

Contributions to Management Science

Wolfgang Weimer-Jehle

Cross-Impact Balances (CIB) for Scenario Analysis

Fundamentals and Implementation

 Springer

Contributions to Management Science

The series *Contributions to Management Science* contains research publications in all fields of business and management science. These publications are primarily monographs and multiple author works containing new research results, and also feature selected conference-based publications are also considered. The focus of the series lies in presenting the development of latest theoretical and empirical research across different viewpoints.

This book series is indexed in Scopus.

Wolfgang Weimer-Jehle

Cross-Impact Balances (CIB) for Scenario Analysis

Fundamentals and Implementation

 Springer

Wolfgang Weimer-Jehle
ZIRIUS
University of Stuttgart
Stuttgart, Germany

ISSN 1431-1941 ISSN 2197-716X (electronic)
Contributions to Management Science
ISBN 978-3-031-27229-5 ISBN 978-3-031-27230-1 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27230-1>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Acknowledgments

The fact that it is possible today to present the CIB method based on an extensive body of practice and multifaceted methodological research is due to a growing community of method users and researchers, from which numerous suggestions, inspirations, methodological innovations, and critical questioning have emerged, thus helping the method mature. I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues worldwide who have been inspired by the CIB method and shared their insights, experiences, and criticism.

It is my pleasure to thank Dr. Diethard Schade, who initiated scenario research at the Center for Technology Assessment, Prof. Georg Förster, my comrade during my first walking attempts toward CIB, and Prof. Ortwin Renn, who fostered the development of CIB at the University of Stuttgart for 15 years by his continuous support.

I especially desire to thank my colleagues at the CIB-Lab of ZIRIUS at the University of Stuttgart for the journey they have undertaken together with me for so many years and who have contributed inestimably to the further development and maturation of the CIB method. Their research, motivation, wealth of ideas, and untiring support have always been an inspiration and encouragement to me. Without them, this book would not have come about in the way it has. I would also like to thank Dr. Wolfgang Hauser, Dr. Hannah Kosow, Prof. Vanessa Schweizer, and M.A. Sandra Wassermann for valuable comments on the book's manuscript. All remaining errors are mine.

Contents

1	Introduction to CIB	1
	References	8
2	The Application Field of CIB	11
2.1	Scenarios	11
2.2	Scenarios and Decisions	13
2.3	Classifying CIB	14
	References	18
3	Foundations of CIB	21
3.1	Descriptors	21
3.2	Descriptor Variants	22
3.2.1	Completeness and Mutual Exclusivity of the Descriptor Variants	23
3.2.2	The Scenario Space	24
3.2.3	The Need for Considering Interdependence	25
3.3	Coping with Interdependence: The Cross-Impact Matrix	25
3.4	Constructing Consistent Scenarios	30
3.4.1	The Impact Diagram	31
3.4.2	Discovering Scenario Inconsistencies Using Influence Diagrams	32
3.4.3	Formalizing Consistency Checks: The Impact Sum	34
3.4.4	The Formalized Consistency Check at Work	35
3.4.5	From Arrows to Rows and Columns: The Matrix-Based Consistency Check	37
3.4.6	Scenario Construction	40
3.5	How to Present CIB Scenarios	40
3.6	Key Indicators of CIB Scenarios	44
3.6.1	The Consistency Value	44
3.6.2	The Consistency Profile	47
3.6.3	The Total Impact Score	49

3.7	Data Uncertainty	49
3.7.1	Estimating Data Uncertainty	50
3.7.2	Data Uncertainty and the Robustness of Conclusions	51
3.7.3	Other Sources of Uncertainty	51
	References	52
4	Analyzing Scenario Portfolios	53
4.1	Structuring a Scenario Portfolio	54
4.1.1	Perspective A: If-Then	54
4.1.2	Perspective B: Order by Performance	57
4.1.3	Perspective C: Portfolio Mapping	60
4.2	Revealing the Whys and Hows of a Scenario	64
4.2.1	How to Proceed	65
4.2.2	The Scenario-Specific Cross-Impact Matrix	66
4.3	Ex Post Consistency Assessment of Scenarios	67
4.3.1	Intuitive Scenarios	68
4.3.2	Reconstructing the Descriptor Field	69
4.3.3	Preparing the Cross-Impact Matrix	70
4.3.4	CIB Evaluation	71
4.4	Intervention Analysis	73
4.4.1	Analysis Example: Interventions to Improve Water Supply	76
4.4.2	The Cross-Impact Matrix and its Portfolio	76
4.4.3	Conducting an Intervention Analysis	76
4.4.4	Surprise-Driven Scenarios	82
4.5	Expert Dissent Analysis	84
4.5.1	Classifying Dissent	84
4.5.2	Rule-Based Decisions	86
4.5.3	The Sum Matrix	86
4.5.4	Delphi	92
4.5.5	Ensemble Evaluation	94
4.5.6	Group Evaluation	97
4.6	Storyline Development	100
4.6.1	Strengths and Weaknesses of CIB-Based Storyline Development	101
4.6.2	Preparation of the Scenario-Specific Cross-Impact Matrix	101
4.6.3	Storyline Creation	102
4.7	Basic Characteristics of a CIB Portfolio	107
4.7.1	Number of Scenarios	107
4.7.2	The Presence Rate	111
4.7.3	The Portfolio Diversity	114
	References	117

- 5 What if... Challenges in CIB Practice** 119
 - 5.1 Insufficient Number of Scenarios 119
 - 5.2 Too Many Scenarios 121
 - 5.2.1 Statistical Analysis 122
 - 5.2.2 Diversity Sampling 124
 - 5.2.3 Positioning Scenarios on a Portfolio Map 128
 - 5.2.4 Further Procedures 129
 - 5.3 Monotonous Portfolio 131
 - 5.3.1 Unbalanced Judgment Sections 132
 - 5.3.2 Unbalanced Columns 134
 - 5.4 Bipolar Portfolio 136
 - 5.4.1 Causes of Bipolar Portfolios 137
 - 5.4.2 Special Approaches for Analyzing Bipolar Portfolios 139
 - 5.5 Underdetermined Descriptors 143
 - 5.6 Essential Vacancies 147
 - 5.6.1 Resolving Vacancies by Expanding the Portfolio 148
 - 5.6.2 Cause Analysis 148
 - 5.7 Context-Dependent Impacts 150
 - References 155

- 6 Data in CIB** 157
 - 6.1 About Descriptors 157
 - 6.1.1 Explanation of Term 157
 - 6.1.2 Descriptor Types 158
 - 6.1.3 Methodological Aspects 164
 - 6.2 About Descriptor Variants 166
 - 6.2.1 Explanation of Term 166
 - 6.2.2 Types of Descriptor Variants 167
 - 6.2.3 Methodological Aspects 171
 - 6.2.4 Designing the Descriptor Variants 174
 - 6.3 About Cross-impacts 177
 - 6.3.1 Explanation of Term 177
 - 6.3.2 Methodological Aspects 178
 - 6.3.3 Data Uncertainty 193
 - 6.4 About Data Elicitation 194
 - 6.4.1 Self-Elicitation 195
 - 6.4.2 Literature Review 196
 - 6.4.3 Expert Elicitation (Written/Online) 199
 - 6.4.4 Expert Elicitation (Interviews) 204
 - 6.4.5 Expert Elicitation (Workshops) 206
 - 6.4.6 Use of Theories or Previous Research as Data Collection Sources 213
 - References 214

7	CIB at Work	219
7.1	Iran Nuclear Deal	220
7.2	Energy and Society	222
7.3	Public Health	224
7.4	IPCC Storylines	227
	References	231
8	Reflections on CIB	233
8.1	Interpretations	233
8.1.1	Interpretation I (Time-Related): CIB in Scenario Analysis	233
8.1.2	Interpretation II (Unrelated to Time): CIB in Steady-State Systems Analysis	234
8.1.3	Interpretation III: CIB in Policy Design	235
8.1.4	Classification of CIB as a Qualitative-Semiquantitative Method of Analysis	236
8.2	Strengths of CIB	239
8.2.1	Scenario Quality	239
8.2.2	Traceability of the Scenario Consistency	239
8.2.3	Reproducibility and Revisability	240
8.2.4	Complete Screening of the Scenario Space	240
8.2.5	Causal Models	241
8.2.6	Knowledge Integration and Inter- and Transdisciplinary Learning	241
8.2.7	Objectivity	242
8.2.8	Scenario Criticism	242
8.3	Challenges and Limitations	243
8.3.1	Time Resources	243
8.3.2	Aggregation Level and Limited Descriptor Number	244
8.3.3	System Boundary	244
8.3.4	Limits to the Completeness of Future Exploration	245
8.3.5	Discrete-Valued Descriptors and Scenarios	245
8.3.6	Trend Stability Assumption	246
8.3.7	Uncertainty and Residual Subjectivity in Data Elicitation	246
8.3.8	Context-Sensitive Influences	247
8.3.9	Consistency as a Principle of Scenario Design	247
8.3.10	Critical Role of Methods Expertise	247
8.3.11	CIB Does Not Study <i>Reality</i> but <i>Mental Models</i> <i>of Reality</i>	248
8.4	Unsuitable Use Cases: A Checklist	248
8.5	Alternative Methods	250
	References	253

Appendix: Analogies	257
Physics	258
Network Analysis	260
Game Theory	262
Glossary	265
Cross-impact matrix (in the context of CIB)	265
Portfolio (in CIB)	267
Scenarios (in the context of CIB)	267
Index	269

Abbreviations

ABM	Agent-based modelling
BASICS	Batelle Scenario Inputs to Corporate Strategy (scenario method)
C	Consistency score of a descriptor or scenario
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
CIB	Cross-Impact Balances (scenario method)
D	Diversity score of a scenario portfolio
FAR	Field Anomaly Relaxation (scenario method)
Gt C	Giga tons (billion tons) of carbon
IC	Inconsistency score of a descriptor or scenario
IC _s	Significance threshold of a scenario inconsistency
IL	Intuitive Logics (scenario method)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KSIM	Kane's Simulation Model (simulation method)
m	Number of matrices of a matrix ensemble
MINT	A group of academic disciplines, consisting of mathematics, informatics, natural sciences, and technology
N	Number of descriptors of a cross impact matrix
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
q	Quorum applied in an ensemble evaluation
SD	Systems Dynamics (simulation method)
SRES	Special Report on Emission Scenarios
TIS	Total impact score
V _i	Number of states of descriptor i
Z	Number of possible configurations of a morphological field

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1	The scenario funnel	12
Fig. 2.2	A classification of scenarios and scenario methods	15
Fig. 2.3	Example of a qualitative network of interacting nodes	16
Fig. 2.4	Workflow of a CIB analysis	17
Fig. 3.1	The descriptor field for the “SomewhereLand” analysis	22
Fig. 3.2	Descriptor variants (alternative futures) for the descriptor “A. Government”	23
Fig. 3.3	Compilation of descriptors and their variants for SomewhereLand	23
Fig. 3.4	Cross-impact assessment of the influence between two descriptors	27
Fig. 3.5	Representing cross-impact data without use of numbers	27
Fig. 3.6	Representation of cross-impact data following Weitz et al. (2019)	28
Fig. 3.7	The cross-impact matrix of SomewhereLand	29
Fig. 3.8	The cross-impact matrix printed without influence-free judgment sections	30
Fig. 3.9	One of 486 scenarios for SomewhereLand	31
Fig. 3.10	Consulting the cross-impact matrix on the influence relationship A2 → B1	32
Fig. 3.11	The impact diagram of scenario [A2 B1 C3 D1 F1 E1]	33
Fig. 3.12	The influence diagram Fig. 3.11 with the impact sums of the descriptors	34
Fig. 3.13	Demonstration of inconsistency of descriptor variant D1	36
Fig. 3.14	Consequential inconsistency in Descriptor E after adjustment of Descriptor D	37
Fig. 3.15	Matrix-based calculation of impact sums for scenario [A2 B1 C3 D1 E1 F1]	38
Fig. 3.16	Matrix-based calculation of the complete impact balances of a scenario	39

Fig. 3.17 The SomewhereLand scenarios in tableau format with integrated descriptor listing 42

Fig. 3.18 The SomewhereLand scenarios in tableau format with separate descriptor listing 42

Fig. 3.19 Impact diagram of SomewhereLand scenario no. 10 43

Fig. 3.20 Consistency values of the descriptors calculated for the test scenario 45

Fig. 3.21 Comparison of consistency and inconsistency scales 46

Fig. 3.22 Two examples of consistency profiles 47

Fig. 4.1 The SomewhereLand-plus matrix 55

Fig. 4.2 SomewhereLand-plus portfolio arranged according to the “if-then” perspective 56

Fig. 4.3 Evaluation of descriptor variants according to their dissimilarity with the present state of SomewhereLand (example values) 58

Fig. 4.4 Arrangement of SomewhereLand scenarios on a performance scale 59

Fig. 4.5 SomewhereLand scenario tableau, ordered by dissimilarity to the present 59

Fig. 4.6 Example of a scenario axes analysis (The example draws from work done by the IPCC on the future of global climate gas emissions (Nakićenović et al. 2000)) 60

Fig. 4.7 Two-dimensional rating of the SomewhereLand descriptor variants 62

Fig. 4.8 A portfolio map of the SomewhereLand scenarios 63

Fig. 4.9 Ordering the portfolio according to probability and effect 64

Fig. 4.10 Elucidating the background of SomewhereLand Scenario no. 1 “Society in crisis” 65

Fig. 4.11 The specific cross-impact matrix of SomewhereLand Scenario no. 1 66

Fig. 4.12 Positive part of a scenario-specific cross-impact matrix 66

Fig. 4.13 Justification form for Descriptor variant “E3 Social cohesion: Unrest” 67

Fig. 4.14 Illustration of the justifications of a descriptor variant 68

Fig. 4.15 Scenario axes diagram and the “SomewhereLand City mobility” example 69

Fig. 4.16 Descriptors and descriptor variants of the “SomewhereLand City” intuitive mobility scenarios 70

Fig. 4.17 “SomewhereLand City” cross-impact matrix 71

Fig. 4.18 “SomewhereLand City” CIB analysis results 72

Fig. 4.19 Consistency critique of “The Unfinished” intuitive scenario 72

Fig. 4.20 Corrected and extended scenario axes diagram according to the result of the CIB analysis 74

Fig. 4.21 Nutshell I—Workflow of a CIB intervention analysis 75

Fig. 4.22 The descriptors and descriptor variants of the “Water supply” intervention analysis 77

Fig. 4.23	“Water supply” cross-impact matrix (basic matrix)	77
Fig. 4.24	The “Water supply” portfolio without interventions (basic portfolio)	78
Fig. 4.25	“Water supply” cross-impact matrix with intervention at E1	79
Fig. 4.26	The IC0 portfolio of the E1 intervention matrix	79
Fig. 4.27	“Water supply” cross-impact matrix with intervention at A2	80
Fig. 4.28	The IC0 portfolio of the A2 intervention matrix	81
Fig. 4.29	Implementation of the “Global economic crises” wildcard into the Somewhereand matrix	83
Fig. 4.30	The Somewhereand portfolio under the impact of the “Global economic crises” wildcard	84
Fig. 4.31	Different qualities of rating differences. Adapted from Jenssen and Weimer-Jehle (2012)	85
Fig. 4.32	Example of a matrix ensemble and its sum matrix	88
Fig. 4.33	Fully consistent solutions of the sum matrix	89
Fig. 4.34	Solutions of the “Resource economy” sum matrix, including all scenarios with nonsignificant inconsistency	90
Fig. 4.35	Procedure of a Delphi survey	93
Fig. 4.36	Dissent management using the Delphi method	94
Fig. 4.37	Compilation of scenarios of the individual evaluations of the “Resource economy” matrix ensemble	96
Fig. 4.38	The ensemble table of the “Resource economy” matrix ensemble	96
Fig. 4.39	Key dissent of the “Resource economy” matrix ensemble	97
Fig. 4.40	Nutshell II—Dissent analysis by group evaluation	99
Fig. 4.41	Specific cross-impact matrix for Somewhereand scenario no. 10	102
Fig. 4.42	Data basis for storyline development for Somewhereand scenario no. 10	103
Fig. 4.43	Data basis for the development of a storyline in graphical representation	103
Fig. 4.44	Example of a perfectly sequencable specific matrix	104
Fig. 4.45	Improved descriptor order for Somewhereand scenario no. 10	104
Fig. 4.46	Frequency distribution of the inconsistency value in the Somewhereand matrix	110
Fig. 4.47	The cross-impact “Oil price” matrix (Weimer-Jehle 2006)	113
Fig. 4.48	The three fully consistent scenarios of the “Oil price” matrix ...	113
Fig. 4.49	Descriptor variant vacancies of the “Oil price” matrix (empty squares)	113
Fig. 4.50	Distance table of the “Oil price” portfolio	114
Fig. 4.51	Distance table of the Somewhereand portfolio with marking of an N/2 selection	115
Fig. 5.1	IC1 portfolio of the “oil price” matrix	120

Fig. 5.2 “Global socioeconomic pathways” matrix. Adapted and modified from Schweizer and O’Neill (2014) 121

Fig. 5.3 Occurrence frequencies of the descriptor variants in the “Global socioeconomic pathways” portfolio 123

Fig. 5.4 Exploring the future space through scenario selection 125

Fig. 5.5 Nutshell III - Procedure for creating a selection with high scenario distances (diversity sampling) 126

Fig. 5.6 Scenario selection according to the “max-min” heuristic (diversity sampling) 127

Fig. 5.7 Evaluation of descriptor variants according to the criteria of social and economic development (exemplary data) 129

Fig. 5.8 Portfolio map of the “Global socioeconomic pathways” portfolio 130

Fig. 5.9 Cross-impact matrix on the social development of an emerging country. Adapted and modified from Cabrera Méndez et al. (2010) (Translation from Spanish by the author) 132

Fig. 5.10 Unbalanced judgment sections in the “Emerging country” matrix 134

Fig. 5.11 Column sums of the “Emerging country” matrix 135

Fig. 5.12 Example of a cross-impact matrix on social sustainability. Adapted and modified from Renn et al. (2007) 136

Fig. 5.13 A bipolar portfolio 137

Fig. 5.14 Cross-impact matrix “Social sustainability” with sorted descriptor variants 138

Fig. 5.15 Intervention effects: worst case (dark shading) and best case (light shading) 142

Fig. 5.16 Effect of dual interventions in the “Social sustainability” matrix 142

Fig. 5.17 Fictitious neighboring countries BigCountry and SmallCountry 144

Fig. 5.18 Economic-social development of the fictitious country SmallCountry 145

Fig. 5.19 Portfolio of the “SmallCountry” matrix according to conventional evaluation 145

Fig. 5.20 “SmallCountry” portfolio when considering the underdetermination of descriptor D 146

Fig. 5.21 Column sums of descriptor “E. Oil price” 149

Fig. 5.22 Conventional (left) and context-dependent impact on B (right) 150

Fig. 5.23 Nutshell IV - Processing context-dependent impacts 151

Fig. 5.24 Context-dependent impacts in the “Mobility demand” matrix ... 152

Fig. 5.25 Conditional cross-impact matrices (the top matrix is valid for E1 scenarios, that below for E2 scenarios) 153

Fig. 5.26 Mobility demand portfolio after consideration of context dependencies 154

Fig. 5.27 Flawed scenario logic due to neglect of context dependency 155

Fig. 6.1 “Group opinion” matrix and its portfolio 159

Fig. 6.2	“Group opinion” cross-impact matrix and portfolio after removing the passive descriptor	160
Fig. 6.3	Post hoc determination of the consistent variant of a passive descriptor	161
Fig. 6.4	Descriptor roles in the “Water supply” matrix	162
Fig. 6.5	Portfolios with (top) and without (bottom) intermediary descriptor D	163
Fig. 6.6	Examples of state descriptors and trend descriptors	168
Fig. 6.7	Examples of nominal, ordinal, and ratio descriptors	169
Fig. 6.8	Example of descriptor variants and their definitions	172
Fig. 6.9	Incorrect definition of descriptor variants due to overlap of topics	174
Fig. 6.10	Examples of central and peripheral descriptor variants	176
Fig. 6.11	Nutshell V. Using subscenarios as descriptor variants	197
Fig. 6.12	Partitioning of the assessment task according to knowledge domains	202
Fig. 6.13	Two ways to construct a cross-impact matrix by expert group elicitation	203
Fig. 6.14	Nutshell VI. Workflow in a scenario validation workshop	212
Fig. 7.1	“Iran 1395” scenarios and their thematic core motifs. Own illustration based on Ayandeban (2016)	221
Fig. 7.2	Map of German societies in 2050 and their CO ₂ emissions. Modified from Pregger et al. (2020)	224
Fig. 7.3	Section of the network of impact relations between the factors influencing the energy balance of an individual. Own representation based on data from Weimer-Jehle et al. (2012) . .	225
Fig. 7.4	CIB analysis of obesity risks for children and adolescents for four case examples. Data from Weimer-Jehle et al. (2012)	226
Fig. 7.5	Scenario axes diagram of the forty SRES emissions scenarios. Own illustration based on data from Nakićenović et al. (2000)	228
Fig. 7.6	Initial phase of the emissions trajectories of the forty SRES scenarios (own illustration based on data from Nakićenović et al. (2000) (SRES scenario emissions) and IPCC (2014) (historical CO ₂ emissions))	229
Fig. 7.7	Number of SRES and CIB scenarios in four classes of carbon intensity. Own illustration based on data from Schweizer and Kriegler (2012)	230
Fig. 8.1	Qualitative system model and its semiquantitative representation	237
Fig. 8.2	Comparative classification of CIB as a qualitative-semiquantitative analysis method	238
Fig. A.1	Analogy of the equilibrium of forces: valleys as rest points for heavy bodies	258

Fig. A.2	“Terrain profiles” of Somewhere-land descriptors in the case of an inconsistent scenario	259
Fig. A.3	“Terrain profiles” in a consistent scenario	259
Fig. A.4	Somewhere-land as a dynamic network	261
Fig. A.5	Analogy between CIB and game theory	263

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Performance matrix for the evaluation of planning variants. Own depiction based on Fink et al. (2002)	13
Table 2.2	Types and functions of scenarios	14
Table 3.1	Number of scenarios in scenario spaces of different sizes	25
Table 3.2	Seven-part cross-impact rating scale	26
Table 3.3	A Somewhereand scenario in list format	41
Table 3.4	The 10 Somewhereand scenarios in short format	41
Table 3.5	Significance of inconsistency classes depending on the number of descriptors	50
Table 4.1	The scenarios of Somewhereand-plus in short format	55
Table 5.1	Portfolio of the “Global socioeconomic pathways” matrix	122
Table 5.2	Only solution of the “Emerging country” matrix	132
Table 5.3	Portfolio after intervention on “A. Economic performance”	140
Table 5.4	Portfolio after intervention on “D. Social engagement”	140
Table 5.5	Portfolio after intervention on “F. Equity of chances”	141
Table 5.6	Portfolio after intervention on “H. Education”	141
Table 5.7	Portfolios of the two conditional matrices “Mobility demand”	153
Table 6.1	Descriptor variant classification	169
Table 6.2	Example of an inverse coding	182
Table 6.3	Correction of an inverse coding	183
Table 6.5	Coding an influence relationship using negative impacts	184
Table 6.4	Coding an influence relationship using positive impacts	184
Table 6.6	Coding an influence relationship using mixed impacts	184
Table 6.7	Example of a double negation	188
Table 6.8	A judgment section contributing to predetermination	189
Table 6.9	A phantom variant	190
Table 6.10	Using absolute cross-impacts	192

Table 6.11 Coding a text passage 198

Table 7.1 Descriptor field of the CIB analysis “Iran 1395” 220

Table A.1 Representation of the Somewhereand descriptor column
“B. Foreign Policy” in Boolean rules. (Just like the cross-impact
matrix, the rule set allows two B variants in certain cases) 260

Chapter 1

Introduction to CIB



Keywords Cross-Impact Balances · CIB · Scenario · Foresight · Qualitative impact network

Dealing sensibly with future indeterminacy and uncertainty is increasingly important in a world where organizations at all levels of society must make long-term, high-stakes decisions and where these decisions must prove their correctness in an increasingly turbulent environment. Because they enable us to identify the scope for action and examine the prospects of our strategies, plans, and decisions, scenarios, i.e., sketches of alternative futures, have emerged in recent decades as a key tool for systematic preparation for an unknown future.

Scenarios are generated by different actors for different purposes using different methods. The methods range from simply thinking about the future to complex mathematical simulations. Surprisingly, there is a rather limited stock of methods for the middle range between mental reflection and mathematical simulation. This is all the more surprising when we realize that in our preparations for the future, we often must cope with “systems” that, on the one hand, are too complex to be penetrated by mental reflection but that, on the other hand, we understand (at least in part) only qualitatively, making a credible mathematical simulation difficult.

In this middle ground between simple and mathematically treatable questions about the future, cross-impact balances (CIB) has established itself since its publication (Weimer-Jehle, 2006) as a method for the algorithmic construction of qualitative scenarios and for qualitative systems analysis. With its help, scenarios and systems analyses have been produced on the topics of waste, the working world, education, biotechnology, energy, societal change, health and health infrastructure, industry and services, information technology, innovation, climate, management, mobility and transport, sustainability, politics, risk and security, urban and spatial planning, technology management, behavior change, and water supply. This range of application fields underscores that CIB has been accepted as a generic method of analysis despite its origin in energy economics research: CIB was originally

developed in 2001 as a scenario tool in a study by the Center for Technology Assessment in Baden-Württemberg on the liberalization of European electricity markets.¹

About this Book

In the meantime, an extensive and steadily growing body of literature on CIB applications, methodological research, and methodological reflections has emerged.² However, a cohesive presentation of the method and its most important evaluation and interpretation approaches is lacking. This is a disadvantage for application practice because, on the one hand, CIB analysis is, contrary to its simple appearance, by no means without difficulties and pitfalls, while on the other hand, it offers much more analytical potential than mere scenario construction, which has been the focus of application practice in the past. Optimal use of the CIB method, including an exhaustive data evaluation and an appropriate interpretation of the results, requires a thorough understanding of the method and a sensible selection and application of evaluation approaches.

The present volume is intended to provide this comprehensive presentation and, as an introduction, is also aimed at users who have little or no experience with CIB. It is intended as a guide for them in their first applications of the method, providing them with the tools required for solid basic use and for the interpretation of results. It refrains, however, from discussing in-depth methodological issues or addressing the more complex analytical procedures that have only recently been developed, such as hybrid scenarios (Weimer-Jehle et al., 2016), the combination of CIB with structure-seeking statistical procedures (Pregger et al., 2020), or the coupling of CIB analyses performed at different regional levels (Schweizer & Kurniawan, 2016; Vögele et al., 2017, 2019). Additionally, the CIB concept of scenario succession and the related interpretation issues and analysis opportunities are only briefly discussed in an appendix. These and other advanced issues and possible applications of the CIB method are to be addressed in a subsequent volume.

Scenarios

As mentioned, scenario construction is the most common application of CIB thus far. It is therefore to this field of application that the descriptions in this book refer, with a few exceptions. This focus is not intended to disregard the value of CIB for qualitative systems analysis but is motivated by the expectation that the transfer of the methodological descriptions and considerations formulated here for scenario analysis to the field of qualitative systems analysis be straightforward.

To fulfill their function as instruments for preparing for the future, scenarios must be well constructed. They must capture what we can reasonably assume today about the future and the forces that will shape it. Taken together, well-constructed scenarios must express the different directions in which these forces can steer events. There have been differing views about how best to achieve this purpose since the early days

¹Method development: Weimer-Jehle (2001). First method application: Förster (2002).

²See the CIB bibliography at www.cross-impact.org/english/CIB_e_Pub.htm

of scenario making in the 1950s and 1960s, from which two distinct “scenario cultures” developed.

Simply Thinking

Herman Kahn, the creator of the modern scenario concept, argued that the most important thing is to “think about the problem” (Schnaars, 1987: 109), in other words, to prepare scenarios without the use of formal construction methods. From Kahn’s perspective, formal construction techniques are perceived as a distraction and an impediment to inspiration, intuition, and free thinking. Following Kahn’s approach, the intuitive logics (IL) method emerged (Huss & Honton, 1987; Wilson, 1998), according to which scenarios are designed “by gut feeling” in expert discussions.³ The first groundbreaking successes of the scenario technique are due to this approach,⁴ and it is by far the most widely used scenario methodology to date, except probably in the area of scientific scenarios.

The Magical Number Seven Plus/Minus Two

Almost simultaneously with the preceding approach, however, another view of scenario construction emerged, which emphasized the value of formal methods in the collection of information and in actual scenario construction. One of the founders of this school of thought is Olaf Helmer, co-developer of the Delphi method for structured collection of expert assessments (Dalkey & Helmer, 1963) and co-inspirer of the first cross-impact techniques for formal analysis of expert judgments (Gordon & Hayward, 1968).

Advocates of formal scenario construction can draw on weighty arguments from cognition research. In a 1956 essay that would become one of the most frequently cited publications in psychology textbooks,⁵ American psychologist George Miller evaluated a series of cognition experiments (Miller, 1956). He concluded that there is an upper limit to our mental capacity to accurately and reliably process information about simultaneously interacting elements⁶ and that this limit is seven plus or minus two elements. The essay triggered extensive and continuing research on the question, with the result that Miller’s “magical number” must be regarded as optimistically high (Cowan, 2001).

The transfer of these findings of cognition research to the problem of scenario construction is inevitable and sobering. If a scenario analysis addresses ten factors that will define the future (a rather modest number), then 90 potential interactions

³Schnaars (1987:106): “Scenario writing is a highly qualitative procedure. It proceeds more from the gut than from the computer, although it may incorporate the results of quantitative models. Scenario writing assumes that the future is not merely some mathematical manipulation of the past, but the confluence of many forces, past, present and future that can best be understood by simply thinking about the problem.”

⁴This refers in particular to the Shell scenarios on the eve of the oil crisis (Wack, 1985a, 1985b).

⁵According to Gorenflo and McConnell (1991).

⁶According to the interpretation of Saaty and Ozdemir (2003). Specifically, the cognitive tasks in the experiments analyzed by Miller were, for example, the identification of n discriminable stimuli and the ability to correctly reproduce n items from a read-out list.

arise between these ten factors. If only about half of the potential interactions actually matter (which, as we will see in Sect. 6.3.2, is about average), persons attempting the mental construction of a scenario will have to keep in mind and weigh approximately 45 interrelationships to extract from them a scenario that considers all relevant interrelationships. Given the limits of our mental capacities shown by cognition research, can we hope to do justice to this task by intuitive scenario construction?

A challenge for mental scenario construction also arises from another angle, that is, from the combinatorial weight of the task. Even if we content ourselves with a rough analysis and grant each of the ten factors three conceivable future developments, which we then must combine into meaningful scenarios, this process results in 3 to the power of 10, i.e., approximately 59,000 combinatorial alternatives, each of which must be considered a possible scenario until disproven. How many of these alternatives can be evaluated by mental reflection, and how many relevant scenarios with potentially massive implications go unnoticed when we finally find ourselves at the end of our time resources after intuitively identifying a few plausible combinations? Incidentally, as we will see later, combinatorial spaces with 59,000 combinatorial alternatives are among the lesser challenges faced in scenario analysis.

However, the question of intuition-based versus formal construction of scenarios is not the only fundamental controversy in the scenario community. A second controversy is whether (or for what purposes) scenarios should rely essentially on quantitative data or whether they should also build substantially on qualitative bodies of knowledge.

If You Can't Count It, It Doesn't Count

This phrase represents the viewpoint that analyses of the future should focus on quantitative methods (e.g., mathematical system models) and quantitative data.⁷ The use of qualitative methods is perceived as a loss of mathematical rigor, and qualitative information as a “gateway” for data that in the worst case are ill-defined or ambiguous to interpret or that, it is argued, too often put forward without a solid evidential base. Many advocates of this perspective acknowledge that unquantifiable factors can have an important influence on future events, particularly in systems whose evolution is shaped by human decisions. Nevertheless, they consider the disadvantage of the loss of rigor when opening the analysis to qualitative aspects to be more serious than the disadvantage of not taking such factors into account.

Better Approximately Right than Precisely Wrong

This phrase summarizes the counterperspective.⁸ Its advocates argue that the rigor of mathematical methods and quantitative data are meaningless and produce

⁷Huss (1988:378), for example, reports the prevalence of this perspective among forecasters during the 1980s.

⁸The phrase is attributed to various individuals, including economist John Maynard Keynes and philosopher Karl Popper. However, the oldest published source known to the author refers to the British philosopher Carveth Read (1920:351) (“Better to be vaguely right than precisely wrong”).

pseudoprecision if essential factors are excluded because they are incompatible with the preferred analysis technique. From this perspective, an approximate but, in essence, accurate picture of the problem is considered more helpful than a picture that is drawn in detail but misleading because of insufficient problem scoping.

Action research teaches that ignoring important problem aspects in favor of “working convenience” is not uncommon among decision-makers. In *The Logic of Failure*, German psychologist Dietrich Dörner analyzed experiments on the behavioral patterns of decision-makers. He found various patterns that can easily lead to failure when one is dealing with complex real-world problems. Among typical causes of failed problem-solving, he found the tendency to tailor the problem view to one’s familiar arsenal of methods (rather than the other way around), noting critically: “We do not solve the problems we are supposed to solve, but the problems we can solve.”⁹

Many perceptive future researchers have long been aware that this danger also exists in their own research domain. The old master of French future research, Michel Godet, a proven friend of mathematical methods, nevertheless deplored in his article *Reducing the Blunders in Forecasting* the tendency of his professional colleagues to exclude the poorly quantifiable factors from consideration to the disadvantage of forecast reliability and wrote of the “... dangers of excessive quantification (the ever-present tendency to concentrate on things which are quantifiable to the detriment of those which are not). . .”¹⁰

CIB and the Concept of “Mechanical Reasoning”

It is pointless to argue about which positions in these discourses are better-founded. However, it is not the case that the truth lies somewhere in the middle and that “everyone is a little bit right.” Rather, in future research, we encounter an immense variety of very different topics. The challenge lies in recognizing anew from case to case which arguments carry the greater weight in the application at hand.

At its core, CIB analysis consists of collecting qualitative information on “cross-impacts,” i.e., the influence relationships between scenario factors, and coding these relationships using an ordinal scale. A software-supported simple balance algorithm is then applied en masse to determine which system developments form a self-stabilizing trend network and can thus be accepted as consistent scenarios. Therefore, with respect to the previously described discourse, the application area of CIB is research questions that (a) are too complex for exclusively mental treatment and at the same time (b) urgently require the inclusion of qualitative knowledge. When synthesizing the overall system picture, CIB combines the collected partial information about the pair relationships between system elements and assembles them into coherent constructions.

⁹Dörner (1997), own translation from German edition.

¹⁰Godet (1983), pages 181, 182, 189. Godet does not conclude from this view to renounce quantitative methods but, rather, recommends a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods for prognostics. These considerations are transferable to the field of scenario methodology.

Correspondingly, American knowledge integration researcher Vanessa Schweizer compares CIB analysis with the procedure of *mechanical reasoning* (Schweizer, 2020). She refers to a discourse initiated by the psychologist Paul Meehl in 1954 and conducted for decades on how case predictions in psychology can best be obtained from case data (e.g., “Does therapy X have prospects of being successful in case Y?” or “Will offender Z recidivate or rather not?”). Are such case predictions best made through expert assessments and case conferences? Or are they better based on formal (today, we would say algorithmic) evaluation of case data, i.e., mechanical reasoning? In psychology, the evidence points to the superiority of mechanical reasoning, and Schweizer refers to the analogy to the process of creating and evaluating scenarios either through intuitive-discursive processes in expert workshops (“case conferences”) or through CIB (“mechanical reasoning”).

Human reasoning is without question much deeper, more multifaceted and more adaptive than any form of mechanical reasoning. However, this comes at the price that far fewer factors and alternatives can be considered. Whenever the mass application of simple reflections yields more benefit than a small number of selectively deepened reflections, mechanical reasoning is likely to have an advantage over human reasoning. This is especially true for combinatorial problems, i.e., problems that are characterized by a large number of successive forks, each with several alternatives. Combinatorial problems arise, for example, in chess, where computer programs today can defeat any human opponent, and also in scenario construction.

How to Work with This Book

The structure of this book follows the concept of a self-study course. Chapter 2 presents a short introduction of the scenario technique and the position of CIB with respect to this technique.

Chapter 3 Chapter 3 presents the technical basics of CIB. We follow step by step how the workflow of a simple CIB analysis is structured and describe the concepts that are applied in it. The core of the chapter is a detailed explanation of the CIB algorithm, which, as experience shows, requires some time to understand despite its structural simplicity and the absence of complex mathematics. The reader should persist in this effort until success is attained because only a detailed understanding of how CIB evaluates cross-impact data allows access to the full application potential of the method and a solid interpretation of its results.

Chapter 4 After “basic training” has been completed, Chap. 4 takes a detailed look at the application of the method by presenting various analysis procedures with examples. This presentation of the spectrum of possible analyses is important to overcoming the narrow focus on scenario generation, which remains observable in CIB practice, and bringing the other, diverse analysis opportunities offered by the method to the reader’s attention.

Chapter 5 For most users, the desired result of a CIB analysis is probably a manageable portfolio of perhaps 3–6 clearly different scenarios. Such a result is in fact not atypical for a CIB analysis. However, CIB does not return a result with standardized properties. Rather, the scenario portfolio it generates is an expression of

the systemic relationships formulated in the cross-impact matrix. The consequent result from a system-analytical perspective can be a small or large, diverse or rather monotonous scenario portfolio—independently of the wishes and expectations of the user. Chapter 5 therefore addresses the case in which the result of a CIB analysis does not meet expectations. It describes using other or supplementary analysis approaches to arrive at a result that meets one's needs or at least at an understanding why one's expectations are at odds with the system picture that was input into the CIB analysis.

Chapter 6 Now that it is clear how CIB functions in principle and what can be achieved with it, it is time to take a closer look at the three central data objects of the method: descriptors, descriptor variants, and cross-impact data. Hidden beneath the surface of the technical application are many differentiations and design decisions that can be handled well or poorly, unconsciously or purposefully. Chapter 6 therefore presents four “dossiers” that compile key information about these data objects and how to collect them. The dossiers are designed to provide in-depth information and can be dispensed with when reading the book for the first time. However, the reader is then advised to read the chapter in a second pass.

Chapter 7 Theory is followed by a visit to the workshops. Chapter 7 outlines four selected studies in which CIB was used by different research teams to analyze the future, to analyze systems or to critically review existing scenarios. The selection of examples is intended to reveal the thematic diversity of the application of the method. The examples also make clear that it is precisely in disciplines with entrenched methodological traditions that new perspectives can be gained by using this still young method.

Chapter 8 The final chapter is dedicated to reflection. Based on the literature and the author's own practice, the chapter describes CIB's strengths but also the challenges it poses. The limitations of CIB are also addressed because a comprehensive understanding of the method has only been acquired when it has also been understood in which cases the use of this method is not promising.

Some of the book's content is presented in forms that require explanation. Where it seems useful, statistical analyses of method practice are presented in *statistics boxes*. These boxes are intended to enable the reader to position his or her own application within the spectrum of method applications. *Nutshells* are compact, self-contained presentations of selected analytical procedures. *Memos* (M for short) highlight important principles that one should remain aware of in method practice.

Several small examples of cross-impact matrices are used to illustrate methodological issues. Occasionally, these matrices are adopted from the literature, which is indicated accordingly. Mostly, however, *CIB miniatures* developed especially for didactic purposes are used. These miniatures do not claim to treat their respective topics substantially, and the analysis results they present should not be misunderstood as solid statements about the subject. The purpose of the miniatures is exclusively to demonstrate the method. The use of abstract matrices would prevent these demonstrations being misunderstood as content-oriented statements about the

topics of the miniatures, but this approach would have reduced the miniatures' vividness.

The practical implementation of CIB analysis requires specialized computer software. At the time of printing this book, the free software *ScenarioWizard* is used almost exclusively in the published literature.¹¹ All CIB evaluations in this book were performed using Version 4.4 of this software. As an invitation to reproduce the method demonstrations, the *ScenarioWizard* project files for all miniatures used in the book are provided at <https://cross-impact.org/miniatures/miniatures.htm>.

Since this book is only intended as a support for CIB users and not as a general textbook about scenario methods, it makes little mention of other methods, and comparative methodological considerations are limited to a brief discussion of method alternatives in Sect. 8.5. The sole purpose of the text is to explain the CIB method, and it avoids burdening readers with explanations that are not necessary for this purpose. For more detailed information on other methods and for comparative analyses, I refer the reader to the general literature on scenario techniques and to more specifically focused research literature.

For the same reason, there is little discussion in the book of how scenarios, once created, can be used to prepare for the future by organizations or academics. This question is not CIB-specific and therefore does not require a CIB-specific discussion, and there are many good descriptions of the question in the general scenario literature.¹² The task of this book essentially ends with the completion of scenario analysis in the narrow sense, i.e., the development and analysis of scenarios.

References

- Cowan, N. (2001). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 24, 87–185.
- Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9, 458–467.
- Dörner D. (1997). *The logic of failure: Recognizing and avoiding error in complex situations basic books*
- Fink, A., Schlake, O., & Siebe, A. (2002). *Erfolg durch Szenario-Management – Prinzip und Werkzeuge der strategischen Vorausschau*. Campus.
- Förster, G. (2002). *Szenarien einer liberalisierten Stromversorgung*. Akademie für Technikfolgenabschätzung.
- Godet, M. (1983). Reducing the blunders in forecasting. *Futures*, 15, 181–192.
- Gordon, T. J., & Hayward, H. (1968). Initial experiments with the cross impact matrix method of forecasting. *Futures*, 1(2), 100–116.
- Gorenflo, D. W., & McConnell, J. (1991). The Most frequently cited journal articles and authors in introductory psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology*, 18, 8–12.

¹¹ Available at: https://www.cross-impact.org/english/CIB_e_ScW.htm

¹² E.g., Kosow and Gaßner (2008), Ringland (2006), Fink et al. (2002).