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Background

Syrians continue to suffer from the extremely violent conflict, which has torn to shreds the social, political and economic fabric of the country. Since early 2012 the Syrian crisis morphed into an open armed conflict which more and more led to one of the bigger humanitarian disasters since WWII and the involvement, direct and indirect, of regional and global external actors.

The conflict has fractured Syria along sectarian lines, divided the country into an unstable patchwork of competing military zones, and threatens the peace and stability of the MENA region. Regional and international actors who support the various parties of the conflict seem to have more and more gained ground both in reducing the capacity of Syrian actors to determine the future of their county and in pursuing their strategic interests at the expenses of a political solution for the Syrian conflict. The growing complexity of the Syrian conflict has repercussions on the negotiations to find an end to the conflict, both at the international and local levels.

Over the course of the last 8 years, while the international community has attempted - with no concrete results so far - to find a political solution to put an end to the war in Syria, local communities, civic and community-based groups, sometimes in coordination with local administrative councils and local CSOs/NGOs, have attempted to negotiate with armed forces present in their territories. The nature and scope of these negotiations varies both in terms of the armed actors involved, their sustainability, objectives and geographical scope.

In the few successful cases of local truces, the participation of local leaders, the establishment of widely representative local councils and the willingness to make compromises have been successful to diminish the violence and to guarantee a minimum of humanitarian access. However, these successful ceasefires are temporary and fragile because of the absence of implementation mechanisms and the lack of international and regional monitoring and support. Moreover, these agreements lacked any reference to IHL, IHRL and International Conventions on armed conflicts, which led to situations where civilians simply passed from being hostages of the violence of one party to the violence of another party.

Against this backdrop and in the framework of its Syria Program, No Peace Without Justice (NPWJ) organised a workshop on Negotiations, which took place in Gaziantep, Turkey, on 19-23 July 2018. The fractured and multifaceted nature of the conflict has determined a situation in which it is very difficult to build coordination mechanisms and processes of information-sharing among Syrian civil society and local NGO groups. Indeed, Syrian CSOs have used, and continue to use, a variety of methodologies to influence negotiations at the local and the international level, but cross-fertilisation is still not happening, even though it might be beneficial to facilitate the development of common negotiating practices and methodologies, with possible multiplier effects both geographically and thematically.

Structure of the training

The training took place over four days, during which Zedoun Alzoubi gave an in-depth presentation of the skills and tools to understand the negotiation lifecycle and its stages; appreciate the different types of negotiations and the pros and cons of each as well as analyse various negotiations technique and understand principled negotiation principles. The training was both theoretical and practical and each session was very participative. Mr Alzoubi actively engaged with participants who asked questions and shared their views openly. Mr Alzoubi built a truthful
atmosphere where each participant had the chance to discuss and outline their thoughts, priorities and interests.

The trainer
Dr. Zedoun Alzoubi is a pacifist activist from Syria. He is the CEO of the Union of Medical Care and Relief Organizations UOSSM with more than 1100 workers. They work to build and run hospitals in Syria. But his responsibilities go further than that: at various levels he is engaged with civil society issues in Syria and beyond, he invests in networking, youth engagement, humanitarian support mechanisms, conflict resolution and mediation. As part of his engagement he took the responsibility to train on negotiations, leadership and facilitate several initiatives for the Syrian civil society including the Ethical Charter for Syrian Media, Ethical charter for Syrian Medical Organizations, Bokra Ahla, and Women Advisory Board to UN Special Envoy for Syria, Mr. De Mistura.

Participants
The participants consisted of representatives from Syrian CSOs and NGOs who work in the field of human rights protection with a focus on smaller organisations that could particularly benefit from this training course. The organisations represented included: Women Now for Development, an organisation dedicated to women’s rights and empowerment; Civilians for Peace and Justice, an independent civil society organisation concerned with political and legal development, peace building and the promotion of a culture of communication and dialogue; Start Point, an independent civil society organisation assisting Syrian women who have suffered rape, detention or kidnapping to re integrate into their communities; the Free Syrian Lawyers Aggregation, which works towards the strengthening of the rule of law and justice in a way that protects freedoms, public and private rights, achieves equality and preserves human dignity; Adalah, a Syrian CSO that works on promoting the dissemination of human rights, democracy and values of citizenship; Human Rights Guardians, a non-governmental, human rights organisation that monitors and documents human rights violations in Syria and neighbouring countries; Midmar, a Syrian civil society organisation working on issues related to capacity building, research and analysis and governance; Emissa is a humanitarian organisation, founded in 2012 in Homs; Syrian Safe Network (Aman Network) is an independent, non-profit network of local community leaders seeking to contribute to building a secure, just and peaceful society that will achieve stability and coexistence through inclusion, partnership and dialogue.

Day One – 19 July
Mr Ghashim from NPWJ welcomed the participants, explained the background of the workshop, laid down its key objectives and introduced the trainer. The trainer illustrated the structure of the training and explained that the first three days of the workshop will be dedicated to negotiation training, while the final fourth day will be a Training the Trainers (ToT) session. The trainer then went through the various topics that he will cover during the training; from negotiation techniques, of which there are approximately 30 positive and constructive techniques and approximately 17 negative techniques to “best alternative,” in which you understand the alternatives you have rather than using best or worst-case scenario; from bloom taxonomy to the importance of location and setting in negotiation. The objective of the training is to provide an understanding of the process, stages and principles of negotiation and analyse mechanisms and technique of negotiation.

Following these introductions, the trainer asked the participants to introduce themselves and to elaborate on their expectations. The participants listed expectations including: discussion about
management, the essence of negotiation, when to negotiate in the first place, team building, mediation, negotiation plans, compromises, and principles and values. Based on the replies received, the trainer expressed the concept that negotiation is an action that many people have to do almost daily; most people negotiate anywhere from 3-4 times a day: from household duties to purchasing a car. The processes of negotiation are similar, whether one acts inside his own house or attending international peace conferences.

Toward the end of this section, the trainer invited the participants to a practical exercise and asked the participants to divide into pairs and say the first five words they think of when they think of negotiation; the words included: access, activities, agreement, Aleppo, alternatives, arguments, bodies, dialogue, goals, head of negotiation, interests, parties, problem solving, resolution, resort and tactics. He then asked the participants to narrow down the list in a group exercise: the final list was the following: activities, agreement, alternative, dialogue, goals, parties, problem solving, resort and tactics.

**Stand-based versus Interest-based negotiation**

Negotiation is a process of communication by two or more parties with the aim of reaching a common decision based on the interests of each party. When you agree to be involved in a negotiation, you need to understand that the goal is a common agreement.

**a) Stand-based negotiations**

The trainer discussed the stand-based approach, which is a strict and rigid approach to negotiation. In the stance-based approach, people are much more interested in embossing their own ideas rather than reaching a common understanding. This often involves animosity and demonising the other party. Under the stand-based approach to negotiation, there are two kind of negotiators: the soft negotiator and the hard negotiator.

For the soft negotiator, all parties are friends. For the hard negotiator, all parties are adversaries; the hard negotiator is both hard in dealing with the problem and dealing with the involved parties, the soft one is the opposite; the soft negotiator wants to maintain the relationship, whereas the hard negotiator wants to prove to be victorious; the hard negotiator uses threats, the soft negotiator provides concessions and is more lenient; the hard negotiator tries to deceive the other party, whereas the soft negotiator is more exposed and shows all of his cards.

The truth lies in between the two. All the parties are partners in solving the problem, and thus they should not necessarily all be friends or enemies. You shouldn’t just focus on your strength. The trainer likened the negotiation process to an iceberg; the position is at the tip and then the interests are lower.

**B) Interest-based negotiation**

Interest-based negotiation, also known as principle-based negotiation, has several characteristics: an emphasis on interests rather than on strict principles; plurality of alternatives, but the decision should be the best considering common interests rather than your own interests; additionally, the negotiation is based on the final objective.

There is a need to think about two things in interest-based negotiations: the outputs and the relationship among the parties. The negotiation usually takes place in the context of an existing relationship. For example, when buying a home, one usually thinks that the relationship with the seller is only at the time of the exchange and based on the price. This relationship, however, is a longer-term relationship. You need to consider the best alternative to maintain the relationship and
achieve the alternatives. The trainer used an example of an orange that both parties want; one can cut the orange in two and both parties get half, but this may depend on what the parties want to do with the orange. Some may want juice, others want to eat it, others want to use it to flavour a cake. This may alter the resolution. He used this to demonstrate that if we understand these metrics before we negotiate, we will get what we want.

Some techniques in interest-based negotiation involves mixing shorter term concessions for longer term advantages. As an example, the trainer mentioned how Germany acted during the inter-war period and how in 14 years managed to acquire again the status of world power after the defeat of 1918. By carefully defining his own goals and analysing the relations among the European Powers of the time, the Prime Minister of Germany opened a dialogue both with the Soviet Union and France and Great Britain. By providing technical expertise and expert workers to the USSR he obtained in exchange arms deals; subsequently he played into anti-Communism fears both in France and in the UK to gain political support. Thus, he understood the interests of the parties and played among their divisions for political decisions favouring Germany.

**Life cycle of negotiation**

It is important to understand that negotiation need to be considered as a process that has five specific phases:

1. **Planning and analysis**
   To prepare for negotiation, the first step is to conduct research on the parties involved and try to understand their positions and interests. In this phase it is also important to plan the mechanisms through which you want to organise your negotiating strategy and develop potential scenarios.

2. **Design**
   In the second phase there is the need to develop and flesh out options and strategies for negotiations, develop alternative ways to reach the objectives and design the negotiation team.

3. **Preparing for the Meeting**
   Once the strategy, goals and team are developed, one needs to take the last-minute steps to prepare the team and finalising the strategy for negotiations.

4. **Negotiation**
   This is the actual negotiation process itself.

5. **Evaluation**
   After the negotiation, it is always critical to evaluate the process to prepare for future negotiation.

**Tools for stakeholders’ analysis**

During the research on the parties involved, it is necessary to develop written notes. No matter what the negotiation is about, it is essential to write it down. The trainer presented a matrix to develop the stakeholders’ analysis and keeping track of the points of communalities the potential conflicts. It is essential, in this phase, to identify all the parties and their common points and conflicts.

The parties involved usually are two, but they can be more. For example, in the case of court, the parties are the lawyers, the judge, the witnesses, the defendant and the plaintiff, etc. The interests of the defendant and the lawyer are never exactly the same and thus there is a need to proceed with a specific analysis of each party. Also, there must be a subsequent analysis of who to negotiate with. If one only selects a single party to negotiate with, then you make adversaries.

Following his presentation, the trainer invited the participants to a practical exercise and broke the participants into two groups and asked them to choose a topic on which they would like to
negotiate and apply the stakeholders’ analysis and develop a negotiation tactic. The two groups had to list all the involved parties, the interests of each actor and the strength and weaknesses of each of them; they also had to analyse how the various parties involved are interrelated.

The first group selected Idlib, the opposition-held province in Northern Syria, as its topic. The reason presented for the selection was that the participants to Group 1 anticipated that Idlib will be the next target for the Assad regime. The Group identified Hayat Tahrir al-Sham (HTS), the Free Syrian Army (FSA), Turkey, Russia and the civilian population including IDPs, as the main actors active in the governorate. There was some debate on whether the EU should also be included among the actors, but some of the participants argued that the EU should not be viewed as one single block as its foreign policy is mostly based on the interest of the various EU countries. For each of these actors the participants identified their specific interests: HTS is interested in keeping military predominance; the FSA may or may not have interests, but generally their objectives are to establish civil governors; Turkey’s interests are national security, refugees, and economic development; Russia is interested in maintaining the narrative that they are supporting the legitimate government, as well as maintaining good relations with Turkey; civilians’ interests are to build peace and to retain stability and economic development, civil society organisations also want to continue their activities on the ground. The group mentioned that the EU is interested in finding a peaceful solution in Idlib and that Iran, while retains interests in Syria might not be specifically interested in the Idlib governorate. Finally, Group 1 identified the relationships between these actors and their specific interests: Turkey and Iran have common political interests, related to the Kurdish issue; Turkey and Iran also have common passive interests in understanding the US is not positive toward them. Additionally, Turkey wants to maintain position within the NATO but also its relationship with Russia.

The second group selected women’s representation in provincial councils as its topic. The Group identified CSOs, HTS, donors, The Syrian Salvation Government and local councils as the main actors active on this issue. For each of these actors the participants identified their specific interests: CSOs remain a strong element and they support the involvement of women in provincial councils or civil and political life, but they don’t have the capacity to achieve this goal alone; HTS is strong and with a lot of influence, but they do not favour women’s participation in public life even if this might change over time; as an example of this the participants referred to a meeting on women organised at the beginning of 2018; while the Syrian Salvation Government is closely connected to HTS, they are not the same and, while they do not believe in the role of women, they have an interest in stability, and for this they might be supportive. The provincial councils itself are not in favour of women being in the council, but their priority is to continue their work, receive funding as well as to maintain legitimacy within local communities, thus their position differs from their interest; finally, the donors believe in the role of women in public life and put it as a requirement for any project they support. Group Two then discussed the relationships between the parties and identified the links between the provincial councils and local dignitaries as the most critical, since they both want legitimacy and maintain their capacity to control the same local communities. It will be important, therefore, to play on the difference between these two groups to try to achieve the goal of increased presence of women in public life.

The trainer concluded this section of the training, by discussing conflict mapping and how to translate what was presented by the two groups in graphical ways, suggesting to indicate with circles of various diameters the influence of each involved parties; straight lines can identify strong relationships among the parties; dotted lines can indicate troubled relationships; double lines can signal alliance while zigzag lines means conflict. Using this method provides better insight on relationships among the parties involved in a negotiation, it helps understand potential alliances or
Day Two – 20 July

The day started with a review of the concepts discussed in the first day and the trainer asked three volunteers to play a game called “American Standoff,” where each participant had a paper ball to throw to the others; the one that would not be hit will be the winner. During the first round, the three participants had their backs to each other while during the second round they faced each other. During the second round, the two people who got hit the first time agreed to hit the third person who had not been hit the previous round. Following this practical exercise the trainer discussed with the participants the outcomes of this exercise and pointed out that they could have agreed to not throw their paper ball at anyone; that it was easier to agree with others what to do when they were facing each other rather than having their backs to each other, and if one was patient and waited to throw the ball until the other actors acted, you could be sure to act in a way that most benefited you, because if you shoot right away, you lose your bargaining chip.

In this game, much like in real negotiations, each person had the interest of not getting hit and a fear based on an assumption - getting hit with the assumption that the other the parties are going to hit you. If you act on your fear and assume the others are going to hit you, you may or may not win. But if everyone comes to the table with their intentions clear and separate from their fears, then the parties can strive to reach a common interest first.

Preparing for negotiation: Interest analysis

In this session, the trainer discussed Attitude, Behaviour, Context and Interest (ABCI). Usually, at the top of the pyramid there is behaviour and we build a position based on this behaviour. Often, behaviours are based on underlying interests, sometimes interests we are completely unaware of. We need to understand the context of this behaviour to get the bigger picture. To provide a concrete example, the trained described a situation in which an employee misbehaved and his employer immediately punished him. If you get the employee and the boss together to find out what happened, you will find out that the employee’s behaviour was a culmination of previous incidents, and that there was no effort to understand the context of these behaviours by the employer. Eventually, the two collided with each other. If we would have spent five minutes to mediate, we would have probably spared the disagreement.

The trainer then invited the participants to another practical exercise in which the same two groups that were formed the day before had to understand the interests, attitudes, behaviours and contexts of three parties.

The Group 1 selected three of the actors who were identified on the first day, namely: Turkey, Russia, and HTS. The participants to the group identified Turkey’s basic interest in protecting its national security and avoid a flood of refugees pouring across the border; while the political disagreement with Assad remains, Turkey’s economic interests overshadow their political interests; Russia’s main objective is to protect its geopolitical interests in the area, this includes helping the Syrian regime to regain control of the entire country; finally, HTS is interested in gaining more control and power in the region.

The second group focused on increasing women’s representation in provincial councils and identified local dignitaries and the Women’s Consultation Team as critical actors on this subject. The creation of the Women’s Consultation Team was criticised at first, but now that Idlib is more
and more unstable, there is a possibility to collaborate with them to allow for more women’s representation in provincial councils, which have a supportive attitude, but their real attitude is impartial. The women’s NGOs can play a critical role as they are continuing to act and speak in favour of increased participation of women in public life.

**BATNA, WATNA and ZOPA**

Following the practical exercise, the trainer begun explaining the concepts of Best Alternative for the Negotiated Agreement (BATNA), Worst Alternative for the Negotiated Agreement (WATNA) and the Zone of Possible Agreement (ZOPA).

To negotiate each party needs to determine what is the desired outcome and the not-desired outcome. First, you must determine a BATNA, the best that you can hope for if negotiations fail, and what are the possible alternatives if you fail to get your desired result; you must also determine what is your WATNA, the worst you can realistically fear. The area where the BATNAs and WATNAs of the various negotiating parties overlap is the ZOPA. One example the trainer gave was that not all people living under the control of Assad are regime supporters and vice-versa, which is why we need a common ground for both sides. Usually your BATNA is the other party’s WATNA.

The trainer then invited the participants to another practical exercise in which he made the groups act as one party and requested them to create a strategy to negotiate with the opposing parties. The first group was the Syrian political opposition and their opposing parties were Turkey and Russia. The participants determined that their objective was to establish a ceasefire in Idlib and to deliver humanitarian assistance in Turkey. They also determined that they did not want to lose the relationship with Turkey and to be hostages of the Russian agenda.

For a successful negotiating strategy, it is critical to focus mostly on what one wants and on what the other parties want. As much as possible, it is also critical to always be negotiating towards your goal through multiple channels so no one has complete power over you and can have a plan B.

**Day 3 - 21 July 2018**

The day started with a review of the concepts discussed in the previous day. The trainer concluded this section reminding the participants that the first stage of negotiation is planning; the second stage is designing the negotiation, which it will be the topic of the third day of the training.

**Negotiation Strategies**

When designing negotiations, it is very important to first define who you are, which are your objectives and which are the unwanted outcomes. This exercise it is very important for a successful negotiation strategy and it is something that needs to be done within your own party. This is also a negotiating process, and sometimes negotiating with your own people can be as difficult as to negotiate with the opposing party.

Once your “internal negotiations” are closed and the key leaders of your party agree upon the negotiation strategy, i.e. who you are, what you want and want you want to avoid, you can move on and select the negotiating team. Your negotiators can be neutral or non-neutral, and if they are professional enough it may not make a difference. Lawyers are often a good choice, because they are professional negotiators. On a negotiation team, you need to have technical experts who also have negotiation skills to be involved in the process. In the process of forming up a negotiating team, it is essential to consider how the negotiators think and negotiate as a group and which are
their relations to better design your negotiation strategy. Before you start a negotiation, you need a network of people respected in the field to support you in the hardest times of negotiation and to convince people of the value of your work. Ideally, one of your negotiators can hold the role of being a “fascinator” so that you have a higher chance of getting the necessary parties together.

Despite ideally being interest-focused, negotiation is not about what you want but about what you can achieve. Once the parties are together, a benefit of being the first party to talk is that you can set the boundaries for negotiation. Although not always, it usually can save time to set your own boundaries.

Going forward with the design process, the first thing that must be negotiated and agreed upon between the parties before anything else is the criteria for negotiation. In this process, which needs to be done with the other parties of the negotiation, one should not include your goal among the criteria for negotiation, unless you want to completely kill all prospect of a successful negotiation on the spot. You want the criteria to be as neutral as possible, because if you cannot agree on the criteria, you will not progress in negotiation and the conflict will continue. In the case of Syria, even setting the criteria for negotiations at the beginning proved to be impossible, because the expectations of the two negotiating teams were extremely high and any of them was willing to accept any compromise.

As conclusion of the training, the trainer invited the participants to watch together the movie “Bridge of Spies” and discuss it afterwards. The movie takes place in the United States during the Cold War: in 1957, lawyer James B. Donovan (Tom Hanks) is recruited from his law firm to defend an accused Soviet spy. It’s an unenviable task in many respects as Donovan has not practiced criminal law since he was a prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials after World War II and the strong anti-Communist mood at the time makes him a target from who think the Russian spy should just be executed. Donovan convinces the judge to sentence the spy to prison, rather than execute him, as they may at some point in the future want to swap him for an American spy the Soviets might have in custody. Just such a scenario comes into play when in 1960 a U-2 spy pilot is shot down over Soviet territory and taken prisoner. Donovan is again recruited to act as the intermediary and negotiate swapping the Russian spy for the American requiring him to travel to East Berlin crossing the newly built Berlin Wall.

Prior to the projection of the movie, the trainer explained that the relevant parts of this movie, and the reason for which he decided to show it to the participants, are Donovan’s negotiation skill and invited the participants to analyse in details how the protagonist of the movie organise his work and manage the expectation of the many parties (the Americans, the Russians, the East Germans, etc) involved in his rescue attempt.

Following the screening of the movie, the trainer opened the discussion with the participants to develop and list together the key points of what can be learned from the movie. What emerged for the discussion was:

• Relationship is the key centre point of negotiations. If you do not have or build a relationship with the people you are negotiating with, the negotiation is less likely to go your way. Relationships with people important to your counterparts in the negotiation can also be helpful and important assets of your negotiation strategy.

• If you start negotiations by knowing everyone’s objective, you can find creative, out-of-the box ways to help everyone get what they want.
• Setting is important in negotiation. There are some settings where your adversary is likely to be more lenient and some where your adversary is likely to be more unyielding. It is therefore important to choose wisely.

• It can also be helpful to bring up the interests of third parties, if those interests are relevant to the negotiating parties. This is especially true if one of the parties has an interest in appeasing or looking good to a third party, or if a third party has a particularly adversarial relationship with your counterparts.

• It is critical that negotiators are highly emotionally intelligent.

Day four - 22 July 2018.

The final day of the training was dedicated to a Training the Trainers (ToT), with a focus on training the participants to facilitate negotiation training on their own. Thus, the emphasis of the subsequent sessions is on training the participants to lead successful workshops and events.

Bloom’s Taxonomy

Bloom's taxonomy is a set of three hierarchical models used to classify educational learning objectives into levels of complexity and specificity. The three lists cover the learning objectives in cognitive, affective and sensory domains. The cognitive domain list has been the primary focus of most traditional education and is frequently used to structure curriculum learning objectives, assessments and activities. In this context the Bloom’s taxonomy is very relevant to the issues that will be discussed during the training, as they will assist the participants in defining their desired outputs for future trainings that they might want to organise and in developing the agenda and curricula of the trainings.

In Bloom’s taxonomy, the cognitive domain is broken into the following six levels of objectives: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Each level also has relevant verbs, as follows:

1. Knowledge: memorise, remember;
2. Comprehension: understand, explain, demonstrate, describe, interpret;
3. Application: use, choose, apply, modify;
4. Analysis: categorise, classify, convey, contrast, prioritise;
5. Synthesis: constructing, creating, planning;

In designing a training, it is critical to begin defining the end goal and then plan backwards and look at methodologies you can use to get the participants to reach that goal. To do this effectively, one must know at what level each of the participants and the trainer are in the Bloom’s taxonomy; also, in it important to consider time constraints and the constraints related to the number of trainees. Having taken into consideration all these factors, a trainer can develop his desired outputs and the methodology to reach that goals in a realistic way. For example, if you are a mechanic and your workshop is about cars and your goal is for each participant to come away with a knowledge-level about cars, then you might have your participants memorise all the different parts and the functions of each part; if your goal, instead, is to get to the application stage for all your participants, then first you will have to ensure that everyone’s knowledge stage is solid, and then you could give them the task of disassembling and reassembling a car with help, and then by themselves. It is also important to know the expectations of your trainees so that, if necessary, you can manage those
expectations and ensure that they feel, at the end of the training, that they have acquired useful information and knowledge.

The trainer then invited the participants to another practical exercise in which they had to make up a training plan for a conference, including the selection of the venue and participants, seating plan, desired outputs and resources.

**Seating, venue and control in negotiations**

Every aspect of a training affects every other aspect, this might extend to circumstances that are not necessarily related to your training plan, like the distance of the nearest smoking area from the venue or the size of the room in which the training will be hosted; if the nearest smoking area is a 15-minute walk away every smoke-break is going to take over 30 minutes, you will need to take this into account while preparing the agenda of the training; if you have a large number of participants and you are planning to have many practical exercises and group-work, you would be better off using round tables for seating rather than a long, rectangular one.

Once your venue is confirmed, get in contact with the managers of the venue and check with them the logistics: where the smoking areas, bathrooms and prayer rooms are; how many chairs and tables are at your disposal; if there’s a whiteboard; if post-it notes can be placed on the walls; and any other rules for the space. You should also visit the space the day before to make sure there is enough room for any group activities you were planning on. Make sure the seating arrangement you had planned is set up and will work in the space you have, take note of things like the temperature and level of noise and make sure that all equipment you are planning to use is working perfectly. In this process, you should constantly ask yourself, “what if there’s a surprise?” and determine alternative plans. To make sure you get everything, it is a good idea to prepare a checklist and then check off every item, never assuming that something you have not checked will work.

**Relations with the participants**

The participants are the hardest thing to manage because you might have full control over all aspects of the training but you cannot control people.

Be sure to leave all your prejudices and preconceptions about the participants at the door; even after you have gotten your first impression of everyone because first impressions can be wrong. To be able to manage the participants, a trainer will need to learn as much as possible about them and their personalities by extrapolating from what they say and do and how they carry themselves. It is always critical to remain in control of your own self and your reactions so you do not allow them to control you. Interact with each person as an individual with their own individual personality. Once you know who they are, you can also look for more information about the participants on social media to learn as much as possible about who they are, what they do and what they know.

There are different kinds of participants. The ten most common archetypes are as follows:

1. **The Complainer**
   This description is self-explanatory. Sometimes, you do have to just concede the point, however, you cannot always do it. One way to deal with complainers is to ask them to give alternatives, instead of just criticising.
2. **The Adversary**
This is the participant who openly says he does not see the value in the training. He might say offensive things to you or to others in the workshop. Try to be a peacemaker. If he comes after you do not get offended, normally he has some aggression issues and he is just trying to get that aggression out. Let his words roll off your back and treat him with grace and forgiveness. If he offends someone else act as a mediator and a peacemaker, preferably not in front of everyone.

3. **The Troublemaker**
How to deal with them: keep them busy.

4. **The Conceited**
The conceited participant thinks he knows everything, keeps interrupting and throws in esoteric or long words to try to impress the other participants. A tip for this personality: keep some pieces of information that no one knows, so you can throw these out when this guy needs to be taken down a peg. However, if you use this tip, directly tell everyone that no one knows everything. This is a preventative measure so that if someone asks you a question and you do not know everything. This is a lesson about modesty.

5. **The Sophisticate**
Much like the Conceited, only this person might actually know more than everyone else in the room. As a facilitator, you can ignore them a little, and ask them to comment on some selected topics.

6. **The Talkative**
This is super common in the Syrian context, so you should be very prepared for this. One technique is to approach them gradually and give them the impression that you get their point, so then they can stop. Another technique is to set a time limit for each intervention, but only use this technique rarely, because you can make people feel pressured or limit somebody’s amazing insight.

7. **The Hyper-positive**
It’s really rare to get these to the point where their positivity is problematic. But when it does happen, the best technique is to mix them with pessimistic people as much as you can. When the two opposite personalities team up, they will usually come up with a realistic average.

8. **The Passive**
Unwilling to actively participate. The passive participants are not necessary shy, they just choose not to participate. For this participant it is best to directly engage with them and force them to participate in some way. You can also indirectly engage this kind of participant by mentioning something they have a connection with, like their city, in this way, they won’t feel targeted but instead engaged. It is even better if you can mention something that this participant knows better than anyone else in the room. Of course, to do this, you will have had to pay attention to your participants and know something about each one.

9. **The Hesitant**
Self-explanatory. To deal with this, always have very firm time frames, and try to break the participants up into small groups to complete a task or decide criteria for something. And have each group present their findings/results to the whole group.
10. **The Funny**

Usually this person is helpful, but sometimes they go too far. There is not much you can do about this one. If a participant is trying to embarrass you, engage the rest of the class more. This will distract the whole class and make embarrassing you more difficult.

**Presentation skills, reading the room and managing expectations**

The first thirty seconds of your training are critical, because if you start the wrong way the rest of the training will be affected. When you are facilitating a training, you are in the hotspot without all the information you need. You do not know who knows what or how much experience they have, but they are still expecting to learn. Thus, you need to train in a way that teaches those with experience without leaving the more novice of your trainees behind.

To gain the trust of your trainees, look confident, introduce yourself: why you are here, your background and your credentials for teaching. This part is particularly important in the context of those working for peace in Syria, because everyone is providing “trainings” these days. If you speak confidently, you will gain respect. If you are enthusiastic, you will incite enthusiasm. Do both, and you will help the participants shake any fear or hesitation they may have. It is very helpful to have a short exercise at the beginning to break the ice, but also so you may observe the participants interacting with each other and glean information about the participants that you can use to make the training more effective for the trainees.

At the beginning of your training, you must present the expected outputs of the training. You can do this in different ways, though, particularly because your desired outputs might be different than the desired outputs of the participants you should ask them about their expectations. If you only impose your own outputs on them, you are unlikely to have satisfied participants at the end of the training. However, do not let your participants interfere with your methods, agenda, timeframe and rules. Moreover, when planning your agenda, make sure that you begin your first session of the day with some time to warm up/break ice/or talk about the agenda for the day; also plan regular breaks throughout the sessions, not going more than an hour and a half without a break for the participants. This will ensure that their level of attention will always be high.

**Communication**

Communication is the most important part of a training, but only 3% is about what you say. The other 97% is about body language and how you say it. There are three main things that constitute the 97% of communication: voice; body language; and work environment and cultural differences.

**Voice**

The lack of vocal inflection (and body language) is why online communication can be so easily misinterpreted and why emojis are so common to help convey what you mean in a text. When training, your voice should be clear and loud enough for everyone to hear you. Silence is also part of this and can be used to make your meaning come across. The pitch of your voice also matters - be sure to vary your pitch to avoid being monotone and put your audience to sleep.

**Body Language & Cultural Difference**

Maintain eye contact with participants to keep them engaged. Most people are usually visual, auditory or kinaesthetic learners. Language is a code, but you can use different kinds of codes. This message is decoded by the receiver, and not always into what the speaker tried to say. Unconscious body language, cultural differences, assumptions brought to the session by you and/or the participants or even internal or external noise can muddle your meaning. If you want to make sure the message gets across correctly, you must receive feedback from your audience and adjust accordingly; the feedback can be in the form of direct comments from the participants but
sometimes you can also use their body language to give you the feedback you need. Be conscious of the gestures you make and any cultural difference that exists between you and your audience. Also take in the cultural differences between you and your participants when you choose examples and illustrations to illuminate your points.

Conclusions
The training achieved its main purpose of engaging Syrian organisations and civil society activists and providing them with the necessary skills and tools to understand the negotiation lifecycle and its stages; appreciate the different types of negotiations and the pros and cons of each as well as analyse various negotiations technique and understand principled negotiation principles. All participants expressed their eagerness to continue working on these issues and to participate in future trainings and initiatives. Most of the participants felt the organisation of the workshop was excellent.
## Annex I - Program

### Training course: Negotiation Skills ToT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time/الفترة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1: 19/07/2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to know each other: participants &amp; organizations and introducing the objectives of the course</td>
<td>9:30-11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Negotiation process-stages and outcomes, Types of negotiations, principled negotiation</td>
<td>11:30-13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>13:00-14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for negotiation: Stakeholders analysis I</td>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>16:00-17:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Day 2: 20/07/2018** |
| Review | 9:00-9:30 |
| • Preparing for negotiation: Interests and relationship analysis II | 9:30-11:00 |
| Break | 11:00 – 11:30 |
| • BATNA, WATNA, & ZOPA | 11:30-13:00 |
| Break | 13:00-14:00 |
| • Negotiations strategies | 14:00-15:30 |
| Break | 15:30-16:00 |
| Recap | 16:00-17:00 |

<p>| <strong>Day 3: 21/07/2018</strong> |
| Review | 9:00-9:30 |
| • Conducting negotiations | 9:30-11:00 |
| Break | 11:00 – 11:30 |
| • Principles of negotiations | 11:30-13:00 |
| Break | 13:00-14:00 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
<td>Principles of negotiations</td>
<td>مبادئ التفاوض</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>استراحة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:00</td>
<td>Recap</td>
<td>خلاصة و أسئلة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
<td>How to design trainings</td>
<td>كيف نصمم التدريب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-11:00</td>
<td>Bloom taxonomy</td>
<td>تقسيم بلوم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>استراحة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Seating and venue design</td>
<td>الإجلاس و تصميم المكان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>استراحة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30-16:00</td>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>مهارات العرض</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>استراحة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:00</td>
<td>Training evaluation and future prospects</td>
<td>تقييم التدريب والأفكار المستقبلية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 4: 22/07/2018**