DIPLOMACY

ДИПЛОМАТИЯ

International Negotiations in the Digital Age

Marina M. Lebedeva ⓘ**, Elena S. Zinovieva** ⓘ ✉

MGIMO University, Moscow, Russian Federation

✉elena.zinovjeva@gmail.com

Abstract. The digital revolution has a significant impact on world politics, including the practice of international negotiations and diplomacy, which, being extremely conservative areas of human activity, still have to adapt to the new digital reality conditions. The practice of digital diplomacy, which involves using social networks to interact with a wide international audience, is becoming widespread. New diplomacy formats are emerging that focused on working with big data, machine learning and artificial intelligence technologies. This study explores the impact of the digital revolution on the practice of international negotiations. Methodologically, the analysis is based on the structural-functional approach, according to which international negotiations act as a structural element of diplomacy and foreign policy. At the same time, the authors single out the invariants of negotiations, which include the stages of international negotiations — preparation phase, discussions and implementation of the results of negotiations. The digital revolution is changing the nature of international negotiations, creating new opportunities for negotiation tactics, as well as new challenges, primarily related to information security and confidentiality. In addition, the development of digital technologies produces new subject areas of international negotiations that focus on Internet regulation, information security and other digital society problems, and contributes to the emergence and development of new international negotiations formats — multistakeholder negotiations and online remote negotiations. The authors conclude that the main negotiation invariants remain the same. However, digital technologies are transforming the available negotiating tools and tactics. Under these conditions, new knowledge and competencies are in demand among diplomats, in particular, in the field of data management and information security.

Key words: digital technologies, digital diplomacy, data diplomacy, diplomacy, digital revolution, information security

Специфика международных переговоров в эпоху цифровизации

М.М. Лебедева [iD], Е.С. Зиновьева [iD] ✉

МГИМО МИД России, Москва, Российская Федерация

✉elena.zinovjeva@gmail.com

Аннотация. Цифровая революция оказывает существенное влияние на все области мировой политики, в том числе и на практику международных переговоров и дипломатию, вынуждая адаптироваться к условиям новой цифровой реальности. Широкое распространение получает практика цифровой дипломатии, которая подразумевает использование социальных сетей для взаимодействия с широкой международной аудиторией. Появляются новые форматы дипломатии, ориентированные на работу с большими данными и технологиями машинного обучения и искусственного интеллекта. Исследование посвящено изучению влияния цифровой революции на практику международных переговоров. Методологически анализ основывается на структурно-функциональном подходе, согласно которому международные переговоры выступают в качестве структурного элемента дипломатии в ходе реализации внешнеполитического курса страны. При этом авторы выделяют в качестве инвариантов переговорной деятельности этапы, которые последовательно проходят любые международные переговоры, — подготовка к переговорам, их ведение и имплементация достигнутых результатов. Показано, что цифровая революция изменяет характер международных переговоров на всех этапах, создавая новые возможности в области тактики ведения переговоров, а также новые вызовы, прежде всего связанные с вопросами безопасности и конфиденциальности информации. Кроме того, развитие технологий формирует новые предметные сферы международных переговоров, посвященные регулированию интернета, обеспечению информационной безопасности и других проблем цифрового общества, а также способствует появлению и развитию новых форматов международных переговоров — многоуровневых переговоров и дистанционных переговоров в онлайн-режиме. Авторы приходят к выводу, что основные инварианты переговоров остаются прежними, однако цифровые технологии трансформируют доступные инструменты и тактику ведения переговоров. В этих условиях востребованы новые знания и компетенции у дипломатов, в частности, в области работы с данными и обеспечения информационной безопасности.

Ключевые слова: цифровые технологии, цифровая дипломатия, дипломатия данных, дипломатия, цифровая революция, информационная безопасность

Problem Statement

The Fourth Industrial Revolution (Schwab, 2016) has affected all areas of human activity — the economy, politics, security, social and cultural spheres. Diplomacy has also changed significantly due to using new technologies based on digitalization (Tsvetkova, 2020). At the same time, digital technologies and their level of development have begun to determine the country's position in the international arena and the range of available opportunities in foreign policy.

Negotiations, along with cooperation and struggle, constitute the main form of political expression in the modern world (Held, 1989). They have always acted as a core of diplomacy. Diplomats have been conducting diplomatic

negotiations for centuries, which is one of the most conservative of human activities. Nevertheless, as A.G. Kovalev, diplomat, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, asserts that the development of communication means has had and is having a significant impact on the way diplomatic affairs are conducted (Kovalev, 1988, p. 237). Obviously, in the modern era, digitalization processes have influenced international negotiations, like other spheres of human activity.

Research question: How has the global digital revolution affected international negotiation activities?

The research is based on a structural-functional approach. They consider international negotiations as a structural element of diplomacy in implementing foreign policy. The study is also based on P.Y. Galperin's theory of structural non-variable parameters of activity (Galperin, 1976) and the presence of such non-variable parameters in negotiations (Lebedeva, 1993), which makes it possible to analyze the impact of digitalization on these invariants. They use case analysis and discourse analysis as methods of research.

Different actors negotiate in different formats (bilateral, multilateral, within international organizations, with the participation of non-state actors, etc.), so different theories of international relations are used in case studies. The analysis of bilateral negotiations examples assumes a realist approach, in which the parties to the negotiations seek to realize the national interests of the states they represent. Studies of negotiations conducted within international organizations focus on using liberal institutionalism, according to which international organizations and other international institutions facilitate cooperation in the absence of supreme authority in international relations (Keohane & Martin, 2003). Such theoretical eclecticism in case studies is permissible (Sil & Katzenstein, 2010).

The aim of the study is to identify new formats, domains, and structural elements of international negotiations in the digitalization context.

Digitalization and Digital Diplomacy

The widespread digitalization is the most important feature of the current stage of world politics. According to statistics,[1] in 2021 the total number of Internet users was about 60% of the total population of the planet Earth, with social network users accounting for 53% of the total population of the planet. The widespread use of cell phones has led to the fact that people spend a lot of time on the Internet — in general, according to statistics, about 7 hours a day in various applications, of which almost half the time accounts for social networks.[2]

The modern stage in the development of information and communication technologies is increasingly referred to in the scientific literature as the "digital revolution," in order to emphasize its difference from the earlier information revolution, which dates back to the 1990s and is characterized by the widespread use of user computers and the global Internet. Scientists characterize the digital revolution by the growing data amount transmitted via global information networks, especially social networks such as TikTok, VKontakte and others. Data and social networks are having a transformative effect on the world economy, world politics, and all areas of individual, social, and national life. In 2018, 2.5 quintillion bytes of data (a thousand to the sixth power) were created per day.[3] Metaphorically, many scientists describe data as the new oil of the 21st century.[4] Consequently,

---

[1] Digital 2021: Global Overview Report // DataReportal. January 27, 2021. URL: https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2021-global-overview-report (accessed: 09.03.2021).

[2] Ibid.

[3] Data never sleeps 6.0 // DOMO. 2018. URL: https://www.domo.com/solution/data-never-sleeps-6 (accessed: 09.03.2021).

[4] Haupt M. "Data is the New Oil" — A Ludicrous Proposition // Medium. May 2, 2016. URL: https://medium.com/project-2030/data-is-the-new-oil-a-ludicrous-proposition-1d91bba4f294#.vjyvcwnp0 (accessed: 09.03.2021).

today, the ability to control, process and manage data flows is becoming an important determinant of a country's international capabilities and foreign policy potential.

Diplomatic practice and the negotiation process are reshaping under the influence of rapidly evolving digital technologies. Diplomacy is adapting to the new technological reality. Digital technology and data are becoming a tool in international negotiations. In the vast majority of countries heads of state, foreign ministers and ordinary diplomats regularly maintain social media accounts. Diplomats use video conferences for negotiations, even at the highest levels. Under the digitalization influence, the public opinion role in negotiations is changing, as the official language of diplomatic communication. New issues are emerging in terms of international law and legal customs governing international negotiations. Artificial intelligence, machine learning and big data analytics are widely used, including in the work of diplomats in emergency response, consular work and preparation for international negotiations. In addition, digitalization is creating new subject areas in negotiations, such as international Internet governance, international information security or personal data protection.

Scientists originally used the term "digital diplomacy" to describe the changes in international negotiations and diplomacy. In addition, scientists understood the term as using social media to interact with domestic and international audiences and create a positive country image in the international arena. Moreover, scientists used the term "digital diplomacy" to enhance soft power, as well as cover international negotiations and build a loyal public opinion. Other terms have gradually emerged — "cyber-diplomacy," "internet diplomacy," and "network diplomacy." In the broadest sense, the mentioned terms reflect the digitalization of modern diplomacy and negotiation practices. In recent years, the term "data diplomacy" has become popular, reflecting the growing importance of big data in negotiation practices and diplomatic work.

To sum up, there is no single term to describe the changes taking place. Moreover, there is no single theoretical approach to understand the new digital diplomatic practice. Journalists and scientists often use the term "digital diplomacy" widely. It is also widely used in journalistic works. As a rule, it refers to digital public diplomacy — the use of social media by representatives of states and non-state actors to interact with foreign audiences and promote the country's foreign policy goals, primarily to strengthen its soft power and form a positive image.

Foreign scientists use frequently the term "strategic communication" to emphasize the growing importance of digital technologies in political communication at the international level. In addition, foreign scientists use the broad term "cyber-diplomacy" to reflect not only the digitalization of diplomacy and negotiation, but also the new international politics subject areas that have emerged because of digital technologies. In particular, cyber-diplomacy involves discussing issues such as the development of norms of responsible behavior in the global information space, as well as attribution of cyber threats or the fight against hacker attacks. For example, in April 2022, the U.S. Department of State created the Bureau of Cyberspace and Digital Policy to promote responsible government behavior in cyberspace and policies that protect the integrity and security of the Internet infrastructure, serve U.S. interests, promote competitiveness and support democratic values.[5] Thus, the mission of the Bureau is to promote U.S. values and interests in the global digital space.

In the academic literature, there is also increasing attention to the study of cyber-

---

[5] Bureau of Cyberspace and Digital Policy // U.S. Department of State. URL: https://www.state.gov/bureaus-offices/deputy-secretary-of-state/bureau-of-cyberspace-and-digital-policy/#:~:text=The%20Bureau%20of%20Cyberspace%20and,Internet%2C%20serve%20U.S.%20interests%2C%20promote (accessed: 09.03.2021).

diplomacy theory as a broad field that involves solving foreign policy problems in cyberspace and / or with the help of digital tools (Attatfa, Renaud & De Paoli, 2020).

Approaches to this issue study have also evolved. Initially, researchers focused on the specifics of foreign ministries' adaptation to information technology and social media (Manor, 2016; Bjola, 2015), as well as on the specifics of diplomats' and political leaders' interaction with a broad international audience through social media (Bjola, 2016; Tsvetkova, 2011). The next stage was the formation of theoretical concepts that explain the diplomacy digitalization, in particular the digital diplomacy importance as a soft power tool (Adesina, 2017; Hocking & Melissen, 2015). Concepts that reflect the growing role of big and small data analysis in diplomacy, processed by artificial intelligence, are becoming popular today. Moreover, methodologies for studying relevant data processed by artificial intelligence are becoming relevant to understand better current trends in diplomacy as well as the impact on public opinion (Tsvetkova & Kuznetsov, 2020).

This article uses a broad interpretation of the digitalization impact on diplomacy and the negotiation process, which assumes that digital technology not only generates new subject areas in negotiations, but also influences the negotiation process by creating new formats and new tools in all negotiation process phases.

New Subject Areas of International Negotiations and New Formats of International Negotiation

New Subject Areas of International Negotiations Shaped by Digitalization

Digitalization has given rise to new areas of international negotiations, including international Internet governance, international information security, and, in recent years such issues as protecting personal data of Internet users, regulating major digital platforms, cross-border taxation of digital trade and e-commerce, and others.

The international governance issue was one of the first issues on the international agenda related to the developing informational technology. The development of the Internet has raised the question of the need to elaborate international rules for the use and development of this technology — primarily to coordinate the namespace and addresses of the Internet, the technical systems that ensure the network coherent operation on a global scale. The issue complexity lies in the fact that in addition to differences in the states' interests, business structures and Internet communities also have their own interests. In fact, negotiations on Internet governance were one of the first examples of multilevel diplomacy involving representatives of states and non-state actors. Since 2003, there have been several conferences on Internet governance issues — most notably the World Summit on the Information Society in 2003[6] и 2005.[7] These events resulted in the permanent UN Internet Governance Forum. Since 2006, the Forum has been held annually by governmental and nongovernmental actors.[8]

The Internet governance internationalization as a major contradiction at the intergovernmental level implies transferring namespace and addresses of the Internet from a private entity to an intergovernmental organization, the International Telecommunication Union. Public Technical Identifiers currently carries out the function. The U.S and its NATO partners advocate status quo, while Russia, China and a number of Middle Eastern and Latin American countries favor the Internet governance internationalization. The interests of business and Internet communities are to preserve the

---

[6] World Summit on the Information Society, First Phase, Geneva: 10—12 December 2003 // International Telecommunication Union. 2003. URL: https://www.itu.int/net/wsis/geneva/index.html (accessed: 09.03.2021).

[7] World Summit on the Information Society, Second Phase, Tunis: 16—18 November 2005 // International Telecommunication Union. 2005. URL: https://www.itu.int/net/wsis/tunis/index.html (accessed: 09.03.2021).

[8] About the Internet Governance Forum // Internet Governance Forum. URL: https://intgovforum.org/en/filedepot_download/261/22254 (accessed: 09.03.2021).

commercial potential of the Internet and consolidate certain rules of Internet communities that emerged in the early stages of network development (network neutrality, openness of Internet protocols, etc.). It should be said that at present the Internet governance agenda has somewhat evolved — not only the issues of control over the technical infrastructure of the Internet, but also a wide range of political, economic, socio-humanitarian and human rights issues related to developing global network are discussed. The Internet communities influence has significantly decreased, while the business influence, especially from large digital platforms such as Google, TikTok and others, has increased.

Information security has become another new area of international negotiations. In this area, multilevel interaction formats have become widespread in recent years at Russia's initiative. The use of digital technologies, namely videoconferencing, provides an effective multilevel format of international negotiations, since many representatives of business, civil society and the academic community cannot afford to travel to New York for financial reasons.

There is a new area of interaction between diplomats and representatives of big IT-businesses in international negotiations, where diplomats develop rules for IT-companies or obtain expertise. For example, Denmark and other countries are sending diplomats to Silicon Valley in the US to establish contacts with IT-business representatives and communicate with them.[9] In its turn, the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs actively cooperates with major Russian IT-businesses, both in the field of international information security and in the global information society development.[10]

---

[9] Erzse A., Garson M. A Leaders' Guide to Building a Tech-Forward Foreign Policy // Tony Blair Institute for Global Change. March 25, 2022. URL: https://institute.global/policy/leaders-guide-building-tech-forward-foreign-policy (accessed: 11.05.2022).

[10] Melnikova O. Is the business community able to contribute to the intensification of the negotiation process

New Negotiation Formats — International Negotiations in Distance and Hybrid Formats

The COVID-19 pandemic and forced self-isolation became a kind of catalyst for developing various kinds of video meetings — conferences and negotiations. Despite the fact that people had developed technology earlier, they organized meetings in traditional ways. In part, psychologists attribute this to the desire to use tried-and-true everyday practices, and in part to the negative aspects that video meeting formats contain. The latter can include psychological and technical issues.

Psychologists long before the COVID-19 pandemic were engaged in analyzing video communication issues and focused on video training. Nevertheless, psychologists can apply some of the findings from these studies to the negotiation process. For example, psychologists have shown that in order for interactions between participants in video meetings to be effective, negotiators need to understand the significance of the efforts being made, feel comfortable and trust each other (Hughes et al., 2002).

During the COVID-19 pandemic, video meetings intensified dramatically. Studies on the problems of conducting them have also appeared. In particular, research on asymmetric attention allocation has been published (Kuzminykh & Rintel, 2020). The problem with attention at online conferences involves a number of aspects. First, attention is focused on the speaker. Opportunities to see and "read" information from the rest of the negotiators are limited. Second, negotiators are often even unwittingly distracted by what is not "at the negotiation table." Legal and protocol problems arise in connection with international negotiations in the online format. For example, the rules of procedure of the UN Security Council do not specify the possibility of working

---

on international information security issues? // International Affairs. 2021. (In Russian). URL: https://interaffairs.ru/jauthor/material/2481 (accessed: 09.03.2021).

remotely, so all online meetings during the pandemic were informal.[11] In addition, there is the issue of confidentiality of information and voting. Obviously, these issues need to be resolved, and not only within the UN system. As a rule, the way out within international organizations is to use a hybrid format of negotiations — the voting members of delegations participate in the negotiations in a face-to-face format, while everyone else is connected remotely.

At the same time, there are positive aspects of conducting international negotiations online. Positive aspects are the following:

1) reduction of financial and time costs associated with travel to negotiations;

2) opportunities for intensive interaction with the "center" of each party;

3) the possibility of almost constant contact between the parties in negotiations;

4) there is no a choice problem of a place for negotiations / which is important in the case of international negotiations in conflict conditions;

5) in conflict conditions online negotiations do not involve a protocol handshake, which participants in the conflict can painfully perceive.

The choice a location for negotiations is a political issue. In general, the following options are possible: on the territory of one of the participants; on neutral territory; in different territories in case of lengthy international negotiations. All of these options have taken place in the history of international negotiations. Parties often found it difficult to agree on a location for negotiations. The memoirs of Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary V.V. Karyagin give an example of how, in late 1953, the USSR, the USA, France and Great Britain agreed to hold a meeting of foreign ministers in early 1954. However, the question arose about location for the meeting. Western countries offered the building of the former Control Council, which was located in the American sector of Berlin. The Soviet side proposed the residence of the Supreme Commissioner of the USSR. After a long discussion, the Western countries proposed that three meetings should be held in the building of the Control Council, as proposed by the United States, France and Great Britain, and one, at the suggestion of the USSR, in the building of the USSR High Commissioner, since four parties were involved in the negotiations. The USSR objected, arguing that the West was united, therefore, as a compromise; two meetings should be held on one territory, and two in another. As a result, the parties came to a decision, according to which two meetings should be held in the building of the former Control Council and one in the residence of the USSR High Commissioner (Karyagin, 1994).

There are many similar examples of discussions about the location of international negotiations. Obviously, in the case of online negotiations, the problem is removed.

The negotiation format can also be hybrid, namely, some meetings are offline, while others are online. The negotiations between Russia and Ukraine in February-March 2022 can be an example of such using the format. The first three rounds were held offline on the Belarusian-Ukrainian border and on the territory of the Republic of Belarus, and then the negotiations continued in the video format.[12]

Forums and Conferences with the Participation of NGOs and Business Structures — Multilevel Negotiations

Multilevel negotiation (or "multistakeholderism," negotiations involving different stakeholders, states and non-state actors) is a format that began to develop intensively since the late 20th century,

---

[11] During the pandemic, the UN Security Council will vote on resolutions on the new system // TASS. March 31, 2019. (In Russian). URL: https://tass.ru/politika/8120521 (accessed: 09.03.2021).

[12] Kremlin confirms talks between Russia and Ukraine in video format // Interfax. March 12, 2022. (In Russian). URL: https://www.interfax.ru/world/827832 (accessed: 11.04.2022).

simultaneously with the development of digitalization processes. Two subject areas stand out here that were among the first to be discussed in a multilevel format — environmental protection and Internet regulation. In both the negotiation process is very complex due to the multiplicity of actors and the many different aspects.

There have been examples of complex multilateral and multidimensional negotiations before. For example, A.G. Kovalev notes that during the second stage of the CSCE diplomats negotiated in three commissions. The first commission had two sub-commissions, the second commission — five sub-commissions, and the third — four sub-commissions. In addition, working groups were established. The total number of commissions, sub-commissions and working groups was 20. Overall, during the second phase of the CSCE there were about 2,500 meetings where working groups considered 4,700 drafts, not counting drafting options. There were also informal meetings. About 500 diplomats from different countries took part in the work of the second phase of CSCE (Kovalev, 1988).

This example of international negotiations dates back to the second half of the 20th century. Modern negotiations turn out to be much more complicated. While the participants in the second phase of the CSCE were diplomats, today civil society and business representatives become participators of international negotiations. The December 2021 UN Climate Change Conference in Glasgow (COP26), for example, brought together representatives from almost 200 states, 40,000 registered participants, including 22,274 delegates from the parties, 14,124 observers, and 9,529 non-state participants.[13]

The large number of participants involving non-state actors makes the international

negotiation process more democratic and inclusive (Lebedeva, 2016). For example, through participating in negotiations NGO representatives are able to influence the process of introducing new norms into international practice, increases the legitimacy of negotiations, and provides them with expertise on certain issues (Lebedeva, 2016). At the same time, however, such forums and conferences also pose challenges, as all of these actors have different interests, and international negotiations themselves are multidimensional in the sense of the problem under discussion, which has a number of quantitative parameters.

Digitalization facilitates international negotiations with a large number of participants. With its help it is possible to visualize information on an issue, to process statistical data, to trace the dynamics of changes, in general, to work with large databases. Big databases are already being implemented in foreign policy and diplomatic practice of a number of countries, including the United States, Russia, China, Iran, Venezuela, and Brazil. Artificial intelligence in foreign policy and diplomacy is developing (Tsvetkova & Kuznetsov, 2020). The UN recognizes the importance of collecting data and working with big data, in particular for sustainable development.

However, there are also many challenges to working with big data. First, there are a number of questions for negotiators about working with big data. At the UN, along with the benefits, there are risks associated with their use, especially those related to confidentiality, sovereignty, privacy protection, inequalities between those who have the data and those who do not, etc.[14]

Second, access to large databases of international negotiators, most of whom are not professional diplomats, complicates the problem of data privacy and security. Data leaks during

---

[13] FCCC/CP/2021/INF.3 (Part II) // United Nations. November 23, 2021. URL: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cp2021_inf03p02_adv.pdf (accessed: 11.04.2022).

[14] Big Data for Sustainable Development // United Nations. URL: https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/big-data-for-sustainable-development (accessed: 11.04.2022).

negotiations may not only compromise the participants, but also discredit the results of the negotiations and disrupt the negotiation process.[15]

In addition to the challenges directly related to digitalization, multilevel negotiations face challenges related to the differences in the competencies of their participants. Diplomats usually have a background in international relations and world politics, at least the relevant courses. Such education often includes courses on digitalization in diplomacy and courses on negotiation technology. Many non-state representatives actors lack such training, which complicates the negotiation process and can impede mutual understanding.

The Structure of the Negotiation Process in the Digital Age

Digitalization has influenced international negotiations and their structural non-variable parameters. The negotiation process distinguishes between negotiation stages (preparation for negotiations, negotiation process, analysis of the outcome and implementing agreements reached) and tactical techniques (Lebedeva, 1993).

Preparing for International Negotiations

At the preparation stage, the digitalization possibilities allow to move the preparing negotiations to a higher quality level, using big data and artificial intelligence. An example here is the negotiations on the UK's exit from the EU. When preparing for negotiations, the parties intensively used hashtag and sentiment analysis on social media in order to understand the area where agreement is possible, taking into account public opinion in the EU and the UK (Manor, 2019). In particular, during the preparation of the

UK negotiating position, the sentiment of Twitter[16] users was actively monitored, using hashtag analysis technology, which allowed complementing the public opinion results regarding the final agreement formats. Thus, the analysis of social media sentiment allowed for a more informed decision regarding the perception of the modalities of the UK — EU agreement (Manor, 2019).

During the Iran nuclear deal, countries were no longer only using social media for analysis, but also for influencing public opinion. Thanks to digital diplomacy, positive attitudes on social media in both Iran and Western states contributed to the successful signing of agreements (Manor, 2019).

Preparing for negotiations requires interaction, both with the opposing side to resolve protocol and procedural issues, and with various ministries and agencies within the country. While widespread foreign platforms are used to communicate with the opposing side, domestic platforms are needed for "internal negotiations" (interagency approvals) to avoid information leakage, in particular in Russia the TrueConf platform was developed.[17] In addition, there is the question of creating a unified database of different agencies to form a negotiating position. On the one hand, such a database will make it possible to see a complete picture; on the other hand, the danger of information leaks increases.

In preparation for negotiations, various kinds of meetings, situation analyses, and modelling of negotiations are held. There are great opportunities for digitalization here. The use of digital technologies in the preparation of content depending on the nature of the problem

---

[15] Big Data for Sustainable Development // United Nations. URL: https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/big-data-for-sustainable-development (accessed: 11.04.2022).

[16] On the basis on the requirement of the Prosecutor General's Office of the Russian Federation dated February 24, 2022, access to the Twitter resource in the Russian Federation is limited.

[17] Martirosyan A. TrueConf introduced the first domestic platform for unified communications // TrueConf. March 28, 2013. (In Russian). URL: https://trueconf.ru/blog/press-release/trueconf-predstavil-pervuyu-otechestvennuyu-platformu-dlya-obedinennyih-kommunikatsiy.html (accessed: 11.04.2022).

can be extremely diverse, including the creation of large databases, simulations, etc. Satellite data analysis can be used as part of the reasoning in negotiations.

Moreover, digitalization saves considerable financial as well as human resources by reducing travel for negotiations. Of course, the human resources themselves are not eliminated altogether in this case.

Finally, digitalization has had a strong impact on the process of preparing for international negotiations at the expense of public opinion. Previously, preparations for international negotiations implied a rather chamber-like atmosphere. The exceptions were comments by analysts and journalists and possible leaks to the media. The digital age has opened up additional means of influencing those engaged in preparations for international negotiations through social networks, including by creating fakes on them, as well as by engaging bots. As a result, negotiators find themselves under external pressure when preparing for negotiations. Negotiators can be influenced through non-diplomatic channels, including social networks, by transnational corporations and other non-state actors in order to realize their own interests (Djamalov, 2021). The opposite side can also exert similar influence in its own interests. In addition, participants in preparations for negotiations can be disoriented by the huge volume of information and comments, which in many cases prove difficult to assess correctly.

The International Negotiation Process

At the stage of international negotiations, the influence of the external environment on the negotiators becomes especially significant. In fact, with most international negotiations being open to the international public through social media and other electronic media, the public becomes another party to the negotiation process. Obviously, negotiators cannot ignore the public in developing negotiating positions, strategies

and tactics. During negotiations, pressure from social groups can lead to the phenomenon of "window-drawing" (Zartman & Berman, 1982). According to this phenomenon, instead of discussing with the opposite side, international negotiators engage in a discussion with third parties, with social groups. The transparency of the negotiation process and the accessibility of information about the course of negotiations is high, which is due to the special culture of digital society, which implies maximum openness and accessibility of information.

Modern practices of data diplomacy also provide opportunities to influence public opinion. Artificial intelligence and the machine way of distributing materials (bots) create large-scale flows of information, direct them precisely to target audiences and, most importantly, respond to user comments in social networks, producing accurate, striking and convincing responses (Tsvetkova & Fedorova, 2021).

Traditionally, the parties hold international talks in face-to-face meetings. Pandemic has opened up online and hybrid formats of interaction (by hybrid formats we mean negotiations that combine virtual and real interaction). Conducting online negotiations, discussing protocol and procedural issues in preparation for negotiations, saves money and time. Moreover, it makes it possible to direct them towards solving other issues.[18] However, substantive negotiations require more direct communication. Informal situations (in coffee breaks, as well as meetings outside formal negotiations) provide opportunities to discuss the most complex and sensitive issues (Kaufmann, 1996). Participants in international negotiations during informal conversations often use the "trial balloon" technique, in which they formulate an idea as a "what if...." (Lebedeva, 1993). Such a

---

[18] Tabarinceva-Romanova K. "Cloud diplomacy" — panacea during pandemics? // Russian International Affairs Council. March 26, 2021. (In Russian). URL: https://russiancouncil.ru/analytics-and-comments/columns/digitaldiplomacy/oblachnaya-diplomatiya-panatseya-v-epokhu-pandemii/?sphrase_id=83213171 (accessed: 09.03.2022).

"trial balloon," which is not a formal proposal, can easily be removed if the partner reacts negatively to it. In a formal negotiation session, it is much more difficult to do so.

Specialists in business psychology have suggested a two-level model of interaction in negotiations, which involves negotiating not only with the partner, but also with their "center." In this case, the "center" turns out to be heterogeneous and negotiators must take into account the interests of different groups in the "center" (Putnam, 1988). Digitalization greatly expands the possibilities of communication with such a heterogeneous "center," makes it possible to exchange information quickly, to obtain new inputs. At the same time, the issue of the security of information channels is again acute here.

When agreements are reached as a result of international negotiations, the task of working on the final document arises. Digitalization in this case is an effective mechanism for the joint editing of texts. However, the final documents are not only subject to co-editing. The role of textual information is increasing in today's world. Negotiations are no exception here, and digitalization greatly facilitates the work on any joint texts of the negotiating parties. Joint statements are an example of facilitated work through digitalization.

Analysis of the Results and Implementing the Agreements Reached

In the final phase, digitalization allows to analyze the negotiations results. The negotiation simulation is one of the options here. It is noteworthy that long before the era of digitalization, the scientist made the first steps of analyzing international negotiations with the help of computer modeling at MGIMO (Lukov & Sergeev, 1981). Moreover, depending on the substantive features of negotiations, as well as at the stage of preparation for negotiations, a variety of digital tools can be used. In particular,

at the stage of implementing the agreements reached, working with public opinion and its preparation for the decisions and compromises reached is a particularly significant factor.

At the present stage, digital technologies supplement opportunities in this direction. In particular, the UN Sustainable Development Goals program emphasizes the use of data analysis to assess the achievement of the goals.

Conclusion

Digitalization has had a significant impact on international negotiations, largely reshaping this activity and creating new areas for negotiation. This fact confirms the pervasive digitalization effect on world politics.

With digitalization, international negotiations have become more complex in a number of dimensions, and negotiators face new challenges. Obviously, we can overcome these challenges, but the issue of learning the new realities of negotiation is acute. Diplomats have to master new unfamiliar areas, including the technical aspects related to them. While previously not all universities offered courses on negotiation in international relations and world politics, now, with the ongoing digitalization, such courses are simply necessary. Moreover, we should expect an even greater digitalization impact due to developing artificial intelligence, big data, biotechnology and cognitive technologies that are just beginning to penetrate international negotiations.

In practical terms, there is also the question of interacting official structures with business representatives and civil society structures. Digital technologies pose a greater risk of data leakage from unofficial negotiators due to a different degree of responsibility; attempt to fully realize their interests due to inexperience in negotiating, etc.

Obviously, the digitalization process of the international negotiations will continue. It is difficult to say exactly how digitalization in international negotiations will proceed in general. However, we cannot outline some

directions. For example, back in the early 1990s, V.A. Kremenyuk came up with the idea of international negotiations system (Kremenyuk, 1991). He suggested that the subject areas of various international negotiations should be linked with each other in order to increase their efficiency. This idea was not implemented. In principle, it could not be implemented because of its complexity without the use of digital technology. Today it is becoming possible.

References

Adesina, O. S. (2017). Foreign policy in an era of digital diplomacy. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 129—175. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2017.1297175

Attatfa, A., Renaud, K., & De Paoli, S. (2020). Cyber diplomacy: A systematic literature review. *Procedia Computer Science*, 176, 60—69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.08.007

Bjola, C. (2015). Introduction: Making sense of digital diplomacy. In C. Bjola & M. Holmes (Eds.), *Digital diplomacy. Theory and practice* (pp. 15—24). London: Routledge.

Bjola, C. (2016). Digital diplomacy — the state of the art. *Global Affairs*, 2(3), 297—299. https://doi.org/10.1080/23340460.2016.1239372

Djamalov, F. O. (2021). Challenges of the digital age for conducting diplomacy in the period of globalization and the coronavirus pandemic. *Aktual'nye Issledovanija*, (10), 83—86. (In Russian). Retrieved from https://apni.ru/article/2020-vizovi-tsifrovoj-epokhi-na-vedenie-diplomatii

Galperin, P. Y. (1976). *Introduction into psychology*. Moscow: Izd-vo Moskovskogo universiteta publ. (In Russian).

Held, D. (1989). *Political theory and the modern state. Essays on state, power, and democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hocking, B., & Melissen, J. (2015). Diplomacy in the digital age. *Clingendael Report*, 1—58. Retrieved from https://www.clingendael.org/sites/default/files/2016-02/Digital_Diplomacy_in_the_Digital%20Age_Clingendael_July2015.pdf

Hughes, S. C., Wickersham, L., Ryan-Jones, D. L., & Smith, S. A. (2002). Overcoming social and psychological barriers to effective on-line collaboration. *Educational Technology and Society*, 5(1), 86—92.

Karyagin, V. V. (1994). *Diplomatic life beyond the curtains and on the stage*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija publ. (In Russian).

Kaufmann, J. (1996). *Conference diplomacy: An introductory analysis*. London: Macmillan Press.

Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (2003). Institutional theory as a research program. In C. Elman & M. F. Elman (Eds.), *Progress in international relations theory: Appraising the field* (pp. 71—108). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5627.003.0006

Kovalev, A. G. (1988). *Manual on diplomacy*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija publ. (In Russian).

Kremenyuk, V. A. (1991). The emerging system of international negotiation. In V. A. Kremenyuk (Ed.), *International negotiation: Analysis, approaches, issues* (pp. 22—39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuzminykh, A., & Rintel, S. (2020). Classification of functional attention in video meetings. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1—13). New York: Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376546

Lebedeva, M. M. (1993). *You are to negotiate*. Moscow: Ekonomika publ. (In Russian).

Lebedeva, M. M. (2016). *International negotiations technologies*. Moscow: Aspekt Press publ. (In Russian).

Lukov, V. B., & Sergeev, V. M. (1981). Methodological and methodical foundations of the SSCE information and logic system. In I. G. Tyulin & M. A. Khrustalev (Eds.), *Modelling issues in multilateral diplomatic negotiations* (pp. 48—70). Moscow: MGIMO publ. (In Russian).

Manor, I. (2019). *The digitalization of public diplomacy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-04405-3

Manor, I. (2016). *Are we there yet: Have MFAs realized the potential of digital diplomacy? Results from a cross-national comparison*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.

Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games. *International Organization*, 42(3), 427—460. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027697

Schwab, K. (2016). *The fourth industrial revolution*. Moscow: Eksmo publ. (In Russian).

Sil, R., & Katzenstein, P. (2010). Analytic eclecticism in the study of world politics: Reconfiguring problems and mechanisms across research traditions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2), 411—431. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592710001179

Tsvetkova, N. A. (2020). The digital diplomacy as a phenomenon of international relations: Research methodology. *RGGU Bulletin. Series: Political Science. History. International Relations*, (2), 37—47. (In Russian). https://doi.org/10.28995/2073-6339-2020-2-37-47

Tsvetkova, N. A. (2011). US WEB public diplomacy. *USA & Canada: Economics, Politics, Culture*, (3), 109—122. (In Russian).

Tsvetkova, N. A., & Fedorova, I. V. (2021). U.S. data diplomacy: Imperative, apparatus, and scope. *USA & Canada: Economics, Politics, Culture*, 51(1), 104—116. (In Russian). https://doi.org/10.31857/S268667300013205-5

Tsvetkova, N. A., & Kuznetsov, N. M. (2020). Phenomenon of big data diplomacy in world politics. *RGGU Bulletin. Series: Political Science. History. International Relations*, (4), 27—44. (In Russian). https://doi.org/10.28995/2073-6339-2020-4-27-44

Zartman, I. W., & Berman, M. R. (1982). *The practical negotiator*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

About the authors: *Lebedeva Marina Mikhailovna* — PhD (Psychology), Dr. of Sc. (Political Science), Professor, Head, Department of World Politics, MGIMO University; ORCID: 0000-0003-4162-0807; e-mail: mmlebedeva@gmail.com

Zinovieva Elena Sergeevna — PhD, Dr. of Sc. (Political Science), Professor, Deputy Director, Centre for International Information Security, Science and Technology Policy, MGIMO University; ORCID: 0000-0002-5129-338X; e-mail: elena.zinovjeva@gmail.com