

The preparation of the preliminary debate was based on the actors, both present and not present. In this reflection strategies surrounding the present actors will be discussed, along with our overarching goal. Lastly the aftermath of the debate, the resulting proposal, will be reflected upon with the debate in mind as well.

The first debate was with Rijkswaterstaat, the Delta commission and Environmental activists. Only the environmental activists were seen as opponents, because we were certain they would be in favour of room for the river and against a polluting transport company.. Rijkswaterstaat, the Delta commission and the provinces all had common ground with us that could be used to influence policy in our favour. Our goal in this debate was to see whether common ground could be found between all actors to vote against room for the river. Our preferred policy wants the variable 'water level' to be as high as possible. We also want a low risk of breaches, as this would hinder day-to-day operation. We expressed this as either minimizing expected damage or death, whichever was favoured by the other actors.

We want for the river to be as deep as possible. From our analysts we had perceived that consensus was the primary goal of Rijkswaterstaat. Since they were the most powerful actor, with the ability to draft policy, we wanted to keep this central. Regarding the Delta commission, safety was their main concern. We aligned with this completely, stating that we as users of the river feel responsible for the safety of the occupants of the surroundings. From here we posed that dike heightening is the cheapest and the safest course of action, aside from also being a historic staple of our nations' identity. Definitive proof for all these statements was not fully present to us at that time, however our mandate stated that we could interpret our analysts results liberally.

The actor we knew was going to oppose us was the Environmental group. The strategy to deal with this came from EPA1424 "Political Decision-making". We knew the environment was going to be their central argument, so we created a frame that turned their argument against them. The frame was: "Room for the river only hides a symptom of climate change, while preventing us from taking real action to counter climate change." A key point of knowledge which we introduced is that bigger and deeper boats are far more eco-friendly than using several small boats. When asked how we would respond to a shallower river we mentioned having to resort to the use of more, smaller pollutive boats or having to result to even more polluting trucks. We reached out to the environmental activists and tried to broaden the scope of the issue. If they were to agree to deeper rivers, we were to pledge to reduce our CO2-output in line with the Paris climate accords. The activists responded positively to this.

The first part of the debate ended with all actors voicing policy that was in line with our wishes. The second debate introduced the provinces, which were to our delight vehemently against more 'invasive' room for the river projects. Most municipalities preferred dike heightening and were ready to defend their statements. As the transport company we knew from our analysts that both provinces had an interest in maintaining the commercial opportunities that we provide, alongside not relocating their farmers. We did not have to leverage our case against room for the river much, as this was already being done. So we moved to our higher goal, which was to deepen the river more than it is currently. We proposed to aid in this endeavour, providing Rijkswaterstaat with information and some monetary aid to complete this. In our mind, further deepening ensured that we could expand and enlarge our fleet in the future.

A few days after the debate, the proposal from Rijkswaterstaat was received. No policies that would shallow the river routes directly were seen. We had completed our goal. However, no deepening of the entire route was included. We will move to add this to the policy in the final debate.