

USER GUIDE

Planning (DPE)

Delphi ecosystem — user guides

English

Version 1.0 · 2026-09-23

Contact: Hannu Linturi · hannu.linturi@gmail.com

Contents

PLANNING (DPE)

Orientation, variation and question architecture	3
Orientation — from which standpoint the future is studied	3
Variation — the cadence of rounds	4
Scoping the phenomenon — what is actually studied	4
Question architecture — the theses	5
When there is no real panel — simulation	5
Building the panel: epistemic space, perspective and gates	6
Orientation sets the panel type	6
The perspective layer: position + view	7
Perspective Health Score (PHS)	7
Epistemic coverage: $7 \times 3 = 21$ cells	8
Quality gates before collection	8
Building the panel in practice	9
Simulation: the Argument Simulator (Route B)	11
How it proceeds — six phases	11
Anomaly check — surfacing blind spots	12
Worked example — Food Paradigm 2050	12

Orientation, variation and question architecture

Planning (DPE)

Planning determines what Pronoia collects and what DAE can interpret. The quality of the study is decided here — two locked starting choices (orientation and variation) plus the scoping of the phenomenon and theses shape everything downstream.

Orientation — from which standpoint the future is studied

Orientation is the study's **locked starting choice**. It affects how theses are framed, how the panel is composed, and how the facilitator acts between rounds (in Pronoia it also drives the PIRE round-gap assistant).

Orientation	Core	Relation to consensus
N — Normative	Desirability and the desired state. "What future is good?"	Leans toward consensus — seeking a shared view of the goal
S — Strategic	Feasibility and agency. "How is the goal reached, who acts?"	Emphasises means and alternatives
R — Radical	Ruptures and protecting deviance. "What could change fundamentally?"	Protects minority views — no forced convergence
E — Emergent / abductive	New, still-forming phenomena. An observing stance: what is emerging?	Does not seek consensus — it maps
D — Intentional combination	A mixed form where different questions may carry different logic	Default for multifaceted studies
D+ — Four-path	Intentional and emergent in parallel	Two panels, each with its own requirements

Orientation is not just a label — it **constrains methodological choices**. An R study does not use convergent "central-tendency only" feedback, because that would erase the very deviance it aims to protect. In an N study consensus is a natural target. Orientation also sets the **panel type**: N/S/R/D → expert matrix, E → observer matrix (see Building the panel).

Variation — the cadence of rounds

Alongside orientation, a **variation** is chosen that sets how rounds and feedback are paced. In Pronoia this is `delphi_mode` :

Variation	How it advances	When
Argument Delphi (default)	Staged rounds: response → dialogue → revision → pause; aims at dissensus — tensions and reasoning	When reasoning and the differences between views are the result
Classic Delphi	The same process and phases as Argument Delphi; aims at reasoned consensus and measures it (CCI)	When the study must arrive at a position
Real-Time Delphi	One round in which answering and dialogue are open at the same time; no comparison between rounds	Fast, continuous eDelphi
Barometer Delphi	The same theses from one wave to the next; a thesis may be retired between waves	Repeated monitoring — a trend over time, not converging one run

Variation and orientation are different axes: orientation gives the *standpoint*, variation the *cadence*. The same normative study can be run as any of the four. Round 0 (orientation) belongs to every variation.

Scoping the phenomenon — what is actually studied

Before the theses, the **phenomenon** is defined: the boundary of the inquiry. This is planning's most critical scoping step — it decides what is in and what is out. An optional pre-analysis sharpens it:

- **Futures Wheel** — an impact network: first-, second- and third-order consequences (STEPP+). Maps what follows from the phenomenon.
- **Relevance Tree** — a goals-means hierarchy: priorities and success criteria. Maps what the phenomenon aims at.

Pre-analysis produces a scoped, structured view of the phenomenon that feeds directly into panel and thesis design.

Question architecture — the theses

The theses are the collection instrument: every argument is one panel member's response to one thesis, so the set of arguments is **theses × panel members**. Thesis structure follows the orientation:

- **Dialectical theses (N / S / R / D)** — a claim taken a position on by probability and desirability; dialogue produces for/against arguments.
- **Abductive theses (E)** — more open and exploratory: what is emerging, what it looks like.

A single thesis's logic can be tuned with a **P/D tag**: probability (P) leans to consensus, desirability (D) allows dissensus — overriding the orientation default for that thesis. There are at least three theses.

Planning ends at a quality gate. Only a coherent design — orientation, phenomenon, panel and theses aligned — is packaged as the **Planning Handoff Package** and crosses into Pronoia for collection. The design is not rebuilt in Pronoia but continued (see [Integration guide](#)).

When there is no real panel — simulation

If no real panel exists yet, the **Argument Simulator** (Route B) generates synthetic, orientation-aware arguments for the theses — a test or seed dataset that can be carried into DAE. Simulation tests the theses before a real panel; it does not replace one.

Sources: [help/02-orientaatiot](#), [planning-core \(M1a\)](#). Variations correspond to Pronoia's [delphi_mode](#) states.

Building the panel: epistemic space, perspective and gates

Planning (DPE)

A Pronoia panel is not a random set of experts. It is a **designed epistemic space** whose reach and gaps are deliberate and documented. Panel composition is a methodological decision, not a recruitment convenience — because the panel defines the entire argument space, its coverage and blind spots are known **before any data exists**.

Three working principles:

- A **homogeneous panel** (same education, sector, culture) is an epistemic risk and is recorded as such — even if every member is individually excellent.
- The target is **commensurability** — enough shared ground for genuine dialogue — not full consensus. Disagreement that is well covered is a feature, not a defect.
- Watch for **lock-in**: a single perspective claiming universality. It can masquerade as dialogue simply because it is loud.

Orientation sets the panel type

Orientation	Panel type	Selection basis	Practical requirement
N / S / R / D (intentional)	Expert matrix	Expertise, stakeholder representation, competence domain	At least 3×3; ≥3 stakeholder groups; ≥2 domains; power balance considered
E (emergent)	Observer matrix	Observation distance (inside / edge / outside), not expertise	At least 2×3; ≥3 observation distances; ≥3 "outside" roles; no decision-makers; each role names its observation position and "what it sees"
D+ (four-path)	Two parallel panels	Intentional and emergent in parallel	Both requirement sets apply independently

Emergent studies are about *where you stand to watch*, not credentials — which is why decision-makers are excluded and observation distance replaces expertise as the selection basis.

The perspective layer: position + view

The optional but recommended **perspective layer** rests on a simple idea: *perspective = position + view*. The same phenomenon genuinely looks different from different positions — not because anyone is wrong, but because the phenomenon is multidimensional. This is not relativism: the aim is to identify what each position *can* see and what it necessarily *cannot*.

When the layer is active, each role carries three attributes:

Attribute	What it captures	Values
Observation position	Where the member stands relative to the phenomenon	inside / edge / outside / below / above
Epistemic type	The kind of knowledge the member brings	formal / experiential / tacit
Value basis	The standpoint's underlying values	short free-text

Blind-spot analysis. The facilitator checks which positions identified in the phenomenon map are systematically absent from the panel matrix. The key distinction: a blind spot is a **systematic absence**, not a random gap. Naming blind spots before round 1 is part of designing the space, and they become candidates for supplementation later.

Perspective Health Score (PHS)

After the panel is designed, Pronoia summarises its diversity as a **Perspective Health Score** on a 0–12 scale, built from four dimensions (position diversity, epistemic diversity, value-basis variation, marginal voices — each 0–3):

PHS	Interpretation	Recommended action
0–5	Diversity too thin	Panel supplementation required before round 2
6–8	Adequate, with gaps	Hautamäki perspective theses recommended
9–12	Excellent diversity	No action needed

Epistemic coverage: $7 \times 3 = 21$ cells

Arguments are read on two dimensions — **where the claim draws from** (knowledge base) and **what it does to the thesis** (function):

Knowledge base (7)		Function (3)	
EMP Empirical	data, measurements, statistics	TUK Supporting	reinforces the thesis
KOK Experiential	personal/professional experience, tacit knowledge	HAS Challenging	questions, weakens
NOR Normative	values, ethical principles	AVA Opening	introduces a new viewpoint, widens the frame
TEO Theoretical	models, theories, frameworks		
INT Interest-based	actor/stakeholder viewpoint		
EPV Uncertainty	acknowledged ignorance		
IMA Imaginative	vision, alternative, radical reframing		

Seven knowledge bases $\times$ three functions = a **21-cell map** of the argument space. Empty cells are the panel's blind spots — viewpoints that never appeared. The **Epistemic Coverage Index (ECI)** is simply how many of the 21 cells are filled. A typical Delphi run fills roughly 9–14/21; very low coverage is a signal to add roles that bring the missing viewpoints.

Quality gates before collection

Before a panel is accepted, it must pass orientation-specific gates:

Check	Intentional (N/S/R/D)	Emergent (E)
Matrix size	$\geq 3 \times 3$	$\geq 2 \times 3$
Stakeholder groups / observation distances	≥ 3 groups	≥ 3 distances
Domains / outside roles	≥ 2 domains	≥ 3 outside roles
Decision-makers	Power balance noted	Exactly 0
Per-role attribute	Expertise named	Observation position + "what it sees" named
Theses	≥ 3	≥ 3

If a gate fails, the panel is not yet ready for collection — the facilitator adjusts composition or theses and re-checks. The gates are guardrails that keep coverage and balance honest before any arguments are gathered.

Building the panel in practice

1. **Start from orientation.** Confirm the orientation; it decides whether you build an expert or an observer matrix.
2. **Build the matrix.** Lay out the two axes (e.g. expertise $\times$ stakeholder, or observation position $\times$ context) and place members so the hard minimums are met.
3. **Activate the perspective layer** when standpoint matters: give each role its observation position, epistemic type and value basis.
4. **Map blind spots** against the phenomenon map — name the systematically missing positions rather than treating gaps as random.
5. **Read the PHS and act on it:** supplement a thin panel before round 2, or add perspective theses where recommended.
6. **Mind the coverage.** Watch which of the 21 epistemic cells stay empty; low coverage prompts adding roles.
7. **Guard against lock-in.** Keep checking that one loud perspective is not crowding out the rest; the aim is commensurable dialogue.
8. **Clear the gates.** Confirm the orientation-specific quality gates before collection — and re-confirm after any panel change.

Source: *Pronoia — Building the Panel* (Metodix, June 2026).

Simulation: the Argument Simulator (Route B)

Planning (DPE)

When no real panel exists yet, the **Argument Simulator (Route B)** generates realistic expert and observer arguments for the designed theses. It is **orientation-aware** (N/S/R/E/D/D+) and produces structured arguments that the DAE pipeline reads (CP-1...CP-20). The purpose is to **test the theses and panel logic before a real panel** — or to provide material to analyse when no panel is available.

This does not replace a real panel. The arguments are synthetic, GenAI-disclosed drafts that require an audit. The actual interpretation happens in DAE under quality gates — simulation provides source material, not conclusions.

How it proceeds — six phases

The simulator activates once the planning context has passed the **QG-SIM-TRANSFER** gate (orientation, question structure, panel logic, theses). Then:

1. **Individual arguments** — one argument per role per thesis. Dialectical (N/S/R/D): thesis + antithesis + synthesis view. Abductive (E/D+): observation → explanation → anticipation.
2. **Quick analysis** — distributions, the 7×3 epistemic profile (knowledge base × function), conditional asymmetry.
3. **Dialogues** — 5–8 thesis tensions or observation clusters: position → concessions → synthesis insight.
4. **Analysis dimensions** — tension architecture, CLA pre-profile (causal layers), the 7×3 epistemic cross-tab, MLP pre-profile (multi-level).
5. **Anomaly check & supplementation** — an automatic blind-spot check (see below). Where needed, the panel is supplemented with missing viewpoints (marked `source: supplement`, ≤25 % of the panel).
6. **Summary & handoff** — the overall result, a keystone candidate and readiness for the DAE pipeline (→ CP-1 panel validation).

Each transition produces a light **Learning Note** that carries lessons from planning through simulation into DAE.

Anomaly check — surfacing blind spots

After phase 4 the simulator automatically checks whether the material leans unhealthily:

Trigger	Threshold
Any 7×3 knowledge base = 0	empty cell
Opening (AVA) arguments < 3	frame not opened
CLA litany layer > 80 %	surface dominates
CLA deep layers (L3+L4) < 10 %	worldview/myth missing
MLP regime > 60 %	incumbent system dominates
D–P gap < 0.3 on all theses	too much consensus

A trigger leads to a **supplementation protocol**: roles are designed to bring the missing viewpoints and a supplementary simulation is run — the same logic as supplementing a real panel (see Building the panel).

Worked example — Food Paradigm 2050

The Documentation Sprint's worked example shows Route B in practice:

Field	Value
Orientation	D (N + S + R) — multi-actor adaptation
Route	B (Argument Simulator)
Time horizon	2050 (decisive window 2026–2035)
Perspective layer	Active (Hautamäki), PHS 12/12
Panel	19 simulated roles (post-audit)
Theses	8 R1 dialectical + 4 R2 perspective theses + invitation + blind-spot
Quality	94.5/100, 27/27 quality gates passed

The phenomenon: five competing food-system paradigms (techno-capitalist, distributed bio-economic, fragmentation, multipath cultural-pluralism, post-smallholder), entry tension *technological autonomy* ↔ *environmental sustainability*. The example shows how a D orientation propagates coherently from the goal hierarchy to the theses, and how the perspective layer integrates without friction.

Sources: Argument Simulator v2.5 (*metodix-planning-simulation*); worked example CASE_202605_FOOD-2050-WE-001 (*Documentation Sprint*).