the form of an official Israeli news release and deliberately highlighted the Israeli point of view. This opening scenario, illustrated in figure 6.4, confronted all actors with the possibility of an impending agreement that overlooked some core interests of the adversaries and could lead to countermeasures, even violence and war. It described an opportunity to settle the long-standing nuclear issue that involved high stress for all actors who were uncertain of Iranian credibility. The conditional Israeli willingness to join the negotiations, a fiction element at the time of the scenario, was designed to make the rivals aware that, if a viable accord is the aim, regional actors who were left outside the negotiation process must also be taken into account. In reaction to this opening scenario, all teams addressed major dilemmas real leaders face when they need to coordinate conflicting interests between multiple actors. It made participants realize that risk-taking, openness, and compromise are essential to prevent radicalization of foes and at the same time to preserve good relations between allies.

When you design a simulation with several rounds of world politics, an opening scenario for each one of them is necessary, with an introduction of new developments. Just like the first opening scenario, each additional scenario builds upon events from the previous round with some step-level change, a new challenge, threats, time pressure, and uncertainty for all actors. For example, if the first round ended with stalemate, you may introduce a dramatic mediation proposal to foster communications. Conversely, if teams reached an agreement in the first round, you may add a mass-casualty terror attack, which challenges the agreement and calls upon the teams to confirm their mutual commitments.

The opening scenario can be presented shortly before world politics interactions begin or immediately as they start. To publicize the opening scenario, in cyber and face-