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Abstract: The procurement procedure includes analytical modelling that enables better decision-making. Negotiations generally take place in the conditions of incertitude. Incertitude is frequently the result of lack of information, lack of understanding of such information, and of encountering equally attractive alternatives in the process of decision-making. The Dempster–Shafer belief theory is used so that information from multiple sources is combined into a consolidated presentation; the plausibility of the sources is taken into account in the calculation, which should enable better insight into the situation of decision-making on the other side, that is, of both parties participating in the negotiated procedure. The hypothesis that, from the aspect of resolving conflict situations, the use of DST enables better insight into the situation of decision-making on the other side, that is, of both parties participating in the negotiated procedure, was confirmed.
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1 Introduction

The methodology of harmonisation in the procurement procedure is based on analytical modelling with a view to more successful decision-making in the procedures of negotiations on organisation, clients, and tenderers. [8] In view of the complexity of the problem of decision-making connected with procurement, the appropriate procedures of the negotiated procedure are used. They shorten the procedure for submitting proposals of solutions and the time leading up to the beginning of negotiations considerably, and the said procedures are sufficiently flexible and leave enough space for creating the so-called satisfactory situation for both sides to the negotiation. Negotiations generally take place in the conditions of incertitude. Defining incertitude depends on the conditions in which it appears, but one could say that incertitude is a phenomenon that is not fully quantifiable. [5] The theory of incertitude that uses probabilities and sets of numbers to describe incertitude was constructed in order to determine the extent to which the phenomenon is quantifiable. Probability is quite frequently defined as a synonym of incertitude but the two concepts are very different and should not be used interchangeably. Incertitude is frequently the result of lack of information, lack of understanding of such information, and of encountering equally attractive alternatives in the process of decision-making. Lack of understanding of information and equally attractive alternatives represent the sources of incertitude that are dependent on the environment in which they appear and on the person making the decision. The Dempster–Shafer belief theory (DST) is used so that information from multiple sources is combined into a consolidated presentation, where the plausibility of such sources is taken into account, that is, we can interpret it as the assignment of a degree to the plausibility of the sources. [5] The use of DST should enable better insight into the situation of decision-making on the other side, that is, of both parties taking part in the negotiated procedure. The terms incertitude and negotiations are discussed in detail at the beginning of the paper, and so is the concept and the possibility of using DST. Preparations for the negotiated procedure are described in detail in further text as an introduction.
to the use of DST in preparations for the negotiated procedure. A description of the negotiated procedure based on the value model and the evidence theory is presented at the end of this paper immediately before the conclusion.

2 Incertitude and negotiations
The negotiated procedure generally takes place in an environment that we could describe as uncertain. Incertitude includes the impossibility of making a prediction and the impossibility, in principle, of making a prognosis. Incertitude is objectively different from ignorance, a condition that can be altered by further research and study.[6] It is different from risk, since risk can always be calculated. [9] In the case of complex decision-making in the conditions of incertitude, the person making the decision chooses from several possibilities and has no information about their probability. [3] Uncertain decision-making is defined as part of the theory of decision-making in which possible results are known but the likelihood of their appearance in terms of possible states cannot be calculated. We can make a brief distinction between the terms risk and incertitude [30] by stating that risk is the probability of appearance of an unfavourable or harmful event, which can be determined and measured, that is, in general, statistically modelled, while incertitude is a circumstance where there is no sufficiently accurate knowledge of the probability of a harmful event but only awareness of the possibility of its appearance.

The outcome of decision-making, in the case of uncertain decision-making, can be presented by using the results matrix where the person making the decision chooses from a number of possibilities (m_i), which depending on the possible states (s_j), result in a different outcome (r_i). However, the person making the decision does not know all states and the probability of appearance of the results of his decision.

From the very beginnings of the probability theory, scholars are aware that truth is not the only criterion of potential interest for interpreting probabilities. There is a whole series of situations where belief has primary significance for the person making decisions, or at least the same relevance as truth. [1] Belief is important in situations where the goal is to remove doubt and in analyses in which emphasis is on justifying recommendations given to clients, that is, in all business decisions made in circumstances that are uncertain and in which truth cannot be established with certitude.

Smith, Benson and Curley [1] tied this recognition to a philosophical analysis of knowledge as “justified true belief” [2] and to the use of probabilities as qualifications of beliefs that fall short of knowledge. The analysis highlights two separate criteria along which such beliefs may be qualified: truth and justification. This theoretical distinction forms the basis of a long-standing differentiation between Pascalian probability based on likelihood relative to a criterion of truth and Baconian probability based on support relative to a criterion of justification [11]. The distinction is also the basis of a common differentiation between the mass and the balance of evidence that can be traced to Keynes and which has played a major role in motivating the study of ambiguity in decision-making. When faced with incertitude, decision-makers apply numerous strategies and methods. Ignoring, accepting, and identifying incertitude are some of the strategies, and the methods that appear frequently are the sensitivity analysis, scenario analysis, simulation, and many others. Each of the methods is adequate for certain situations or incertitudes, and the selection of one of the methods, or several, is up to the decision-maker. For a method to be appropriately applied and for its results to be legitimate, it is important to collect quality and accurate facts that can be of help in diminishing incertitude.

The main elements of the negotiated procedure—namely, facts—are connected with the criterion of justification. The mass or, to put it simply, value depends on the quantity and plausibility of a particular fact. How many solid facts are there? How good are the facts at enabling differentiation of possibilities? As opposed to balance that is used to calculate probability, the mass does not mean complementarity, that is, increased support for one possibility, and it is not essentially reflected negatively on the support of other possibilities. Thus, with a view to encouraging faster resolution and boosting added value in negotiated procedures, it is proposed to use a simplified Dempster-Shafer evidence theory.

3 The Dempster–Shafer belief theory
The Dempster-Shafer theory (DST) is a mathematical theory of evidence. It is used to combine information from different sources into a consolidated presentation [4], where the plausibility of the sources is taken into account when making the calculation [2], that is, we can interpret the action as the assignment of degrees to the plausibility of sources.

In the 1960s, Arthur Dempster wrote a number of articles on the theory of evidence. Glenn Shafer
continued in Dempster's footsteps in 1976. [2]
Since then, the theory is known as the Dempster-
Shafer theory of evidence. The fact or, within
the meaning of this theory, evidence may be regarded as
the expansion of likelihood where a two-
dimensional measure is used instead of a one-
dimensional, consisting of the degree of certitude or
the degree of confidence in that a particular source
is correct, and of the plausibility or probability of an
event, that is, the area of probability with a lower
and an upper frontier. [4]
An advantage of this practical approach consists of
the modelling of the process of consolidating
information from multiple sources into a single
belief by aggregation of the grades of coefficients
of certitude. [10] Experts use facts or evidence that
direct their reasoning to an expanded subset of
possible events instead of a single hypothesis.
Shafer [2] noticed that there is no difference
between insufficient or imperfect knowledge and the
equal degree of certitude and, when applying
Dempster's theoretical principle in practice, enabled
the assignment of a degree of certitude to the
subsets of hypotheses and all separate elements. The
Bayesian probability firmly defines the relationship
between the probability of an event “D” and
the opposite event through the expression $P(D) + P(\text{not } D) = 1$. In DST, we express the relationship as $m(D) + m(\text{not } D) + m(D, \text{not } D) = 1$. For presentation of
subjective incertitude, Dempster proposed [4] the
terms lower and upper probability. Shafer [33]
developed the theory further and practically
elaborated on the function of certitude and the
measure of probability with a view to attributing
subjective belief.

4 Preparations for the negotiated procedure
Application of the said theory to the negotiated
procedure will in most cases enable a win-win
scenario because it makes possible to either create
or design new values, shared by both parties
interested in an agreement. Negotiations are often
conducted under the circumstances of incertitude
that can be most successfully managed by using co-
operative negotiating techniques, thus reducing the
possibility of creating an inappropriate environment
that does not contribute to the resolution of conflict
situations. Most authors agree that the outcome of
negotiations depends greatly on the way in which
the negotiations are conducted. [12]
In line with the foregoing, in further text of this
paper the authors will focus on the confirmation of
the hypothesis that, from the aspect of resolving
conflict situations, the use of DST enables better
insight into the situation of decision-making of the
other side, that is, of both parties taking part in the
negotiated procedure.

5 Use of the evidence theory in the
negotiated procedure
Before defining the shared purpose of the
negotiation, it is necessary to define our interest
based on value-oriented theory and then, by using
evidence theory and by expressing a subjective
evaluation of incertitude within the meaning of
likelihood, define the interests of the other side and
finally, by defining the shared purpose of the
negotiation and using the win-win approach, enable
concerted preparations for the negotiation.
Development of the model for the shaping of
incertitude, developed and based on a simplified
model of DST, which is needed to define the
interests of the other side, includes a description of
the problem, that is, the defining of the initial and
final state of the premises and the defining of rules
for an appropriate crossover from one state to
another. The state of incertitude can be defined as a
state that is unknown, undefined, dubious, often
ambiguous, changeable, and unreliable. Facts that
serve to realise advice on the best crossover from
incertitude to the target state are the basis for a
developed consolidated model integrated into the
system of business intelligence.
It is key to represent interests, and not solely
standpoints and positions, because that would not
result in a favourable agreement for parties to the
negotiation. Interests are more important because
they are under the influence of the end result of the
negotiation, while the outcome of the negotiation
does not influence the positions or standpoints of the
negotiators. For each tender of the manufacturer and
the alternative that is the possible outcome of the
negotiation, key insecurities and the associated
incertitude must be reviewed. If they exist, the risk
profile for each assortment of products or services is
determined, which specifies a possible outcome of
the purchase, their probability, and the
consequences arising from the purchase of a specific
type of products or services. If probability is not
known, we refer to incertitude and we begin to
develop the model on the basis of the theory of
evidence that will consolidate collected information
from various sources into a single belief, where the
plausibility of such sources is taken into account in
the calculation.
In general, in this part of the negotiation analysis, starting positions for the negotiation are examined, and so are the minimal and maximal positions as well as target positions, that is, the standpoints of the negotiators. The said points can be key or problematic on the way to reaching an agreement. Modelling the as-is situation, described as incertitude, can be shown in the form of a table with the following structure: an assertion that needs to be proven, information or evidence corroborating the assertion, input obtained through various methods, and the calculation of the solidity of belief in the best tender based on the Dempster-Shafer theory of evidence.

### Table 1: Basic model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion / tender</th>
<th>Tender X.x: for the purchase of equipment for the navigation of ships in river transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dempster-Shafer theory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>n=1-N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Type of impact in T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₁</td>
<td>U₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₂</td>
<td>U₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₃</td>
<td>U₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I₄</td>
<td>U₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assertion or a specific tender (in the table 1 and in further text, Tₓ) is the basis of the model. [7] After defining Tₓ, it is necessary to collect information from various sources and list all elements of the tender (in further text, Iₓ) and, as described in the previous chapters, process them and define their impact on the tender (in further text, Uₓ on Tₓ).

Depending on Uₓ and the type of impact (in further text, V), the values of belief (Xₓ), ignorance (Yₓ) and, in the case of conflicting evidence, disbelief (Zₓ) are presented. The model states examples in which V is positive, neutral and negative. The case with more facts is also indicated, in which an assessment of the joint impact Uₓ results in the calculation of the value Xₓ. In view of the main effort to have the value Xₓ strive towards 100%, the number of collected information n will depend on their impact Uₓ and the type of impact Vₓ on the assertion Tₓ.

In the example that follows (Table 2), there is a calculation that is based on the tender T and on a series of information Iₓ that consolidate belief in the tender. After the first piece of information that by assessment of an expert with 80% belief confirms our certitude that we are dealing with quality products, all impact or evidence in favour of the belief to follow are expressed in an amount by which they come close to absolute belief (which is a situation with 100% belief).

### Table 2: Example of a complex form with included impact and conflicting information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tender X.1.2.3: for the purchase of equipment for the navigation of ships in river transport</th>
<th>Calculation of value based on the theory of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Offred price of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Cost of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Variations offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New information obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Impact by the manufacturer at the date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Number of applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reduced period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Percentage of each other tender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We then incorporate negative value of impact V on assertion T in the model, that is, in the case of the second information I₂ there is the combination of conflicting evidence. The variant in which both pieces of information are correct I₁ and I₅, that is, they solidify our belief in an assertion, now become impossible. If it is claimed otherwise, both information cannot be plausible. According to the Dempster-Shafer theory, all possible cases are scaled again so that the sum of all values once again yields 100, which means that all values for potential cases are divided by the sum of all values for possible cases.

Any entry Iₓ, that is, individual piece of information, is presented with the value obtained through assessment that reflects our belief in the assertion that needs to be proven. If we hold that a piece of information Iₓ does not affect the assertion, we can
exclude it (V=0). For the sake of objectivity, any entry that can be on the scale from -100 to 100 (multiplied with the value of impact -1 to 1) can be determined by using some of the methods that are usually used in the preparation and processing of business information. Methods used can also be methods for the shaping of incertitude, such as the fuzzy method or the simplest methods of calculating the frequency or the method of averages. Selection of a method depends on evidence and the source of data processed.

6 Negotiations
After the preliminary part in which various scenarios and acceptable alternatives are examined and forecast, and in which tenders collected are processed by using the theory of evidence as presented, the parties negotiate. At the beginning of the negotiation, the parties present the current situation, described in real needs of the negotiators and their starting positions entered in the table of information collected. The introductory part is followed by specific proposals and a discussion about differences between the parties in the current and future states, especially in the part concerning the determination of impact on the assessment of the tender. The goal of the negotiation is to direct the parties towards a solution that leads to added value, as shown in Figure 1.

Based on added and perceived greater value, it is expected that all parties involved in the negotiation will experience greater satisfaction and a satisfactory return on investment, that is, a positive outcome.

The use of the theory of evidence in the negotiation procedure enables better decisions before and during the negotiating process. The outcome of the negotiation analysis is the preparation for creating new values, with the lowest possible price of the product. The use of the theory of evidence enables the restructuring and change of the flow of the negotiation, creation of new values, and a better negotiation outcome. The described manner of negotiation should be recognised as the procedure of preparation and application of certain tried models that do not require considerable organisational changes. Any negotiation for the purpose of creating added value requires the introduction of tools and procedures that enable higher management levels and other influential persons in the organisation to provide better management and better provision of support to the negotiators. After the negotiation is finished, it is necessary to perform a review of the results, and institutionalise the negotiation. By institutionalisation, negotiating becomes an organisational ability, just like risk management.

7 Conclusion
Negotiating is a business organisational activity that must be improved continuously because it leads to a better final outcome. New knowledge incorporated in the described negotiation analysis, the goal of which is to create new added values, is a characteristic of dynamic negotiations and relates to risk management before and during the negotiation, and before the issuing of a final decision on procurement.

The next step in the harmonisation methodology, risk management, is applied immediately after the completion of the negotiation, and before signing. After the risk management process is concluded, the negotiation with manufacturers may be regarded as finished.

The negotiation analysis, along with determining the number of participants and the model of the most appropriate assortment for a particular organisation, also includes the defining of the limitations of the organisation. Some of the most frequent limitations are limited financial resources, the time and the deadline of procurement, insufficient number of experts for financial and legal problems concerning procurement, and the lack of experience of the parties in the organisation in negotiations.

One of the most important limitations of the organisation that becomes particularly pronounced during negotiations is the inability to check all performances of the manufacturer’s tender. The same limitation relates to the process of risk management if the risk is quantified. Use of the theory of evidence can reduce the limitation considerably and contribute that through the collection of information connected with the process of procurement everything is simply and successfully processed.
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