



Political Rating Agency  
**POLITICAL RATING AGENCY**

# Build Your Own PRA Scenario

Public User Guide

*Public Version v0.3*

Author: Edmond Saint Samoht

[saintsamoh@politicalrating.org](mailto:saintsamoh@politicalrating.org)

## A Deliberately Simple Process

The public package allows users to develop a foresight trajectory from explicit assumptions without exposing the full technical machinery of the PRA model. It contains only three files:

- this Guide, which explains the approach and provides the essential reference points;
- the Questionnaire, which allows users to select an answer from a drop-down menu and add a comment when useful;
- the Template, which supports scenario drafting for users who wish to go beyond the initial reflection exercise.

You may, if you wish, go directly to the Questionnaire without reading the presentation that follows, which describes the exercise's main parameters and methodological environment. You will discover some of them as you complete the Questionnaire and then the Template. Once you have finished, you may send both documents to [saintsamoh@politicalrating.org](mailto:saintsamoh@politicalrating.org).

### Guiding Principle

A PRA scenario is not a prediction. It is a conditional trajectory: if certain assumptions materialize, then certain forces, vulnerabilities, and configurations of actors become more plausible.

Start the Exercise

Download the PRA Questionnaire

Download the PRA Scenario Template

## 2. Completing the Questionnaire

Each row presents a question and a drop-down menu specific to that question. The answer directly reflects one of the five directions proposed in the book, from -2 to +2. Three additional options allow a question to remain neutral: DK (Don't know), NP (Not pertinent), and PO (No opinion).

| Choice   | Function                                           | Guidance                                           |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| -2 to +2 | Select the direction that appears most plausible.  | Read all five options before answering.            |
| DK       | Don't know.                                        | The question is left without a directional answer. |
| NP       | Not pertinent to the scenario under consideration. | The question does not shape the trajectory.        |
| PO       | No opinion.                                        | No direction is selected.                          |

The "Optional comment" column may be used to specify a triggering event, a time horizon, an actor concerned, or a condition that would make the assumption less plausible.

## 3. The Ten Analytical Variables

The variables below structure the advanced method. In the public package, they serve only as an analytical framework. No impact coefficient or quantified displacement is calculated.

| Code | Variable                                | Concise definition                                                                                     |
|------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H1   | Hegemonic propensity                    | Willingness to impose norms, interests, narratives, or dependencies beyond the actor's natural sphere. |
| H2   | Restorationist narrative                | Nostalgia for past greatness, a sense of decline, or a historical and civilizational mission.          |
| ER1  | Economic interests / critical resources | Interest in controlling resources, markets, flows, critical infrastructure, or chains of dependence.   |
| C1   | Coercion available or used              | Capacity or propensity to employ military, economic, digital, legal, or informational coercion.        |
| A1   | Strategic autonomy                      | Capacity to act without excessive dependence on a protector, supplier, market, or regulator.           |

| Code | Variable                               | Concise definition                                                                                           |
|------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| D1   | Asymmetric dependence                  | Vulnerability to another actor for security, technology, resources, debt, or markets.                        |
| P1   | Personalization of decision-making     | Concentration of power around a leader, founder, party, family, regime, or narrow inner circle.              |
| I1   | Informational / cognitive power        | Capacity to shape perceptions, attention, narratives, data, algorithms, or the dissemination of information. |
| I2   | Polarizing ideological pressure        | Intensity of ideologies that reduce compromise, designate an enemy, or reinforce conviction rigidity.        |
| M1   | Cooperative / multilateral orientation | Propensity to respect rules, cooperate, accept interdependence, and contribute to common goods.              |

## 4. The Seven Reference Clusters

The clusters are analytical families of actors with similar profiles. They are neither political camps nor moral judgments. The examples below are intentionally abbreviated.

| No. | Cluster                                  | Illustrative examples                                                                                          |
|-----|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Autonomous hegemonic projection          | United States, China, Russia, India, Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Musk ecosystem.                       |
| 2   | Ideological-coercive polarization        | North Korea, Hezbollah, Houthis, Hamas/Palestinian Islamic Jihad, jihadist networks, conspiracy networks.      |
| 3   | Strategic dependence / exposure          | Ukraine, Belarus, Philippines, Myanmar, Iraq, Lebanon, Jordan, Serbia.                                         |
| 4   | Critical infrastructure & capital        | Nvidia, ASML, TSMC, Aramco, Airbus, Visa/Mastercard, major funds, and logistics groups.                        |
| 5   | Institutional / multilateral cooperation | European Union, United Nations, Germany, Japan, Canada, Australia, NGOs, and cooperative transnational actors. |

| No. | Cluster                             | Illustrative examples                                                                      |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6   | Middle powers / pivots              | NATO, France, United Kingdom, Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria, Vietnam, BRICS+, defense industries. |
| 7   | Tech-information actors & platforms | Microsoft/OpenAI, Alphabet, Amazon/AWS, Meta, Palantir, TikTok, Huawei, Tencent, G42.      |

## 5. Scope of the Public Version

This version prioritizes pedagogical simplicity. It does not include the detailed Impact Matrix, the individual sensitivity of actors, reprojection into the PCA, or the calculation of centroid displacements.

### For Further Assistance

**Users who wish to go further, adapt the Questionnaire for a workshop, discuss the variables, or obtain methodological support may contact the author: [saintsamoh@politicalrating.org](mailto:saintsamoh@politicalrating.org).**

Any distribution of a scenario produced using this package should include the following attribution: "Scenario developed using the PRA public framework - Political Rating Agency."