

What skill/tool would I like to develop or practice during the rest of the negotiation/mediation?

Professionalism demands constant learning and improvement. Reflect on these questions – they will help take you to the next level.

After the Simulation's Conclusion:

Describe a point in the negotiation/mediation where your strongest quality or ability was best demonstrated. How did the use of this specific tool advance the negotiation/mediation?

Describe a point of difficulty in the negotiation/mediation. What skill or tool you might have used to advance the negotiation/mediation? Focus on yourself, rather than on others!

What significant insight did I find during this workshop, regarding the practice of negotiation/mediation? How will I be using it in my future negotiations/mediations? Professionalism demands constant learning and improvement. Reflect on these questions – they will help take you to the next level.

Converging! (September 2007 in Israel/Palestine)
Simulation-Game Feedback Sheet

We constantly wish to learn and to improve our training skills and materials. Your thoughts on the following topics will help us improve our future workshops. Please take a few minutes to answer these questions. You can expand on the opposite side of the page:

How would you say the simulation contributed to your negotiating/mediating skills?

How would you say the workshop contributed to your understanding of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?

Please comment on some of these issues, regarding the organization of the simulation:
Amount and relevance of the background material:

Clarity and order of the occurrences in the simulation:

Staff handling of difficulties arising during the simulation: