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1. Introduction

There can be no advancement for companies without innovation. A number of supporting tools and methods are implemented in the process of product development in order to pave the way for innovation. Instead of a purely in-house perspective an increasing number of companies start to recognize the need to open up their innovation processes and make it transparent – key word: open innovation – and to get involved in cooperation in various forms. This is a result of increasingly complex requirements that lead to companies being less and less able to manage all necessary disciplines, e.g. idea generation and technology development, on their own.

But how can external sources systematically be involved in the innovation process to expand a company's own basis of innovation? Which strategies, methods and tools can support the process of an active use of a company's respective environment? Which influence does the strategy of open innovation have on established business models? How can knowledge about the open innovation business models actively be transferred to corporations?

The here described workshop methodology will try to give guidance how to answer this questions for companies within a seminar. A method to facilitate a transfer of knowledge about open innovation business models has been developed. This method actively transfers knowledge about open innovation business models to companies to help increase their ability of innovation. This method was validated in an expert-workshop and was employed in all three regions of the BMOI project. This report also contains a cross-workshop analysis which will comprise findings from the workshops performed in each region.
2. Open business model workshop methodology

2.1 Description of the methodology

Figure 1 shows a diagram detailing the phases and milestones comprising the method for transferring open innovation business models. The method is divided into five phases. For each phase, the key tasks or methods are specified, and the corresponding outcomes are defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases/Mile Stones</th>
<th>Tasks/ Methods</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning the transfer</td>
<td>• Define targets</td>
<td>Transfer plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draw up a short description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan timeframe and resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan modules and content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine internal and external services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create a transfer plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning marketing activities</td>
<td>• Determine marketing channels</td>
<td>Marketing measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determine addresses and contacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create marketing media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement marketing measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating the transfer</td>
<td>• Concretise the transfer plan</td>
<td>Transfer concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work content theory module out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work content practice module out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Work content interaction module out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prepare materials and documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create transfer concept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the transfer</td>
<td>• Implement transfer concept</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moderate transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Complete transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Solicit feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following up on the transfer</td>
<td>• Edit feedback</td>
<td>Transfer effectiveness/ Potential portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Derive potentials for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate transfer effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create potential portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Diagram detailing the phases and milestones of the method for transferring open innovation business models
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The following section gives a general overview of the five phases of the method. The following section will illustrate its practical relevance, based on the application of the method within the BMOI research project.

Planning the transfer

The outcome of the first phase is the transfer plan. The transfer plan contains all the information necessary to relate the planned transfer to a third party, whether manager, colleague or service provider. The transfer plan also serves to support transfer coordinators, helping them to marshal their thoughts and ideas. A structured concept is particularly important when communicating intentions for the transfer to commentators and decision makers. Once the objectives of the transfer have been defined, a short outline is drawn up. This generally includes the title, a description of the content and the target audience, as well as the objectives of the transfer. The name given to the transfer or seminar is critical as it needs to give a concise summary of the topic at hand and will be used to advertise the seminar internally and externally. Following on from this, timings, resources, modules and module content are planned out. In the process, items of content – the objects of transfer – are assigned as headings and keywords to the modules of theory, practice and interactive learning. Planning one's individual contribution together with that of others helps determine what resources are already available internally and what will have to be bought in. The method for this phase is an iterative one, ultimately yielding a fully drawn-up transfer plan.

Planning marketing activities

The outcome of the second phase is a set of concrete marketing strategies. Implementing these measures informs the target audience and the general public of the planned transfer. The information can be conveyed by means of various marketing channels. Here, there is a distinction to be made between personal modalities, such as personalized letters and telephone calls, and non-targeted channels, such as a website or event calendar. Once suitable marketing channels have been selected, the recipients of the information must be identified. Personal channels of communication require specific contact details, non-targeted ones the appointment of a coordinator. As soon as marketing channels and recipients of information have been determined, the necessary marketing materials – itinerary, invitation letters and emails – must be composed and delivered. In the course of their development, the transfer plan is referred back to as a point of reference. In addition to content, the design of these communications as concerns graphics, layout and visual message is of particular importance if the measures are to be implemented successfully. The second phase is concluded as soon as the agreed marketing strategies have been implemented.

Formulating the transfer

The outcome of the third phase is the transfer concept. The transfer concept takes account of the transfer plan to date, substantiating and building upon it. The aim of this phase is to prepare the transfer to the point that it can be implemented in the next phase. The first step is to finalize and compile the module content. This content is then sequenced to ensure a common thread throughout. Once the modules and their sequence have been finalized, the knowledge forming the object of the transfer must be put into a suitable format. For the theory and practice modules, this can take the form of presentation slides, open discussion, videos or other channels of information. The interactive module on the other hand, taking the form of a workshop, sets out a space where participants can apply what they have learned in small groups. This requires the preparation of comprehensive workshop materials. The transfer concept
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contains all the content, schedules and materials necessary to implement the transfer in the next phase. The transfer concept can therefore be regarded as a framework or guideline.

Implementing the transfer

The outcome of the fourth phase consists of feedback from participants. Feedback is fundamentally subjective, the necessary consequence of communication between people. For our purposes, feedback means allowing people to subjectively evaluate a given piece of value-neutral information – for it is this process of subjective evaluation that makes information usable or unusable. Evaluation is normally an unconscious process and tends to align with individual experience, values and socialization processes. Accordingly, a knowledge transfer can be considered effective when participants deem the material learnt to be personally applicable, in the sense of a directly experienced change. In this regard, communication technique is just as important as the information prepared, and is a critical factor for the success of the implementation phase. Participants are constantly reacting to content, giving feedback in the form of comments, questions and gestures. To keep the communication process focused on objectives, a suitable leadership and presentation style is needed. After the theory, practice and interactive learning modules have been delivered, the consolidation of the transfer must be assured. This can take the form of summaries, discussion groups or takeaways. The end of the fourth phase is marked by the documentation of feedback.

Following up on the transfer

The outcome of the fifth phase is the determination of transfer effectiveness and the creation of a portfolio for assessing potential. The first step is to process feedback. There is a distinction to be made here between quantitative feedback (“On a scale of 1 to 10, I give it a 7!”) and qualitative feedback (“I was pleased with the event but XY was missing!”). The quantitative feedback helps evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer. This is measured by the degree to which expectations and objectives have been fulfilled, and participants’ estimation of the increase in their own personal understanding. Transfer effectiveness is an important indicator in evaluating the transfer and making it capable of comparison. Qualitative feedback reveals potential in the form of unfulfilled expectations, new perspectives, requirements, reservations and critiques. This information is the basis for potential room for improvement in the future. These potential ideas are evaluated based on their attractiveness and the effort required to implement them, and then collected into a portfolio. The evaluation is finally used to derive measures for implementing the ideas with the most promise.

2.2 Application of the method within the BMOI research project

The method for transferring open innovation business models is being used by project partners in Navarra, Eindhoven and Stuttgart. The aim is to transfer knowledge from science into local industry. The method was pre-validated in an expert workshop held in July 2012 with researchers from Fraunhofer IAO. The method is also being used for the EURIS event “Neue Wege zur Innovation” (New ways to innovation), since the originally planned event, “Vernetzt zu Innovationen” (Networking for innovation) on July 4, had to be cancelled due to an insufficient number of participants. Thanks to the flexible design of the workshop concept, this change could be smoothly implemented. Repeated application around Europe is allowing the transfer concept to be continually improved. The BMOI research project’s commercial strategy envisages that the final version of the transfer concept will be employed as an advisory tool and teaching aid. The method developed in the course of the project contains the basic concepts and content needed for this purpose.
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Owing to the varying contexts of the applications detailed above, the following section will use a prototype to illustrate the use of the method. The prototype event is based on the planning of the event “Vernetzt zu Innovationen” (Networking for innovation).

**Phase 1: planning the transfer**

The outcome of the first phase is the transfer plan. The transfer plan contains all the information necessary to relate the planned transfer to a third party, whether manager, colleague or service provider. The transfer plan also serves to support transfer coordinators, helping them to marshal their thoughts and ideas. A structured concept is particularly important when communicating intentions for the transfer to commentators and decision makers. The mind mapping technique should be used for the planning itself, and its contents carried over to the transfer plan at a later stage. The advantage of mind mapping is that planning can be flexibly extended in any direction by adding new nodes. Figure 2 shows a practical initial framework for beginning planning. At the end, the transfer plan is drawn up with reference to the mind map.

![Figure 2: The mind mapping technique as a flexible tool for planning your transfer](image)

**Objectives, short outline, timings and resources**

The fundamental aspect of planning is to define the objectives to be achieved by the knowledge transfer. In addition to content-based objectives, this phase must define the target audience, that is to say, the recipients of the transfer/participants. The transfer coordinator (event organizer) should remember that these objectives need not match up exactly with participants’ own objectives. It would be much more accurate to say that each individual participant brings with them their own expectations and objectives for what they wish to achieve by way of the knowledge transfer. This results in a conflict of objectives. If the organizer establishes objectives that are too specific, only a small proportion of potential participants will be able to relate to the event. If, on the other hand, the objectives are too general in nature, participants will interpret them subjectively as a confirmation of their own personal objectives and expectations. This leads to too wide a range of possible objectives and expectations, and means they cannot all be achieved once a critical mass of participants has been reached. To avoid such scenarios, it is advisable to draw up both a specific and a general list of objectives, and to use them to find a golden mean. Should the possibility arise, it is a good idea to gauge potential participants’ expectations before the event. Objectives determined in this way take corresponding account of the target audience and, in turn, bind the target audience to the object of transfer (the topic of the event). In
the present case, we are dealing with the topic of open innovation business models. To determine the target audience, then, it is desirable to make a list of thematic keywords. This collection of keywords is then used to identify matching industry duties and job descriptions. Objectives for the content of the event can now be composed, a compromise between the specific and general objective lists put together previously. In turn, drawing up the objectives allows a short outline to be written up that draws on the collection of keywords and the overarching topic of open innovation business models. The short outline consists of the title of the event, a subheading and a short topic-focused description (100-200 words).

Defining objectives and drafting the short outline is not a linear process, but rather one of ongoing modification in consultation with the parties involved, including, for instance, colleagues or Press and Public Relations. Care should be taken when deciding upon a title to ensure that it is not already being used for any other event. In addition, at least five alternative titles should be generated in case of last-minute changes at a later stage in the planning process. Securing the commitment of all involved at an early stage cannot be emphasized enough, and should certainly happen no later than the completion of the transfer plan. Once the objectives and the short outline have been worked up, the required resources and time available are sketched out. In terms of planning resources, the following factors should be taken into consideration: venue, technical equipment, catering, marketing, number of participants, staffing, sponsors, costs and revenue. Planning the timescale involves finding three possible dates for the event as well as mapping out essential milestones within the time period in question. A schedule covering the duration of the event should also be drafted. The length of the event itself depends primarily on the range of content to be covered and the associated objectives. The following section assumes a half-day event of four hours.

Modules; their content; individual and external contributions

The planning of the transfer is complete once modules, content, and individual and external contributions have all been planned out. Figure 3 shows a diagram of the open innovation business models transfer plan. It should be borne in mind that the transfer plan primarily serves as a communication tool; being a summary document, it does not contain every piece of information pertaining to the transfer. Additional information on planning time and resources can be taken from the mind map if required. Planning the modules revolves around the requirements of knowledge transfer and reflects the standpoints of theory, practice and interactive learning. Within these modules, topic-focused headings can then be assigned. The modules are finalized in the third phase of the method, when they are fleshed out with content.

Planning one's own contribution and that of others is a key part of the process going forward. In the particular application set out here, there is the chance to outsource part of the resource planning to a service provider, FpF (Verein zu Förderung produktionstechnischer Forschung e.V. Stuttgart). FpF takes on the coordination of the registration phase, for instance, as well as catering, room reservation and the ordering of technical equipment. Press and Public Relations supports the transfer coordinator in the implementation of marketing strategies at a later stage, as well as in preparing marketing materials. Getting external experts involved is advisable to ensure grounding in practice. In this regard, the more practical contribution, the better it is. The reason for this is that it gives participants a more nuanced understanding, allowing them to make more wide-ranging use of the subsequent opportunity for discussion. The particular application set out here only allows for one practical input due to time constraints. The following method has proved successful in identifying and inviting potential speakers/experts during the planning phase:

1. Filtering personal contacts
2. Emailing colleagues to ask for direct contacts
3. Searching social networks and associated peer groups
4. Researching comparable events and their speakers
5. Researching companies commended for their innovative approach.
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One should remember that a certain level of planning must have been reached before others can be usefully contacted. In addition, one should suggest at least three dates. As soon as the industry speakers have been confirmed, the date of the event is fixed. It is also advisable to take a look at a printout of speakers’ potential presentations in advance of the event. Content should always be agreed in close consultation with the speaker. Determining the modules and their length produces a provisional schedule.

---

**Timeline**

5 month before workshop

1. Create transfer plan
2. Block ressources
3. Involve press and public relations
4. Purchase external service
5. Determine addresses and contacts
6. Implement marketing measures
7. Prepare and concretise contents
8. An event test
9. Finalise event

---

**Theory and science**

- Introduction
- Problems
- Open Innovation Models
- Open Innovation Methods
- Business model structure
- Business model examples
- Challenges
- Research project BMOI

**Practice and experience**

- Open Innovation case studies
- Project results
- Wittenstein AG contribution to: „Absorptive Capacity“
- Discussions

**Interaction and application**

- Common definition to „networked innovation“
- Business plan for business model development with Open Innovation influence

---

**External and internal service**

**External service:** consultant over practice models, part of marketing measures, room and technology reservation, catering

**Internal service:** coordination, organisation, contents, presentation, moderation, preparation, follow-up

---

To conclude, it is worth noting that planning a transfer depends on the personal preferences and prior experience of the transfer coordinator. The method of transfer planning described in this section allows a
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structured conception, creating a necessary base from which to communicate intentions in a targeted manner, whether internally or externally. The outcome of this phase is the transfer plan (Figure 3).

2.3 Phase 2: planning marketing strategies

The outcome of the second phase is a set of marketing strategies and their implementation. The first step is to determine sensible marketing channels as well as to obtain the addresses and contact details of potential participants. From this base, marketing strategies and materials are then developed. Finally, strategies are implemented, publicizing the transfer.

When choosing marketing channels, there is a distinction to be made between personalized, or direct, marketing on the one hand and public marketing on the other. Such channels also present a choice between digital and print-based marketing materials. In our particular scenario, a mixed approach proved effective:

1. Entering the event into the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft and IHK event calendars
2. Posting the event on relevant blogs, forums and Xing peer groups
3. Personal emails
4. Personalized save-the-date cards
5. Personalized letters with an enclosed program flyer

This approach ensures that all relevant channels of communication are covered and the event advertised as thoroughly as possible. It should be borne in mind that there is significant discrepancy in the time and resources required. Entering the event into a calendar or involving social networking communities, for instance, entails a comparatively low investment of time and resources. Here, one can refer back to the content of the transfer plan (the short outline, target audience and objectives). The costs of personalized marketing, on the other hand, are significantly higher. First, addresses and contact details must be obtained. Depending on the target audience, one can either access external databases or use those available internally through Press and Public Relations. Using external databases brings with it associated costs. They can be used to buy contact details and addresses according to search criteria such as industry sector, region, number of employees or seniority. Prior experience of planning similar events suggests that a total of between 2,000 and 3,000 records should be on hand for use in the personalized marketing campaign. Care should be taken that records are up to date and this should be a specific point of enquiry.

Once contact details and addresses are available and the event has been posted on the relevant platforms and social networking sites, the timing of the next set of measures must be worked out (Figure 4). To this end, marketing materials must first be developed. These include a save-the-date card, a personalized letter of invitation and the program flyer. In the particular scenario detailed here, the save-the-date card was abandoned as it serves little purpose unless the date of the event is fixed at least four to five months in advance. As well as the date of the event, the save-the-date card also features contact details to allow interested parties to obtain additional information about the event.

In contrast to the save-the-date card, the program flyer with personalized invitation includes all the relevant information from the transfer plan. Only the schedule remains to be finalized according to module content. The finalized schedule and the design of the program leaflet of the German workshop are shown in Figure 4.

1 Xing peer groups are topic-focused forums of communication within the online professional and career networking site www.xing.de. In the first phase, these peer groups are used to identify potential speakers, and now they can be used for marketing purposes. The relevant groups, for instance “Open Innovation”, “Open Innovation Club”, “Round Table Innovation Management” or “Open Innovation Business Network”, number several thousand members in total.
Because of the scale of the operation, the sending part of the marketing strategy is in fact carried out by a professional third party. This service provider checks for duplicates in the addresses and contact details provided, prints out the personalized letters of invitation, puts them in envelopes along with a copy of the program flyer, and finally has them franked. One should allow for costs of around 3,000 to 4,000 euros for printing and sending the program leaflets and invitation letters. This estimate does not include the costs associated with a save-the-date card.

To conclude, it is worth noting that the second phase of the method for transferring open innovation business models calls for a high degree of coordination and communication. Above all, contacting and consulting all the parties involved – Press and Public Relations, service providers, speakers, managers – is a time-consuming process, driven by deadlines. The timeline set out above for planning and implementing marketing strategies should be adhered to rigidly; a sufficiently long registration period before the event is vital to success. Once marketing strategies have been implemented, the transfer coordinator’s workload diminishes significantly. Around two months before the event, one should begin finalizing the content of the modules with the help of the transfer plan.
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2.4 Phase 3: formulating the transfer

The outcome of the third phase is the transfer concept. The transfer concept is a document in tabular form and contains timings, module content, module targets, the appropriate course of action in each case and necessary materials. The transfer concept serves as an aid to the transfer coordinator in implementing the transfer. To this end, the content of the three modules of theory, practice and interactive learning is first finalized with reference to the transfer plan. Next, presentation slides are prepared as required, along with the materials for the workshop. The last step is to finalize the transfer concept along with all necessary materials. Once the presentations, materials and transfer concept have been developed, the transfer is ready to be implemented in the next phase. It should be noted that during the present phase the method for accomplishing these tasks is an iterative one.

Using the transfer plan, theory, practice and interactive learning modules are constituted. Next, the targets to be attained by participants during the transfer are set for each module. Together, these targets comprise the common thread of the seminar. Content for the theory and practice modules should generally take the form of presentation slides in PowerPoint format. Additional flipcharts and moderators’ cards can be used to further involve the participants. The interactive learning module, on the other hand, is founded on the workshop principle, making use of a simulation game. Accordingly, in this instance one should prepare both presentation slides – for listing tasks, for instance – and relevant materials for interactive group work. So that feedback can be evaluated, a feedback questionnaire should also be developed.

The transfer concept is shown in Figure 5. This section will now go on to give a more detailed description of the individual modules and content contained within the transfer concept. Owing to the range of material, the following part will only go into content that is important for gaining an understanding of the matter at hand. As the materials are worked out specifically for each region some of the following example slides are from the German workshop. It should be noted that the modular construction of the transfer concept allows module content to be added to or altered if necessary. This is a particular advantage in an international setting as it allows local needs to be taken into account. Accordingly, the transfer concept set out here gives project partners a foundation from which to get to grips with their material, while simultaneously allowing for the tailoring of that material.

To conclude, it is worth noting that it is advisable to follow up a combined seminar and workshop of this kind with individual training or coaching if the material learnt is to be lastingly integrated into the workplace. The concept laid out in this endeavor, however, restricts itself to a seminar and workshop alone. The following pages will go into this conception in further detail and provide illustration by means of selected slides from the slide sets.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Target State</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Required Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 min. | **Responsible:** Greeting and introduction  
- Introduction of your organization  
- Structure of the workshop  
- Challenges and target | **Vision** (Phase 1: The Call)  
“We are interested in making our company more innovative by controlling the challenges. Therefore, we are here at the right place. We ask ourselves which methods are indicated in the implementation process.” | Verbal and visual presentation of the slides (~10 min). At the end of the presentation, leave the agenda slide aside and ask the participants to fill out the front page of the workshop factsheet (~5 min). | Presentation:  
1_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Begrüßung.ppt  
First page of the workshop factsheet. |
| 30 min. | **Responsible:** Linked to Innovations – Introduction  
- Scientific basics  
- Methods and tools  
- Examples of business models  
- Challenges for companies | **Comprehension** (Phase 1: The Refusal)  
“We realize that Open Innovation is no moon landing. We have the necessary basic knowledge with regard to Open Innovation and business models. We saw the potential but a concrete application in practice is still unclear.” | Verbal and visual presentation of the slides (~30 min). Participants should write 1–2 reasons for networking (slide 2), collect these on a prepared flipchart. | Presentation:  
2_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Einführung.ppt  
Flipchart, pencils, duct tape, moderations cards |
| 45 min. | **Responsible:** Results from the BMOI Project  
- Description of the BMOI Project  
- 3 case studies from the practice  
- Changes in the business model | **Motivation** (Phase 1: The Mentor „Science perspective“)  
“Based on case studies, we discovered different ideas for implementing Open Innovation. We realized how we can improve a business model by application of Open Innovation.” | Verbal and visual presentation of the slides (~30 min). At the end of the presentation, questions may be asked regarding case studies and the research project (~15 min). | 3_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_BMOI.ppt |
| 45 min. | **Responsible:** Practice Contribution of a company  
- Implementation at “company”  
- Key factor „Absorptive Capacity”  
- Barriers at the implementation | **Strategy** (Phase 1: The Mentor „Practice Perspective“)  
“During the Practice Perspective we discovered possible key factors and barriers at the implementation of Open Innovation. We are motivated to apply the gained knowledge structurally in order to collect experience.” | Verbal and visual presentation of the slides (~30 min). At the end of the presentation, questions may be asked to the expert (~15 min). | 4_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Wittenstein_Praxisbeitrag.pdf |
| 15 min. | **Coffee break (15min)** | **Social Interchange** |  |  |
| 55 min. | **Responsible:** Interactive Workshop (1/2)  
- Case study explanation and task  
- Formation of groups  
- Dealing with the task | **Implementation** (Phase 2: The Test)  
“We discovered a tool to represent, adapt and develop a business model graphically. We are able to apply Open Innovation methods in the innovation process and to develop new cooperative business models.” | WS Case study and task are explained verbally and visually (~10 min). Remove. Form groups of 2-5 people (~5 min). Each group works together with a moderator at the task (~40 min). | 5_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Workshop.ppt  
Workshop Material  
Checkliste_Workshop.docx |
| 20 min. | **Responsible:** Interactive Workshop (2/2)  
- Presentation of results  
- Answer questions | **Result** (Phase 2: The Decisive Test)  
“We have successfully processed the case studies and we can pass on, as well as discuss about the constructive feedback of the problems faced and the potentials met. The business model perspective offers the possibility of talking about future innovation potentials.” | Each group presents its results (~6 min). At the presentation of business models, the following order is useful: customer segments and value proposition, relationships and channels, resources and activities, partner, costs and revenues. | 6_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Zusammenfassung.ppt  
Results of previous workshop |
| 15 min. | **Responsible:** Summary  
- Conclusion and perspective  
- Feedback  
- Discussions | **Reflection and Establishment** (Phase 2: The Reward)  
“We understand the connection between Open Innovation and business models. We discovered methods and tools, which help us improve the innovation ability of our company. We are able to apply our knowledge and pass it on at the workplace.” | Summary of the seminar content. Short evaluation of the workshop results (~10 min). Suggestions for future research topics. Provide access to future research results and advisory services. Answer open questions and moderate discussions. | 7_Vernetzt_zu_Innovationen_Zusammenfassung.ppt  
Second page of the workshop factsheet. |
Module 1: Greeting and introduction

The act of opening and closing a seminar typically falls to someone with extensive expertise and a solid reputation in the relevant field. The welcome address is divided into three key parts and lasts approximately 15 minutes. The address opens by introducing the organizers of the event; in this case the University of Stuttgart and Fraunhofer IAO, before moving on to provide a general overview of the subject matter and structure of the seminar. The address concludes by presenting the challenges commonly faced by companies, as well as the objectives that flow from these (see example-slide German workshop on Figure 7). The primary function of this module is to provide participants with answers to the following questions: “Why are we here?” and “What can we expect in this seminar?”

These challenges form the bridge to the next module; various methods and tools for overcoming them will be presented over the course of the seminar. Once the welcome address has been delivered, participants are to complete the first page of the feedback questionnaire. This involves participants articulating what they expect from the seminar and estimating how much they already know about open innovation and business models. Completing the first page at this stage is a crucial condition of the evaluation that will take place later on. The second and final page of the feedback questionnaire is to be completed at the end of the seminar. Ideally, feedback questionnaires should be filled out in between speakers’ presentations.

Module 2: Networking for innovation – introduction

The purpose of the second module is to develop participants’ understanding of open innovation business models. This requires more detailed illustration of the scientific foundation, background, models and methods involved. This module concludes by offering clear examples and providing a summary of the key points. Upon completion of the second module, it is essential that participants are able to answer the following questions for themselves: “What is open innovation?”, “Which methods and
tools are available?” and “What does open innovation have to do with business models?” The following is a brief description of the points featured in the second module.

Introducing the module is a short exercise designed to get everyone involved. Participants’ responses towards the questions “Why you are personally interlinked?” and “Why should your organization be interlinked?” are collated on a prepared flipchart (see German example on Figure 7).

To expedite the process of answering questions, the second question has already been posed on the feedback questionnaire, enabling answers to be transferred directly to the moderators’ cards. The flipchart remains on view for the duration of the seminar, providing speakers with a reference point when making their presentations (e.g. “As you see, ladies and gentlemen, you can use this method in your company to help generate new ideas for new products”). The bridge to the following slides is based on the information principle “fulfilled information needs in order to raise effectiveness and gained solution information in order to raise efficiency” embedded in almost all of the answers that appear on the flipchart. The next step is to present CHESBROUGH’s open innovation model with permeable company boundaries.

The fact remains that not all of the information available from knowledge and information networks is helpful to companies. In order to utilize knowledge found beyond company boundaries, those boundaries have to be opened at specific points: “But how and where is this to be done?” To answer this question, it is necessary to draw on the systematic levels of a company as described by FULLER and MORAN. The organizational levels “internal activities” and “business model” are addressed during the seminar. This involves first identifying the various methods of using internal activities to open company boundaries. The method overview provides a visual illustration of how this is achieved. The overview is

4 FULLER, T.; MORAN, P.: Small enterprise as complex adaptive systems - a methodological question Entrepreneurship & Regional Development Nr. 13, S. 47-63, University of Durham, Durham, 2001
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followed by more detailed information on the individual methods in the form of method profiles (see example-slide German workshop on Figure 8)

![Figure 8: Example of the open innovation method profile](image)

After addressing the question “How to open?” the next slides tackle the issue of “Where to open?” This first involves presenting the business model structure built by OSTERWALDER and PIGNEUR, with subsequent illustration in the form of three different example business models taken from real life (see example-slide German workshop on Figure 9). It is important to note that the intention in providing examples is not to give fully detailed descriptions, but rather to highlight just how each particular business model works. In the example at hand, the yellow elements denote the classic product-oriented business model, based on the development, manufacture and sale of the iPhone. The green elements denote the next planning stage in the transformation process for Apple’s business model. The iTunes platform supplements the iPhone with an offering of additional services. In contrast, the blue elements highlight features requiring a combination of the iTunes platform and the iPhone. In this way, Apple can continue developing new value propositions without having to target new customer segments. In fact, with the value proposition known as apps, it is not even necessary for Apple to produce them itself in order to profit from them. Instead, many come from unknown developers who create them using the App Toolkit – which also earns Apple money.

Once the various examples of business models have been set out, attention is turned to establishing the differences between closed business models and open innovation business models with respect to revenue and costs. This is followed by outlining the specific challenges companies can expect to face and the risks involved in implementing open innovation solutions.

---

Having now attained a certain level of theoretical and scientific understanding, participants will recognize the necessary change processes in relation to individual or organizational behavior. But although they will have understood the theory, they may not yet have grasped how to put it into practice. Attempting to effect such a change in the workplace is therefore inherently risky, can lead to mere perpetuation of the status quo, and can result in outright refusal to support new measures. To ensure that this is not the case, the following modules focus on how to implement changes in practice. The content of these modules acts as a kind of mentor; providing motivation and demonstrating strategies with which to implement open innovation.

Module 3: BMOI project findings

The third module introduces the findings of the BMOI research project, beginning with a brief description of both the project and its particular approach. This gives way to more detailed analysis of how open innovation is implemented by way of three example cases and the presentation of specific findings. The third module concludes by referencing tasks and challenges that have to be taken into account when using open innovation processes to adapt a business model.

Once the project and its approach have been established, each of the different example cases is presented on three slides. The following is by way of illustration, taking the Bosch case study as an example. The first slide provides an overview outlining the key figures, initial condition and targets, as well as the respective open innovation tool or method applied (see example use case slide German workshop Figure 10).
The second slide illustrates how open innovation is used to change the business model. A greatly simplified version of the original business model is amended by the yellow elements (see Figure 11). What is striking here is that changes occur only on the left — the company side — in that the internal innovation base has been expanded to include new external partners. The next stage is to develop new value propositions based on this expanded base. It is fair to say that the integration of an intermediary in the innovation process does not necessarily lead to a new value proposition. Rather, it demands a subsequent re-estimation and re-evaluation of the level of knowledge now available.

This task has to be handled either by the respective project coordinator or through the in-house R&D department. Figure 12 shows the conclusions reached by Bosch and wraps up discussion of this case study. A further two examples are presented in the same way within this module. Similarities with BMOI
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regional partner case studies together with findings from those studies are presented at the end of this module.

In addition to the theoretical perspective they gained earlier, participants have now become familiar with specific, tangible examples of how to apply open innovation methods. The next, practice-based module widens participants’ practical perspective even further.

Module 4: Practice-based presentation from Wittenstein AG

As the practice-based presentation comes from a third party, it is only possible to have indirect influence over its content. It is crucial to ensure that statements expressed in this module are in line with those of the preceding modules. It is therefore advisable to request a draft of the presentation in good time or, wherever possible, to collaborate in its development. The content of the presentation should focus on specific examples and strategies of how open innovation is to be implemented. Wittenstein AG’s presentation, “How a mechatronics company implements open innovation”, is ideal for this purpose. Here, participants have the opportunity to benefit from first-hand practical experience in the matter under discussion. This presentation puts particular emphasis on the strategies behind the application of open innovation and the key factors and obstacles related to this. It is generally advisable, time permitting, to have a number of practice-based presentations from different companies. At least 15 minutes should be allocated at the end of each presentation to answer any questions. The fourth module serves to make clear the strategic and practical aspects of implementing open innovation. Once the seminar’s scientific and practical content has been successfully transferred, the seminar can proceed to allowing participants to gather their first experiences by putting what they have learned into practice.

Module 5: Interactive workshop (1/2)

Once the theoretical and practical modules have taken shape, it is time to design the interactive module. This involves combining the principles of a workshop with those of a simulation game. Small groups of 2-5 people, overseen by a moderator, generate new collaborative business models. Beyond the direct objectives, on a higher level the aim is for participants to learn how to fashion business models, so they
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are better equipped to overcome the challenges businesses will face in the future. The business model structure as set out in OSTERWALDER and PIENEUR is used as “game space” (“objects” take the form of moderator’s cards etc.). The following gives a more detailed account of the workshop concept and how the simulation game plays out. First comes an explanation of the “game space” (template), after which comes a description of how the game is to proceed, using an example case, starting point, given brief and recommended approach.

Figure 13 shows the starting point of the template as the game begins. Each group requires a template as well as moderator’s cards and markers. The template is a large sheet of paper featuring the business model’s structure. To the right are printouts of the various open innovation method profiles; to the left the description of the example case, the brief, the recommended method and a short description of the elements that make up the business model. Each of the small groups is assigned its own moderator. It is important to bear in mind that the moderators’ role is limited to being a point of reference if something is unclear; they should interfere as little as possible in the actual process of the game.

The purpose of the workshop is to provide participants with answers to the following questions: “How can a business model be developed, illustrated, discussed and presented?” and “What effects can new technologies and open innovation methods have on an existing business model?” In order to answer these questions, an example case has been developed for the participants to work with during the workshop. This example case and the accompanying brief are described in detail on the next few pages (see Figure 14 to Figure 18).
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**Figure 14: Workshop overview for participants**

**Interactive Workshop (1/5)**
What happens during the workshop?

- Groups of 2 to 5 people

  - 15 min – Explanation of case study and group classification
  - 40 min – Processing the task
  - 20 min – Presentation of results (5 min each group)

Processing the task in small groups.
The task refers to a fictional practical example.
Each group will be provided with workshop material.

The objective is to develop **a new business model** based on creativity and the knowledge gained during the seminar.

**Figure 15: Fictional example case for use in the workshop**

**Interactive Workshop (2/5)**
Case Study „Schuh-Exklusiv GmbH“

The business success of **Schuh-Exklusiv GmbH** has been declining for a long time. With a staff of 50 employees, this traditional company designs, produces and sells exclusive **men’s shoes** in the premium segment. A customer survey has shown that the fit of the shoes is moderate.

The management committee hired you as a consultant to identify **business opportunities** and thus cause a trend reversal by means of new technologies.
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Figure 16: New business opportunities made possible by a new technology

Figure 17: Brief for the workshop
This approach proved successful in determining the scope of work. Solutions that emerged from the process of validating the method were documented in the form of photographs. The original business model, which is to be reproduced in 1), is a component of the presentation slides used in the second module and can be related back to that section. The blue moderators’ cards are located beneath the business model structure and participants have to be put them in their correct positions. Once the original business model has been recreated, the next step is to adapt it to reflect business opportunities made possible by the new technology. This begins by using the green moderators’ cards to add in the “3D scanner” technology (key resources) and the new “individual/custom-fit shoes” value proposition. From this point, participants are able to consider other business opportunities arising from the situation and decide which elements of the model have to be adapted or changed. For instance, the sales channel can be widened to incorporate an online shop, or new customer segments can be reached by expanding operations to include the manufacture of orthopedic shoes. Within the set brief, the focus should be on practicing how to go about illustrating business models, so it is important not to stifle participants’ creativity too soon. Once the original business model has been amended to reflect the impact of the new technology, the next step is to apply appropriate open innovation methods or tools. Yellow moderators’ cards, or perhaps Post-it notes, are used to add in the changes driven by open innovation. The key activity of “design”, for instance, can be supported by an innovation competition or toolkit, or it can be contracted out – resulting in new key partners. The business models created are then presented to the other groups.

It should be noted that the aim is not to develop the “best” business model. Participants are to learn how to develop business opportunities together and how to communicate them to each other. The business model structure is a vehicle for expressing ideas. This makes it possible to give business ideas visual expression and to share them visually with third parties. Alexander Osterwalder often hails this situation in particular as the crucial added value of the business model visualization process. Follow-up
workshops devoted to the development or evaluation of business models generally take the path of presenting the original business model before subjecting it to a SWOT analysis. This could, for instance, be part of a follow-up training course.

Having experimented with new business ideas, participants should now have all they need to apply the knowledge gleaned from the modules so far about developing collaborative business models. The next module provides a forum in which to present these results to the other groups.

**Module 6: Interactive workshop (2/2)**

The second part of the interactive workshop is limited to the presentation of the findings from the first part. The reason for dividing the workshop into two modules is simply that it is usually necessary to change rooms when it is time to split into groups. The groups come together again to present their findings, which are presented by the groups themselves rather than by one of the guest speakers. It is in the interest of participants for each group to nominate 1 or 2 of its members to deliver the 5-minute presentation, which is to be given in that group's workspace. In presenting the findings, the following presentation sequence is recommended: customer segments and value propositions, channels and customer relations, activities and key resources, partners, costs and revenue. If time permits, groups may choose to explore the business model's specific strengths and weaknesses. Alternatively, discussion of problems and potential could be incorporated into the group discussion part of the workshop. The latter approach is particularly interesting from the moderators' point of view as it can serve to highlight areas for future improvement. Ultimately, it remains crucial that moderators carry out a trial run of the workshop in advance, in order to get an idea what to expect in terms of group dynamics. At least one trial run should take place a week or so before the event, with the help and input of colleagues, students or others familiar with the matter in hand. All findings should be documented in the form of photographs, so that they can be shared with participants after the seminar is over. Figure 19 shows the business model as adapted by participants during the workshop.

![Figure 19: Workshop participant is presenting the new developed business model](image)

---

* A comprehensive set of questions relating to the appraisal of business models by way of SWOT analyses can be found in OSTERWALDER, A.; PIGNEUR Y.: *Business Model Generation - Ein Handbuch für Visionäre, Spielveränderer und Herausforderer*. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt, 2011
Module 7: Conclusion

The seminar ends with a comprehensive summary in the form of a conclusion and outlook. This should ideally be delivered by the person who opened the seminar. If follow-up events, for instance training courses or coaching events, have already been scheduled, these should be mentioned at this juncture. The final part of the seminar is a closing discussion, after which participants are to fill out the second page of the feedback questionnaire. It is a good idea to have the caterers offer refreshments after the seminar, to give everyone a chance to unwind and to help participants extend their personal networks.

2.5 Phase 4: Implementing the transfer

The outcome of the fourth phase is the documented feedback of the participants. It is essential that the event be organized and administered professionally to ensure positive feedback. In the lead-up to the event, inquiries should be welcomed and processed efficiently. Contacts whose details are given on program flyers or in event calendars must be reachable at all times. During the preparatory phase, one to two weeks prior to the event, tasks and roles should be finalized, assigned and communicated to all taking part. Materials required, such as handouts, seminar tags, name badges and giveaways, have to be produced in time for the event. It is also important to ensure that adequate directions to the venue are made available in advance. Wherever possible, participants should be sent these by e-mail two weeks prior to the event. Planning should also take into account the signage required for the event, leading from the front door all the way to the door of the conference room. On the day itself, organizers should allow themselves ample time to set everything up, so that they can later turn their attention to welcoming participants as they arrive. The seminar is held as set out in the transfer concept, where it is described in detail. During the event, attention should be focused on participants and their feedback. Feedback is by no means limited to the feedback questionnaire; in fact it primarily takes the form of body language. Moderators should make notes on this kind of feedback too; the workshop in particular offers them ample opportunity to observe. At the end of the event, once the feedback questionnaires have been completed and collected and the participants have left, all organizers should come together for a short feedback session while details of the day’s events are still fresh in their minds.

2.6 Phase 5: Transfer follow-up

The outcome of the fifth phase is an evaluation both of the transfer’s effectiveness and of the potential for improvement, which is collected in a portfolio. In order to carry out these evaluations, feedback from the fourth phase first has to be collated and analyzed. The effectiveness of the transfer can be extrapolated from these data, as can ways to improve it in future. The merits of the various potential improvements are then evaluated and the ideas collected into a portfolio to facilitate comparison. This portfolio provides a basis for making decisions as to which improvements should be implemented in the future.

Once the seminar is over, participants’ completed feedback questionnaires are available for review. This two-page form (see Figure 20) is completed by each participant over the course of the seminar. The first page is to be filled out at the beginning of the seminar (after the welcome address module); the second page at the end of the seminar. The first page poses three questions: “What are your expectations of this seminar?”, “In your opinion, why should companies network?”, and “How would you rate your current level of knowledge in the area of open innovation business models?” The primary aim of the first question is to identify participants’ specific needs, whereas the third question serves as a starting point.

---

8 Comprehensive checklists for event preparation can be found in RUEDEL, I.: Workshops - Optimal vorbereiten, Spannend inszenieren, Professionell nachbe-reiten. Linde Verlag, Wien, 2008
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from which to discern the transfer’s effectiveness for each participant. A six-point scale from “low”[1] to “high”[6] is used for each person’s assessment of their own level of knowledge.

![Feedback Questionnaire](image)

Figure 20: The feedback questionnaire developed for the seminar

The second page (to be filled out at the end of the seminar) probes to what extent there has been a change in each individual’s level of knowledge. Here, too, each participant uses a six-point scale to indicate whether they have experienced a “large change” or “no change”. If the seminar has brought about a change in the level of knowledge, then it has been effective. The second page of the feedback questionnaire also contains other evaluation questions that can be analyzed as needed (e.g. which modules were among the most interesting). The following presents the evaluated feedback of the validation expert-workshop.

In addition to the potential for improvement, analysis focuses on the evaluation of the transfer’s effectiveness. Figure 21 shows analysis of the feedback collected with the help of experts as part of the validation process.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Have you obtained important information during the workshop? Scale: very good [1] till unsatisfactory [5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. How would you assess your perceived knowledge improvement after the workshop? Scale: small change [1] till major change [6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of transfer-effectiveness
Perceived knowledge improvement (V.) compared to seminar opening (III.)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Evaluation of transfer effectiveness (n=5)

There are four strands (III, IV, V, transfer effectiveness) that make up the analysis. First, the appropriate averages have to be established. The top line gives a percentage; the bottom line shows the number value given within the specified scale. Participants’ evaluation of their own level of knowledge at the beginning of the seminar gives an average of 3.1. This means that at the start of the seminar, participants felt their knowledge in the area of open innovation business models, at 52%, was essentially average. The remaining questions are concerned with the picture after the seminar. Question IV applies to an overall evaluation of the seminar and is graded using a scale of 1[very good] to 5[unsatisfactory]. On this question of whether participants felt the seminar had given them valuable information (satisfying personal and professional expectations), the seminar achieved an average score of 1.7.

The main objective of the knowledge transfer was achieved to a degree of 87%. Question V is concerned with the degree of change in the level of knowledge brought about by the seminar. For all participants, the perceived degree of change averaged at least 50%. In fact, the mean value was 73%, which puts it in the upper tercile between an average and major level of perceived change. Transfer effectiveness is calculated based on the values collected before and after the seminar. This involves correlating the degree of change from question V with the level of knowledge from question III. For instance, Participant 1 estimated their own level of knowledge to be 2.5 at the start of the seminar. The next step is to apply the perceived degree of change, which in Participant 1’s case was 83%, to this initial value of 2.5 to calculate the proportional change in the level of knowledge. On a scale of improvement where the maximum level of knowledge is 6, 83% of 2.5 equates to a perceived change in the level of knowledge of +2.1, meaning Participant 1 has experienced a 35% improvement in their level of knowledge. Transfer effectiveness proved to be notable for all participants, as demonstrated by the positive average of +2.3 (39%) measured against a maximum level of knowledge of 6. Offering follow-up opportunities such as training courses and coaching sessions can serve to raise this value even higher. In order to make a useful comparison, it should be noted that feedback from additional events has to be gathered and analyzed, too. It is also important to note that evaluating human knowledge always gives a subjective result, meaning it is more a question of discerning trends. Now that
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the transfer effectiveness has been evaluated, the next section moves on to the evaluation of the potential for improvement.

Many different areas offer input on possible improvements. In addition to the feedback questionnaire, suggestions for improvement can come in verbal form directly from participants. Ideas for improvement may also be generated by speakers’ personal observations as well as by the final feedback discussion. The following section addresses the procedure for identifying and evaluating the potential for improvement based on the feedback questionnaire; the procedure to follow for ideas from all other sources is almost identical. The main objective in identifying and evaluating the potential for improvement is to create a portfolio that serves as a basis for deciding which ideas for improvement are then to be implemented. Implementing ideas for improvement is the first step in a process of continual improvement. This begins by analyzing the feedback questionnaire, where the relevant questions are numbers I, IV, V and VI. Question I probes participants’ expectations for the seminar at the beginning of the seminar. Should these expectations fail to be met, there should be an assessment of how legitimate they were to begin with. Expectations communicate a significant degree of information on what is actually required and should therefore be taken seriously. In the validation example at hand, participants’ feedback does not indicate that there were any expectations that were not met. Question V assesses where participants’ main focus lies (on theory, practice, or interaction), and measures the extent to which they feel attending the seminar has been beneficial. Here, too, the positive nature of the feedback implies that nothing stands out as needing improvement. The final question on the feedback questionnaire calls for specific instances requiring improvement to be expressed. From the suggestions made there, the following were extracted and defined as potential improvements:

- “The Schuh-Exklusiv GmbH example case was a good choice for the B2C Workshop, but could be supplemented by a further B2B example case. Participants could then choose which example case they want to use in the workshop.”
- “It would be useful to have a checklist with a well-defined procedure to follow for the practical implementation of open innovation in companies. Where do I start when I want to benefit from open innovation?”
- “It would be very helpful to have an outline of the specific costs and resources involved in implementing and applying open innovation methods in companies.”

The evaluation process can begin once suggestions have been converted into potential profiles. The evaluation is a product of the transfer coordinator’s subjective assessment and how frequently a given response occurs on the feedback questionnaire. Both the attractiveness of a potential improvement and its practicability are evaluated, with attractiveness strongly linked to an idea’s usefulness to participants. The level of practicability depends on estimating how difficult an idea is to implement and whether the required knowledge is present. Figure 22 shows an example of a potential profile, containing a brief description, suggestions for how to implement the idea, and the evaluation of the idea by way of its attractiveness and practicability. All ideas evaluated are then collected into a decision-making portfolio. Bringing all the potential ideas into a portfolio facilitates their comparison according to the two criteria of attractiveness and practicability (see Figure 23). The recommended course of action for the validation example at hand is as follows: the first idea requires little effort to implement and should be executed first. The second and third ideas should not be followed-up due to less practicability.

To conclude, it is worth noting that after a knowledge transfer, follow-up events are absolutely necessary to provide for a continuous improvement process. This process is founded on the evaluation of the transfer’s effectiveness, achievement of objectives and improvement potential. In the present validation, no deficits were identified. This method is to be incorporated into seminar series and events as the BMOI research project continues.
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**Figure 22: Example entry in the portfolio of potential profiles**

**Figure 23: Example Decision portfolio**
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

The cross workshop analysis focuses on the evaluation of the transfer’s effectiveness. The aim is to validate how the developed workshop methodology is enabling an appropriate knowledge transfer in all three regions of the BMOI project. The effectiveness or the knowledge transfer expresses how good the different contents - defined within the modules of the transfer concept - as theory, praxis examples and findings from the BMOI project are enabling the participants to create new open business models within the interactive part of the workshop.

3.1 BMOI Workshop in Stuttgart

After having evaluated the workshop methodology in July together with experts of the Fraunhofer Institute for Industrial engineering, the developed workshop methodology was applied first for an external audience with 11 participants on Wednesday 19th September 2012. The workshop took place in a special session during the EURIS dissemination event in Stuttgart “Neue Wege zur Innovation” (New Ways Towards Innovation).

Figure 24 shows the analysis of the feedback collected at the workshop in Stuttgart. There are four strands (III, IV, V, transfer effectiveness) that make up the analysis. First, the appropriate averages have to be established (see detailed evaluation results in Appendix 1: Workshop Stuttgart – Detailed Evaluation Results).

The top line gives a percentage; the bottom line shows the number value given within the specified scale. Participants’ evaluation of their own level of knowledge at the beginning of the seminar gives an average of 3.5. This means that at the start of the seminar, participants felt their knowledge in the area of open innovation business models, at 58%. The remaining questions are concerned with the picture after the seminar. Question IV applies to an overall evaluation of the seminar and is graded using a scale of 1[very good] to 5[unsatisfactory]. On this question of whether participants felt the seminar had given them valuable information (satisfying personal and professional expectations), the seminar achieved an average score of 2.0.

The main objective the open innovation business model knowledge transfer was achieved to a degree of 80%. Question V is concerned with the degree of change in the level of knowledge brought about by the seminar. For all participants, the perceived degree of change is spread regarding single participants, reaching a mean value of about 65%. Transfer effectiveness is calculated based on the values collected before and after the seminar. This involves correlating the degree of change from question V with the level of knowledge from question III. Transfer effectiveness proved to be notable for all participants, as demonstrated by the positive average of +2.3 (38%) measured against a maximum level of knowledge of 6.
### III. How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3 1/2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Have you obtained important information during the workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. How would you assess your perceived knowledge improvement after the workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of transfer-effectiveness**

Perceived knowledge improvement (V.) compared to seminar opening (III.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,75</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 24: Summary evaluation - Stuttgart*
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

Now that the transfer effectiveness has been evaluated, the next section moves on to the evaluation of the potential for improvement.

The main objective in identifying and evaluating the potential for improvement is to create a portfolio that serves as a basis for deciding which ideas for improvement are then to be implemented. This begins by analyzing the feedback questionnaire. Question I probes participants’ expectations for the seminar at the beginning of the seminar. Should these expectations fail to be met, there should be an assessment of how legitimate they were to begin with. Expectations communicate a significant degree of information on what is actually required and should therefore be taken seriously. In the Stuttgart sample at hand, participants’ feedback does not indicate that there were any expectations that were not met (see summary in Table 1: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?).

Question V assesses where participants' main focus lies (on theory, practice, or interaction), and measures the extent to which they feel attending the seminar has been beneficial (see Table 5: How would you assess your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?). Here, too, the positive nature of the feedback implies that nothing stands out as needing improvement. The final question on the feedback questionnaire calls for specific instances requiring improvement to be expressed (see Table 4: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?). From the suggestions made there, the following where extracted and evaluated as two potential improvements within workshops together with experts from the Fraunhofer Society.

1. “More focusing on single methods”
2. “Contact details of other workshop participants, provision of slides and provision of further information material/sources”

Both the attractiveness of a potential improvement and its practicability are evaluated. The attractiveness is strongly linked to the idea's usefulness to participants. The level of practicability depends on estimating how difficult an idea is to implement and whether the required knowledge is present. Figure 25 and Figure 26 are showing and describing the evaluated potential for improving the workshop methodology identified for the workshop in Germany.

The ideas of the evaluated Stuttgart Workshop are pictured within the decision portfolio in Figure 27. Bringing the potential ideas into a portfolio facilitates their comparison according to the two criteria of attractiveness and practicability.

The recommended course of action for the validation example at hand is as follows:
Both suggestions have got a high implementation priority as they are located in the upper right third of the portfolio and will be therewith applied within the next Stuttgart workshop, they are also generally recommended.
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

**Potential Profile (1/2)**

**Description**
Within the presentation a overview of single Open Innovation methods where given and for each method a description profile where developed. Due to limited time not all methods could have been discussed in detail.

**Approach**
An extension of the second module “Linked to Innovation - Introduction” would allow a detailed discussion of single methods but would also extend the whole workshop duration. While configuring the transfer concept it principally has to be decided if there should be set focus on.

**Evaluation**

![Evaluation Chart]

Attractiveness: 2.0
Practicability: 2.2

---

**Potential Profile (2/2)**

**Description**
Especially in the interactive part of the workshop participants are discussing and exchanging ideas. In order to enable a better networking it was suggested to provide contact details of other participants. For enhancing the knowledge base and to review information the provision of slides and further information material/sources was requested.

**Approach**
In order to guarantee privacy the approach is to collect business cards for those willing to exchange contact details or do want to get slides or further information material/sources. As slides are already created and further material/sources are already identified this potential is very practicable to exploit.

**Evaluation**

![Evaluation Chart]

Attractiveness: 1.5
Practicability: 3.0

---

Figure 25: Potential Profile Stuttgart 1

Figure 26: Potential Profile Stuttgart 2
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

3.2 BMOI Workshop in Eindhoven

Figure 28 shows the analysis of the feedback collected at the workshop in Eindhoven on Tuesday 23rd October 2012. In Eindhoven the same feedback scheme was applied as in Stuttgart and so there are four strands (III, IV, V, transfer effectiveness) that make up the analysis. First, the appropriate averages have to be established (see detailed evaluation results in Appendix 2: Workshop Eindhoven – Detailed Evaluation Results).

The top line gives a percentage; the bottom line shows the number value given within the specified scale. Participants' evaluation of their own level of knowledge at the beginning of the seminar gives an average of 3.8. This means that at the start of the seminar, participants felt their knowledge in the area of open innovation business models, at 64%. The remaining questions are concerned with the picture after the seminar. Question IV applies to an overall evaluation of the seminar and is graded using a scale of 1[very good] to 5[unsatisfactory]. On this question of whether participants felt the seminar had given them valuable information (satisfying personal and professional expectations), the seminar achieved an average score of 2.1.

The main objective the open innovation business model knowledge transfer was achieved to a degree of 78%. Question V is concerned with the degree of change in the level of knowledge brought about by the seminar. For all participants, the perceived degree of change is varying regarding single participants, reaching a mean value of about 68%. Transfer effectiveness is calculated based on the values collected before and after the seminar. This involves correlating the degree of change from question V with the level of knowledge from question III.
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

Transfer effectiveness proved to be notable for all participants, as demonstrated by the positive average of 2.5 (41%) measured against a maximum level of knowledge of 6.

After the transfer effectiveness has been evaluated, the next section is on to the evaluation of the potential for improvement.

Portfolios are created in order to identify and to evaluate the potential for improvement that serves as a basis for deciding which ideas for improvement are then to be implemented. This begins by analyzing the feedback questionnaire. Question 1 probes participants’ expectations for the seminar at the beginning of the seminar. Should these expectations fail to be met, there should be an assessment of how legitimate they were to begin with. Expectations communicate a significant degree of information on what is actually required and should therefore be taken seriously. In the Eindhoven sample at hand, participants’ feedback does not indicate that there were any expectations that were not met (Table 6: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?).

Question V assesses where participants’ main focus lies (on theory, practice, or interaction), and measures the extent to which they feel attending the seminar has been beneficial (see Table 10: How would you asses your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?). Here, too, the positive nature of the feedback implies that nothing stands out as needing improvement. The final question on the feedback questionnaire calls for specific instances requiring improvement to be expressed (see Table 9: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?). From the suggestions made there, the following where extracted and evaluated potential improvements within workshops together with experts from the Fraunhofer Society:

1. “Practical approaches in theoretical part and more best practices“
2. “More insights on alliances and emphasis on open innovation in business model“
4. “Strategic driver of open innovation “
5. “Supply the list of participants“

Both the attractiveness of a potential improvement and its practicability are evaluated. The attractiveness is strongly linked to the idea’s usefulness to participants. The level of practicability depends on estimating how difficult an idea is to implement and whether the required knowledge is present. Figure 29 till Figure 32 are showing and describing the evaluated potential for improving the workshop methodology identified for the workshop in Eindhoven.

The ideas of the evaluated Eindhoven Workshop are pictured within the decision portfolio in Figure 33. Brining the potential ideas into a portfolio facilitates their comparison according to the two criteria of attractiveness and practicability.

The recommended course of action for the validation example at hand is as follows: The second idea has got a high attractiveness and a medium-high practicability and should be regarded for the next course of workshops. Also the first suggestions should be taken into account. The third and fourth idea is not recommended to follow-up. The fifth suggestion was already positively evaluated for the Stuttgart workshop and is therewith also recommended.
### 3. Cross Workshop Analysis

#### II. How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Person 12</th>
<th>Person 13</th>
<th>Person 14</th>
<th>Person 15</th>
<th>Person 16</th>
<th>Person 17</th>
<th>Person 18</th>
<th>Person 19</th>
<th>Person 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV. Have you obtained important information during the workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Person 12</th>
<th>Person 13</th>
<th>Person 14</th>
<th>Person 15</th>
<th>Person 16</th>
<th>Person 17</th>
<th>Person 18</th>
<th>Person 19</th>
<th>Person 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### V. How would you assess your perceived knowledge improvement after the workshop?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Person 12</th>
<th>Person 13</th>
<th>Person 14</th>
<th>Person 15</th>
<th>Person 16</th>
<th>Person 17</th>
<th>Person 18</th>
<th>Person 19</th>
<th>Person 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation of transfer-effectiveness

Perceived knowledge improvement (V.) compared to seminar opening (III.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Person 12</th>
<th>Person 13</th>
<th>Person 14</th>
<th>Person 15</th>
<th>Person 16</th>
<th>Person 17</th>
<th>Person 18</th>
<th>Person 19</th>
<th>Person 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 28: Summary evaluation - Eindhoven
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

**Potential Profile (1/4)**

"Practical approaches in theoretical part and more best practices”

**Description**

The workshop concept contains among others a theoretical part to provide basic knowledge and a practical part where the BMOI use cases are presented. Additionally there is an external speaker presenting an industrial use case.

**Evaluation**

![Evaluation Chart](chart1)

**Approach**

The workshop concept concentrates to present the BMOI use cases with the corresponding findings as best practices could be found in various publications. Even there is already a quantity of practical approaches included in the workshop one have to respect this suggestion.

![Approach Chart](chart2)

---

**Potential Profile (2/4)**

"More insights on alliances and emphasis on open innovation in business model”

**Description**

Open Innovation Business Models are described with the help of the business model canvas in a holistic way, regarding all relevant building blocks. One building block is “key partners” which constitutes the most relevant part of a business model with regard to open innovation as it describes with whom the company forms an alliance.

**Evaluation**

![Evaluation Chart](chart3)

**Approach**

Even some methods are describing how to set up an alliance a strengthened focus could be set on this issue as it stands in the center of Open Innovation Business Models. As this suggestion would bring added value the attractiveness is evaluated high (2.5) and the practicability medium-high (2.5).

![Approach Chart](chart4)
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

**Figure 31: Potential Profile Eindhoven 3**

**Potential Profile (3/4)**

*Description*
Various findings of the BMOI use cases are including among others causes of success and failure. These findings are more on a general level as they depend on the peculiarities of the company acting in its specific context.

*Approach*
A detailed description of success factors compared to a general description is evaluated with a very high attractiveness (3.0). As detailed success factors are company depended the practicability is evaluated low (0.5).

**Figure 32: Potential Profile Eindhoven 4**

**Potential Profile (4/4)**

*Description*
Whether a company deploys open innovation or not depends on various drivers. These could be founded among others due to the need of competences not available or due to strategic decisions. A further important aspect is the fit with the prevailing corporate culture.

*Approach*
As the workshop concept includes the theoretical part explaining pros, cons and limits of open innovation the strategic drivers considering why to deploy open innovation are explained in a coherent way. Therefore the attractiveness is evaluated low (0.5) and the practicability high (2.5).
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

Figure 33: Decision Portfolio Eindhoven

3.3 BMOI Workshop in Navarra

Figure 24 shows the analysis of the feedback collected at the workshop in Navarra in October. Also in Navarra the same evaluation scheme were applied. So the same four strands (III, IV, V, transfer effectiveness) make up the analysis. First the appropriate averages have to be established (see detailed evaluation results in Appendix 3: Workshop Navarra – Detailed Evaluation Results). The top line gives a percentage; the bottom line shows the number value given within the specified scale. Participants’ evaluation of their own level of knowledge at the beginning of the seminar gives an average of 3.6. This means that at the start of the seminar, participants felt their knowledge in the area of open innovation business models, at 60%. The remaining questions are concerned with the picture after the seminar. Question IV applies to an overall evaluation of the seminar and is graded using a scale of 1[very good] to 5[unsatisfactory]. On this question of whether participants felt the seminar had given them valuable information (satisfying personal and professional expectations), the seminar achieved an average score of 2.1.

The main objective the open innovation business model knowledge transfer was achieved to a degree of 78%. Question V is concerned with the degree of change in the level of knowledge brought about by the seminar. For all participants, the perceived degree of change is spread regarding single participants, reaching a mean value of about 70%. Transfer effectiveness is calculated based on the values collected before and after the seminar. This involves correlating the degree of change from question V with the level of knowledge from question III. Transfer effectiveness proved to be notable for all participants, as demonstrated by the positive average of +2.5 (41%) measured against a maximum level of knowledge of 6.
3. Cross Workshop Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person 1</th>
<th>Person 2</th>
<th>Person 3</th>
<th>Person 4</th>
<th>Person 5</th>
<th>Person 6</th>
<th>Person 7</th>
<th>Person 8</th>
<th>Person 9</th>
<th>Person 10</th>
<th>Person 11</th>
<th>Person 12</th>
<th>Person 13</th>
<th>Person 14</th>
<th>Person 15</th>
<th>Person 16</th>
<th>Person 17</th>
<th>Person 18</th>
<th>Person 19</th>
<th>Person 20</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?**

| 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 |

| 42% | 75% | 56% | 33% | 33% | 50% | 83% | 67% | 58% | 83% | 75% | 87% | 83% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 33% | 60% |

**IV. Have you obtained important information during the workshop?**

| 60% | 100% | 93% | 67% | 67% | 80% | 100% | 73% | 100% | 87% | 53% | 93% | 40% | 80% | 80% | 87% | 67% | 80% | 73% | 87% | 78% |

| 60% | 100% | 93% | 67% | 67% | 80% | 100% | 73% | 100% | 87% | 53% | 93% | 40% | 80% | 80% | 87% | 67% | 80% | 73% | 87% | 78% |

**V. How would you assess your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?**

| 50% | 83% | 83% | 100% | 83% | 67% | 33% | 67% | 83% | 100% | 67% | 67% | 17% | 83% | 67% | 67% | 50% | 83% | 67% | 83% | 70% |

| 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 8.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 4.2 |

**Evaluation of transfer-effectiveness**
Perceived knowledge improvement (V.) compared to seminar opening (III.)

| 21% | 63% | 49% | 33% | 28% | 33% | 28% | 44% | 49% | 83% | 50% | 44% | 14% | 28% | 39% | 50% | 33% | 28% | 44% | 58% | 41% |

| 1.3 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 5.8 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 4.4 |

Figure 34: Summary evaluation - Navarra
After the transfer effectiveness has been evaluated, the next section moves on to the evaluation of the potential for improvement.

To identify and evaluate the potential for improvement also for Navarra portfolios had been created that serves as a basis for deciding which ideas for improvement are then to be implemented. This begins by analyzing the feedback questionnaire. Question I probes participants’ expectations for the seminar at the beginning of the seminar. Should these expectations fail to be met, there should be an assessment of how legitimate they were to begin with. Expectations communicate a significant degree of information on what is actually required and should therefore be taken seriously. Also in the Navarra sample at hand, participants’ feedback does not indicate that there were any expectations that were not met (see Table 11: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?).

Question V assesses where participants’ main focus lies (on theory, practice, or interaction), and measures the extent to which they feel attending the seminar has been beneficial (see Table 15: How would you assess your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?). Here, too, the positive nature of the feedback implies that nothing stands out as needing improvement. The final question on the feedback questionnaire calls for specific instances requiring improvement to be expressed (see Table 14: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?). From the suggestions made there, the following where extracted and evaluated as potential improvements within workshops together with experts from the Fraunhofer Society.

1. “More examples of the practical cases”
2. “More specific explanations regarding the tools to implement Open Innovation”
3. “More time for the interactive workshop”

Both the attractiveness of a potential improvement and its practicability are evaluated. The attractiveness is strongly linked to the idea’s usefulness to participants. The level of practicability depends on estimating how difficult an idea is to implement and whether the required knowledge is present. Potential improvement 1) and 2) are already positively evaluated in the profiles for the workshops in Stuttgart and Eindhoven. The suggestion is to include both while setting-up the next course of workshops.

Figure 35 is showing and describing the third evaluated potential for improving the workshop methodology identified for the workshop in Navarra. The idea of the evaluated Navarra Workshop is pictured within the decision portfolio in Figure 36.

The recommended course of action for the validation example at hand is as follows: The idea has got a high attractiveness and requires low effort to implement and should be executed.
Figure 35: Potential Profile Navarra

Figure 36: Decision portfolio Navarra
4. Conclusions and summary

Applying this method makes it possible to actively transfer knowledge of open innovation business models to companies, boosting their potential for innovation. In a future knowledge society, the most highly prized transfer will be of knowledge itself. Organizers of such knowledge transfers will find this method systematically supports them in planning, carrying out and following up on their transfer. Developed along interdisciplinary lines, the method employs scientific findings and models drawn from the areas of engineering, economics and the humanities. The method presented here entirely satisfies the requirements set, and its application clearly demonstrates its suitability for practical uses.

Comparing the main workshop evaluation results there are no major deviations between the three regions Stuttgart, Eindhoven and Navarra. The Participants' evaluation of their own level of knowledge in the area of open innovation business models at the beginning of the seminar is in all three regions of around 60%. All workshops received an overall grade of 2 [good] evaluating if the participants felt the seminar had given them valuable information. The main objective the open innovation business model knowledge transfer was achieved to a degree of 79% in average. For all three regions, the perceived degree of knowledge improvement reaching values between 65% and 70%. Transfer effectiveness proved to be notable for all regions, as demonstrated by the positive average of +2.4 (40%) measured against a maximum level of knowledge of 6.

That means no substantial methodological improvements must be carried out. For further application of the method it is recommended to implement the five positively evaluated improvement potentials, listed as follows:

- „More focusing on single methods“
- „Contact details of other workshop participants, provision of slides and provision of further information material/sources“
- „Practical approaches in theoretical part and more best practices“
- „More insights on alliances and emphasis on open innovation in business model“
- „More time for the interactive workshop“

Open innovation is currently providing research institutes with enormous potential in the area of business model development. Companies that are increasingly opening up their innovation processes in order to gather information on solutions are focused on absorbing only the best information available. Research institutes can highlight their attractiveness in this regard by offering the right range of services. Regular seminars, workshops and training courses can lead to more effective application of the ever-growing store of research findings. New contacts are being made and connectivity is growing in the region. Within this context, it will be interesting to see how research institutes design future business models. Systematic development of new collaborative business models generates potential based on an alliance of science and industry.
Appendix

Appendix 1: Workshop Stuttgart – Detailed Evaluation Results

Table 1: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “Exchange of information about existing OI business models”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Comparing approach with own approach of EU-Open Alps project”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “Built up network/cooperation with other interesting players within region Stuttgart, dealing with OI”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Learning about OI best practices/methods/experiences and getting theoretical input”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “Experiences about Evaluation of OI processes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) “What are obstacles, and reasons for failing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) “How companies deal with OI and IP”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?

Knowledge with regard to Open Innovation before the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 3,8</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge with regard to Business Models before the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 3,1</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Have you obtained important information during the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilled expectations</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,0</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a personal point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,2</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a professional point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,0</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions for improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “More focusing on single methods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Contact details of other workshop participants”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “Providing PowerPoint slides”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Providing further information material/sources”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recognized degree of improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 3.9</td>
<td>![Diagram allocation]</td>
<td>![Diagram percentage]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>![Diagram allocation]</td>
<td>![Diagram percentage]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contribution through module “Basics and Research Results”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.3</td>
<td>![Diagram allocation]</td>
<td>![Diagram average]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contribution through module “Practice-based Contribution of the Industry”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.0</td>
<td>![Diagram allocation]</td>
<td>![Diagram average]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Contribution through module “Workshop & Interaction”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 1.6</td>
<td>![Diagram allocation]</td>
<td>![Diagram average]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2: Workshop Eindhoven – Detailed Evaluation Results

### Table 6: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “Ideas that I can apply in projects / collaborations”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Theoretical framework of Open Business Models”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “New and practical cases on developing usable business models for Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Practical cases”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “Insight on the impact of OI on Business Models and the innovation process”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) “Methods to realize OI in practice”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) “Repeating the Canvas method”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) “New academic insights”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) “Benchmarking workshop styles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?

#### Knowledge with regard to Open Innovation before the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 3.9</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Knowledge with regard to Business Models before the workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 3.8</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8: Have you obtained important information during the workshop?

Fulfilled expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.2</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a personal point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 1.9</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a professional point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?

Suggestions for improvement

1) “Presentation of a best practice case”
2) “Give more insights on alliances”
3) “Provide detailed causes of success”
4) “Theoretical part: more practical approach with examples”
5) “Strategic driver (aims and needs) for open innovation”
6) “More emphasis the role of open innovation in business model innovation”
7) “Supply the list of participants”
### Table 10: How would you assess your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognized degree of improvement</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 4,1</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution through module “Basics and Research Results”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,5</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution through module “Practice-based Contribution of the Industry”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 1,8</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution through module “Workshop & Interaction”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 1,5</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Workshop Navarra – Detailed Evaluation Results

Table 11: What do you expect of the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) &quot;To participate in interactive dynamics&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) &quot;To be clear about what Open Innovation is&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) &quot;To learn from results and real experiences about Open Innovation application&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) &quot;To learn about Open Innovation tools to transform a Business Model&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) &quot;To get familiar with the concept Open Innovation and with the concept of Business Model change. To learn from real experiences about key aspects for OI success&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) &quot;To get familiar with the Open Innovation and its practical application&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) &quot;To learn from real case examples of Business Model change thanks to Open Innovation&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) &quot;To learn about Open Innovation and get to know real cases from Navarra&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: How would you assess your knowledge before the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge with regard to Open Innovation before the workshop</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø 3,2</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge with regard to Business Models before the workshop</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø 4,1</td>
<td><img src="chart3.png" alt="" /></td>
<td><img src="chart4.png" alt="" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Have you obtained important information during the workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilled expectations</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø 2,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a personal point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,2</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of provided knowledge from a professional point of view

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2,2</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Have you got any suggestions for improving our workshop?

Suggestions for improvement

1) “The interactive workshop part should have taken longer time”
2) “More examples of the practical cases”
3) “More specific explanations regarding the tools to implement OI”
Table 15: How would you assess your knowledge after the EURIS workshop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognized degree of improvement</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 4.2</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution through module “Basics and Research Results”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution through module “Practice-based Contribution of the Industry”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 2.1</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution through module “Workshop & Interaction”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Diagram - allocation</th>
<th>Diagram - average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø 1.7</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>