



6C model Report



6C strategic analysis

EUSEMICON2035

ACTOR	European Union
STRATEGIC COUNTERPART	China
OBJECTIVE	European Semiconductor Strategic Autonomy by 2035
REFERENCE CONTEXT SET	25 October 2026 09:07 CET
REPORT GENERATED	25 October 2026 11:08 CET

Contents

Premise	3
Executive summary	4
Strategy 59	7
Strategy 12	9
Strategy 42	11
Strategy 44	13
Strategy 48	15

Premise

The scenario concerns semiconductor competition and Europe's effort to achieve strategic technological autonomy by 2035. The European Union has strengths in manufacturing equipment, industrial chips, power electronics and research, but depends on external suppliers for advanced logic, large-scale foundry capacity and parts of chip design. China is a consequential counterpart through its industrial scale and role in selected materials and supply-chain flows; it also faces constraints in some advanced technologies. The global industry is specialized and interconnected, while the United States, Taiwan and South Korea hold important positions. The objective is to reduce critical vulnerabilities durably, not eliminate all imports.

Executive summary

The 6C Model compares the structured context with 60 strategic motors and identifies the leading comparative-fit directions for interpretation. These positions are not predictions of success and do not replace strategic judgment.

The leading directions favor using time to build options by protecting access, making targeted gains, testing alternatives and expanding them only when demand and production conditions support lasting use. Safeguards bridge the transition; they do not replace capability building.

What would change the strategic choice?

The broad direction is not easily displaced by modest changes in several individual assessments, though the emphasis among leading strategies can shift. A different direction appears in tested cases if Europe's ability to coordinate institutions, member states and industry is judged materially weaker, or if credible attainment is judged to require substantially more coordination. The comparison then favors shaping relationships and rebalancing dependencies. A higher requirement that European capabilities fit real supply-chain needs can also change the leading direction. Reopen the assessment if evidence changes the picture of European coordination, the cooperation needed to achieve the objective, or the requirements for matching capacity to actual industrial and security needs. These are conditional findings from the tested variations, not forecasts.

Comparative-fit pattern and developed strategies

Top ranking trend

The leading strategies in the 6C ordering describe the strongest comparative-fit pattern in the current context; they are not predictions of success or automatic recommendations.

1. **Rank #1 · Strategy 59** — Use time as leverage
2. **Rank #2 · Strategy 12** — Accumulate small gains
3. **Rank #3 · Strategy 42** — Pilot, learn, scale
4. **Rank #4 · Strategy 44** — Renew before disruption

Strategies developed in this report

These are the strategies selected for detailed discussion in this document. Their actual ranking position is shown from the current simulation ordering.

1. **Rank #1 · Strategy 59** — Use time as leverage
2. **Rank #2 · Strategy 12** — Accumulate small gains
3. **Rank #3 · Strategy 42** — Pilot, learn, scale
4. **Rank #4 · Strategy 44** — Renew before disruption

5. **Rank #5 · Strategy 48** — Build preventive barriers

5. **Rank #5 · Strategy 48** — Build preventive barriers

In this report the developed strategies coincide with the Top ranking set; the two roles remain conceptually distinct.

Methodological note

Methodological boundary. The 6C Model compares the frozen structured context with a finite repertoire of strategic motors and produces a comparative strategic-fit distribution. The ordering is not a prediction of success, an objective measurement of strategic strength, or an automatic recommendation. The deterministic part is the comparison; the final strategic choice remains a human judgment under uncertainty.

Assessment note. Actor 6C values are structured assessments of the actor's current strategic conditions. Objective 6C values answer a different question: they express the context-dependent required/appropriate level of each condition for the actor to have a credible strategic basis for attaining the objective. Required does not mean maximal. These calibrated coordinates reduce arbitrariness but are not physical measurements or statistical probabilities.

What the 6C analysis adds. A strong result may confirm a strategically plausible or already established posture; novelty is not required. The model-specific contribution is the explicit comparative-fit structure, the tested sensitivity pattern, observed conditional family switches and the evidence conditions that should trigger reassessment. These model-derived elements should not be confused with strategic propositions that were already plausible before the comparison.

Leading-group and developed-strategy note. Leading positions are used to read the strategic logics showing stronger comparative fit with the same assessed context. Strategies developed in this internal report are a subset chosen for deeper interpretation; selection for development is not a declaration that they are objectively optimal.

Development note. Tactical or operational sections are preliminary hypotheses for a later domain-appropriate design phase. They are not the strategic choice itself and do not invent responsibilities, resources, permissions, timing, commitments or current facts that are absent from the frozen scenario.

Strategic-motor repertoire. The 60-motor repertoire combines the 36 classical stratagem-derived mechanisms with 24 additional strategic motors developed by the Institute for Generative Strategy. The classical source tradition is not claimed as IGS intellectual property. The IGS methodological contribution includes the 6C formalisation and calibrated condition profiles applied across the full repertoire, together with the comparative matching and robustness method.

Composite counterpart note. The strategic counterpart may be a single actor or a composite structural force/set of obstructing causes. When composite, its 6C profile represents the aggregate strategic force exerted on the focal decision; it does not imply a unified will, common intent or single command structure. Internal heterogeneity and countervailing effects remain part of the case interpretation and uncertainty.

Note on strategy names. Historical strategy names are methodological labels of the 6C framework. Their underlying mechanisms must be translated into the actual scenario domain; historical military, deceptive or coercive imagery is not imported literally unless the real domain and evidence support it.

Strategy 59

Public strategic mechanism: Use time as leverage

Methodological origin: Time as leverage

Comparative strategic fit

It means preparing before the moment of need, then acting when a real opportunity can be converted into supply-chain capability. Europe should not wait for a crisis or assume that China will weaken. Timing matters only when a technically and economically credible route is ready.

Significant relationships between context and strategy

Europe's established strengths sit alongside dependence in advanced production and parts of design. Long investment and qualification cycles make timing important, but faster shifts in technology and trade do not prove that a favorable window exists. The strategy fits only when preparation can connect a verified need to a feasible next step.

First operational implication

Do not equate patience with delay. Prepare the qualification, demand, and investment conditions first; move only when they support a real opportunity. Keep later commitments open to review as technology and supply conditions change.

Preliminary development hypothesis

PHASE 1

Operational Action If a dependency is confirmed as consequential, map its application, alternatives, recovery needs, and the route to qualify an alternative. Do not treat a broad production gap as proof that every segment warrants action.

Operational Objective Identify a consequential dependency and a credible path to reduce it.

PHASE 2

Operational Action	If a feasible route exists, set decision gates for technical qualification, customer demand, skilled people, infrastructure, and sustainable production. Advance only when the evidence supports the next stage.
Operational Objective	Test whether readiness can become usable, sustainable capability.

PHASE 3

Operational Action	If the required gates are met and a genuine market or policy window is open, commit to the next stage. Review the case as technology, demand, or supply conditions change; redirect later stages if the original route no longer reduces a critical vulnerability.
Operational Objective	Convert a verified opportunity while keeping later choices reviewable.

Fundamental idea of this implication

The central idea is to prepare before a window opens, then use it to turn a verified European strength into a durable answer to a specific supply-chain dependency. Unlike generic option-keeping, this requires a feasible route, readiness gates, and a clear reason to commit now.

Strategy 12

Public strategic mechanism: Accumulate small gains

Methodological origin: Take the opportunity to pilfer a goat

Comparative strategic fit

It means building European semiconductor capability one useful step at a time. Each step should reduce a specific vulnerability or make a later step more achievable. Small gains that do not connect to real needs or lasting production do not advance the objective.

Significant relationships between context and strategy

The Union has established strengths in equipment, industrial chips, power electronics and research, alongside dependencies in advanced production and design. This creates a basis for cumulative progress, but the long investment cycles and the objective's demand for lasting, selective vulnerability reduction mean that small gains must connect to qualification and sustained use.

First operational implication

Prioritize a small number of evidenced bottlenecks, not minor projects for their own sake. Link each step to qualification, customer use and the next capability, and change course if that link is not demonstrated.

Preliminary development hypothesis

PHASE 1

Operational Action	Map the semiconductor dependencies that matter most to critical European uses. If evidence identifies a bottleneck with few substitutes or a long recovery path, make it a candidate; do not assume that production share alone identifies the priority.
Operational Objective	Identify a specific dependency where a small gain could reduce meaningful exposure.

PHASE 2

Operational Action For a confirmed priority, assess whether existing European research, equipment, design or pilot capabilities can support a practical step toward qualification and use. Treat access, partners and customer uptake as prerequisites to verify.

Operational Objective Choose a gain that builds on existing capability and can reach real industrial use.

PHASE 3

Operational Action If a step reaches validation or qualified use, decide whether to extend it based on evidence that it reduces the named exposure and strengthens a complementary capability. If it does not, adjust or stop the approach rather than counting announcements or construction as durable autonomy.

Operational Objective Keep or expand only gains that reduce exposure and strengthen the next step.

Fundamental idea of this implication

The central idea is to make each modest gain useful twice: first by reducing a specific semiconductor exposure, then by making a complementary capability easier to build. This is more than diversification; successive steps must compound at a real bottleneck, without assuming that any particular bottleneck is already confirmed.

Strategy 42

Public strategic mechanism: Pilot, learn, scale

Methodological origin: Try small, grow big

Comparative strategic fit

It means testing a small, relevant part of the supply chain before making a much larger commitment. The test must show whether a European capability can serve a real user and move toward dependable, qualified supply. A promising demonstration alone is not enough.

Significant relationships between context and strategy

The European Union has strengths that could provide a starting point, but its advanced-production and design dependencies remain relevant to the objective. Small tests can help determine whether a specific strength connects to a real user and dependable supply. They cannot erase the long investment cycles or the gap between a successful test and durable production.

First operational implication

Choose a test only if its result could change a scale-up decision. Tie it to a real user and a consequential vulnerability, then set conditions for continuing, adapting or stopping. Use timing to learn before long commitments become difficult to reverse.

Preliminary development hypothesis

PHASE 1

Operational Action	Identify one consequential vulnerability and a plausible European capability or dependable partner route. Treat it as a candidate, not a confirmed priority, until its relevance to a real downstream user and the objective is established.
Operational Objective	Select a test tied to a consequential vulnerability and a real user need.

PHASE 2

Operational Action If a suitable test can be arranged, connect the capability to its needed design, process access, packaging and user qualification. Check which dependencies remain and whether the route can provide dependable supply.

Operational Objective Learn whether the complete route can meet user needs and expose remaining dependencies.

PHASE 3

Operational Action If the test shows a credible route to qualified supply, define the conditions for scaling, including sustained demand, skills, finance and control over critical knowledge or production decisions. If those conditions are not met, adapt or stop rather than treating the pilot as success.

Operational Objective Scale only when evidence supports durable, strategically relevant supply.

Fundamental idea of this implication

The core idea is to make one small test answer a large investment question: can this capability help provide dependable supply for a real user? Expand only when the test shows a credible route beyond demonstration to qualified use, while exposing dependencies that could preserve external control.

Strategy 44

Public strategic mechanism: Renew before disruption

Methodological origin: Renew before it is too late

Comparative strategic fit

It means changing Europe's own path before long investments make a poor fit difficult to undo. The focus is not to produce every chip locally, but to secure critical functions while preserving innovation and industrial competitiveness.

Significant relationships between context and strategy

Europe's equipment, industrial-chip, power-electronics and research strengths provide a starting point, but dependencies in advanced production and design remain. Because new facilities take time and the global chain is interdependent, the strategy's value lies in checking whether commitments reduce consequential vulnerabilities before they become difficult to change.

First operational implication

Use a renewal test before expanding or redirecting support: does the commitment secure a specified critical function, and can it reach usable capability in time? Where evidence does not support that path, consider a conditional change rather than assuming more capacity is the answer.

Preliminary development hypothesis

PHASE 1

Operational Action If a current priority or proposed commitment can be reviewed, compare its intended contribution with the specific critical function it is meant to secure. Treat this as a selection test; the available context does not establish that any project has failed.

Operational Objective Identify critical functions before changing investment or policy priorities.

PHASE 2

Operational Action For priorities that pass the first test, examine whether there is a credible path from research or pilot work to customer qualification, usable production or dependable access. If a material gap appears, consider a conditional change in sequence or support.

Operational Objective Connect selected priorities to usable capability and the objective's timeline.

PHASE 3

Operational Action If review shows that a commitment no longer addresses a critical vulnerability, consider adjusting or redirecting it only where legal, contractual and commercial conditions permit. Keep the decision open to later evidence on technology, demand, partner access and delivery, and do not treat announcements or approvals as completed capability.

Operational Objective Keep priorities adaptable without mistaking plans or approvals for delivered capacity.

Fundamental idea of this implication

The central idea is to change Europe's own investment path before long construction and qualification cycles make correction costly. Select priorities by the critical functions they secure, then adjust commitments if they cannot produce usable capability or dependable access. This is targeted renewal, not a general call to build more fabs.

Strategy 48

Public strategic mechanism: Build preventive barriers

Methodological origin: Barriers before the battle

Comparative strategic fit

Build protection before supply is disrupted. For Europe, this means arranging and testing ways to keep selected semiconductor functions working if a critical source or process is interrupted. It does not mean ending trade or reproducing every stage of the global industry.

Significant relationships between context and strategy

Europe has strengths that could support selected continuity routes, but it also depends on external advanced production, design and other inputs. Since ties with China combine interdependence with supply-chain leverage, preventive safeguards should address confirmed exposures without assuming universal hostility or complete control by either side.

First operational implication

Start with the bottlenecks that could cause the greatest harm, not with a general push for domestic production. Build and test a fallback only when the dependency is confirmed; preserve useful international links while checking whether they remain usable under stress.

Preliminary development hypothesis

PHASE 1

Operational Action	If a focused review confirms a critical dependency with few substitutes or a long recovery path, identify the exact product, application and linked stages involved. Do not select a safeguard until its importance to European users is clear.
Operational Objective	Define the critical function and the dependency that could interrupt it.

PHASE 2

Operational Action If the review confirms a high-impact bottleneck, compare feasible safeguards. Test whether alternatives can meet the relevant technical and customer requirements; consider access agreements or reserves only where they suit that dependency.

Operational Objective Select a proportionate safeguard that can work for the specified application.

PHASE 3

Operational Action If a safeguard is selected, test the whole route under a plausible interruption: whether access, qualification, materials, packaging and downstream use can continue. Adjust or reject the arrangement if it only shifts dependence, relies on unconfirmed partner behavior, or lacks a viable path to sustained use. Revisit it when technology, demand or access conditions change.

Operational Objective Keep the fallback usable, relevant to the objective and open to review.

Fundamental idea of this implication

The core idea is to make a verified critical function harder to interrupt before a shock occurs. The distinctive move is to secure the interfaces that make alternatives usable—such as qualification, design access, materials and packaging—not simply to add suppliers or announce capacity.