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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Business Modelling Workshops (BMW) were designed to explore the business potential of the best ideas emerging from the thematic hackathons, in order to evaluate which were most suitable for progression through to the intensive Incubation phase.

At each of the six hackathons, three winning teams were selected based on three criteria: use/re-use of digital cultural heritage; potential for job creation; and likelihood of success\(^1\). Deliverable 5.4 - Selection Criteria and Incubation Planning - provides for a full overview of the selection criteria\(^2\). By bringing these three teams together for a one-day workshop in London, full discussions could take place to assess the merits of their idea and the individual team members, to identify the single idea with the most potential to proceed through to the Incubation stage.

The workshops were initially entitled ‘Monetisation Workshops’, to emphasise the importance of developing sustainable business models for the creative enterprises. However, early in the process the project team received substantial feedback from hackathon participants and project partners that this placed too great an emphasis on the commercial objectives of the enterprises. There was a general sense that their motives for engaging with the project were complex, interweaving cultural and commercial objectives, personal development and social impact.

Rather than dissuade the very participants such a workshop was designed to support, the decision was taken to rename it to the Business Modelling Workshop. Whilst this still placed a significant emphasis on commercial viability, it allowed us to market the process of hackathons, Workshops and Incubation as supporting financial sustainability – a subtle change in emphasis where the goal was to create a financially self-supporting enterprise rather than necessarily chase profits.

The subtle change in emphasis made it easier to convince participants of the benefits of the workshop for them, although extensive contextualisation, examples and individual support were required at the hackathon stage to ensure participants’ outcomes were fit for purpose to be able to be further developed at the BMW stage.

Participants of the BMW were told that although the one-day session will not be enough to answer every detail of their potential enterprise, the broad sketches of ideas and opportunities developed during the course of the day would enable a successful team to be selected to progress through to the intensive Incubation process where more detail could be added.

\(^1\) Success is defined as having a business model and method that has a validated likelihood of generating financial income and sustainability.

2 INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview and investigation of the seven Business Modelling Workshops (formerly named Monetisation Workshops) organized by Remix (formerly Culture Label) as part of the Europeana Space project. These workshops served as a second step within the WP5 workflow to ensure that the best candidates proceeded onto Incubation and thus had the strongest chance of offering market-ready products by the end of the project’s duration.

2.1 BACKGROUND

This deliverable is essential for the explanation of work done by WP5 as the Business Modelling Workshops served as the middle tier in the WP5 three-tier process. The objective of this tiered process was to ensure the project had the highest chance of achieving its goals of incubating six market-ready products. The first tier was the hackathons, and the third tier was the Incubation process. This deliverable and aspect of the project was considered of paramount importance by the Project Officer at the Europeana Space kick-off meeting where he noted that the project must

“Increase substantially the use and re-use of cultural heritage resources (and in particular those available through Europeana) by creative industries, organisations and individuals and bring out the economic potential of digitisation actions in Europe through innovative applications and services.”

The Business Modelling Workshops is key for ensuring that the re-use products created during the project have the strongest potential for generating financial gains.

2.2 ROLE OF THIS DELIVERABLE IN THE PROJECT

As aforementioned, this deliverable details the transition and decision making processes as the three winners from each hackathon were evaluated ahead of one being selected to reach the Incubation stage. Choices and decisions are justified based on the results from the Business Modelling Workshops organized and run by Remix. The work undertaken contributed greatly to the overall goals of the project, which were to show how creative re-use of digitised cultural heritage material can generate market-viable products, which have sustainable business models.

There are several necessary inputs that were needed for this deliverable, including the actions and results from all the hackathons and more importantly the participation of the hackathon winners to continue their journey further and be willing and open to have their ideas challenged, pushed and changed for the sake of success.

Furthermore deliverable D5.4 - Selection criteria and Incubation planning - is integral for understanding this document as it clarifies which aspects business modelling workshop participants are being assessed on. The selection criteria used to identify teams to progress to the Incubation phase is replicated here as an appendix. D5.2 – Hackathons Report – also provides context for the teams that have reached the BMW stage.
This deliverable feeds directly into D5.5 – *Enterprise Development Report* - which will cover the incubation process and final results for the selected teams.

### 2.3 APPROACH

The work for this task was carried out predominantly by Remix with assistance from Work Package 5 Leader NISV, with further advice and participation from various partners within the project. Remix handled all logistical and hands-on work including professional assessment of the projects. NISV handled logistics within the project and managed problems that arose along with Project Manager, COVUNI. Other project partners either provided feedback during planning or plenary assessments, legal counsel, or in physical attendance of the BMWs.

The first Workshop was held months before any of the others. The TV hackathon had been brought forward to act as a pathfinder to learn lessons which would be shared with those hackathons that followed. The BMW moved forward in parallel with the hackathon and similarly benefitted by experimenting with ideas that were developed further for the later Workshops.

A key metric and tool used for this part of the project was the Business Model Canvas\(^3\). The project also looked towards other creative re-use projects such as Europeana Creative and Apps4Europe for guidance and took into account lessons learned. There was immediate value derived here due to the partner cross-overs between the multiple projects. Remix themselves have published several books on the topic of innovation, business models and re-use between the creative and cultural sector which are all made available for free.\(^4\)

### 2.4 STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT

This document begins with an overview of the format of the Business Modelling Workshops and how they came into being. This is followed by a presentation and analysis of the participants and assessment of their projects. Next is an explanation for why the project had a specific BMW for the pilots and demonstrators and the results from said event. The document concludes with a lessons learned section and the presentation of the final list of projects that have moved on to incubation.

---

\(^3\) [https://strategyzer.com/canvas/business-model-canvas](https://strategyzer.com/canvas/business-model-canvas)

3 DEVELOPING THE BUSINESS MODELLING PROCESS

3.1 CONCEPTION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE PROJECT

The Business Modelling Workshops were an integral part of the Europeana Space project to show how value and sustainable business models could be derived from innovative and creative re-use of digital cultural heritage assets.

The original description outlined the events focusing on the six thematic areas of the project with 10-20 participants that would take into account the creative applications that were explored in the pilots and then the hackathons.

The interpretation of this description was left at the behest of the WP5 Task Leader, Remix and WP5 leader, NISV and Project Coordinator, COVUNI. It was decided, as part of the three tier workflow described in D5.4 - *Selection criteria and Incubation planning* - and D5.2 – *Hackathons report* - that these Business Modelling Workshops would best serve the project by being an intensive workshop for the hackathon outcomes rather than an open conference that generically and broadly explored business modelling. This was determined by remaining focused on the goals of WP5 which were to source, incubate and launch 6 projects that are market viable and capable of being self-sustaining.

Each Business Modelling Workshop was open to the project consortium, but it was stressed by the WP5 Task Leaders that the focus of the workshop would be on the three hackathon winners and not the partners’ respective needs. A need was felt to serve the hackathon winners with the best consultation possible to ensure that their ideas were fostered and enriched through the expertise of the project consortium. Thus, in addition to the attendance of the hackathon winners, Business Modelling Workshops were attended by partners from the OCC, UNEXE, COVUNI and NISV.

3.2 BUDGET REALLOCATION AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF INCENTIVISING HACKATHON PARTICIPATION

One of the debates held within the WP5 team when designing the process from hackathons to Business Modelling Workshops to Incubation was the lack of incentive that the hackathon provided in terms of prizes. Many hackathons will offer a cash prize or physical awards like new technologies. In their initial design the Europeana Space hackathons only offered Incubation from Remix and support from the Europeana Space consortium. The project felt that this was not a strong enough incentive as to many audiences, the Europeana Space project, consortium and Remix were unknown, thus lacking any sort of recognisable brand or quality identification that a company like IBM, for instance, would have.
Thus one of the motivations for re-structuring the BMWs was to add an extra level of enticement for possible participants. So now the prizes were a Business Modelling Workshop in London hosted by Remix and Incubation support for the strongest team after the BMW.

However, how these winning teams were supposed to get to London, one of Europe’s most expensive cities, raised new questions. The project was targeting young students or start-ups for the hackathons, two demographics notoriously low on disposable income. It was therefore felt that offering the prize of a Business Modelling Workshop in London then became less of a prize and more of a financial burden therefore making it a disincentive.

It was then proposed by NISV that the three winning hackathon teams be awarded a paid trip to London for the workshop. Various figures were estimated and in the end it was decided that paying for a flight and one night accommodation for one team representative for each of the three winning teams was feasible considering the Business Modelling Workshop budget of 4,000 Euro each.

After this long-standing debate and process, the hackathons were able to promote a prize of a paid trip to London for an intensive Business Modelling Workshop hosted by Remix. Many teams sent more than one representative, with other members paying for their own expenses; this showed a strong level of commitment and desire to pursue their ideas further.

Between the hackathon and BMW, each team was set further questions based on the jury comments from the hackathon to help them prepare for the day.
4 BUSINESS MODELING WORKSHOPS AT A GLANCE

4.1 STRUCTURE OF THE BUSINESS MODELING WORKSHOPS

The workshops were organised around two main sections: Creating Value and Resourcing Value Creation.

The first half of the day focused on identifying, testing and refining the core value proposition of the teams’ ideas. This provided the judges with a clear summary of what was being proposed, given the often extensive changes to the idea that arose as a result of this process. The first exercise encouraged participants to think broadly about the importance of their communication strategies. Participants were asked to introduce themselves to the others through a Visual Storytelling exercise, which prioritised a few strong images and trigger words they wanted to convey. If the participant couldn’t see the image, they were able to convey it to their listeners: feeding images for the listener to feast on.

Participants were then walked through a short introduction to branding, with specific attention on the role of communicating brand purpose. This was prepared by the communications agency Wolff Olins for Remix. Three broad principles were identified: the importance of brand to show an idea that you stand for, creating a better reality; creating a sense of self-identity and belonging; and providing a platform for action. Participants were then introduced to the Brand Butterfly Tool, an exercise that encouraged them to think about the intersection between ‘What does the world need?’ and ‘What makes you special?’ that is, between consumer trends and cultural assets.

4.2 IDENTIFYING AND DERIVING VALUE FROM THE PROJECTS

Much of the value derived from Remix delivering this workshop was the reflective feedback that can be provided to participants by specialist facilitators across a broad range of entrepreneurial topics and insights. Remix brings a unique combination of skills and knowledge as a result of trend scouting for current cultural and creative innovations; selecting and incubating creative businesses; and hands-on experience in the practical realities of successfully guiding a creative start-up through bootstrapping, investment and growth. Throughout the exercises participants were extensively challenged to prove and rethink their assumptions, reshape their approaches, and constantly evaluate alternative options in an effort to place consumers at the heart of their idea.

Once a general direction had been set for each team proposition, the second half of the day then considered the business model required for that idea to be successful. The Business Model Canvas was used as a useful summary to specifically introduce the relationship between target audiences, value propositions and finances (revenue and cost models). The emphasis of this exercise was to quickly summarise their assumptions for each of these elements in order to open an extended discussion to evaluate them. Once again, the objective was to provide reflective feedback from the moderators and other workshop participants to help challenge, test and improve the idea.
Depending on the stage that each team was at with their idea development, additional questions were introduced to consider issues such as churn rates, margins and predictability of revenues. For the majority of teams, the BMW was too early for this level of development: most needed time, space and feedback to hone their core propositions, target audiences and sources of financial sustainability.

4.3 CONCLUDING THE WORKSHOP AND FOLLOW-UP WORK

At the end of the workshop, participants were reminded of the tools provided including Visual Storytelling, Brand Butterfly and Business Model Canvas. They were asked to submit a written summary in their preferred format of how they wished to develop their idea going forwards. This was a valuable opportunity for participants to adapt their ideas based on the workshop feedback, and give us a clear sense of how they were likely to approach engaging with the rigours of the Incubation process (e.g. speed and quality of response, level of self-reflection, response to feedback, etc.).

Figure 1 Business Model Canvas
5 PARTICIPANTS, EVALUATIONS AND OUTCOMES

This section lists all the Business Modelling Workshops held by Remix, the participants and assessments of their ideas by the end of the BMW process.

5.1 WORKSHOP 1: 26 JUNE 2015 (TV)

Teams from Art(f)inder, Bosch and Mnemosyne attended this workshop having been the three winners at the TV hackathon. The concepts of each team are described in D5.2 – Hackathons Report. After deliberation the following two were subsequently eliminated:

5.1.1 Art(f)inder
Although this simplicity and strength of the concept and interface were good, given the limited time available for Incubation it was decided that the necessary support would not be sufficient to overcome the considerable issues relating to revenue, competition and logistics. There was a high risk attached to the likelihood of reaching a significant number of users, especially in the highly competitive landscape of visitor apps. Reaching enough users to create a critical mass is particularly difficult for apps with single uses (in this case, only art galleries). Furthermore, creating a two-sided marketplace of this kind is a sizable undertaking, with resource required for identifying, partnering with and managing destinations as well as consumer marketing. This is on top of core functions such as technical development, which was a skillset currently unavailable in the team. Given the reservations around revenue potential (and user uptake), it seems a very significant amount of work for an outcome that may or may not succeed.
5.1.2 Bosch (Artvoice)
The idea was strong, and as long as the team maintained a focus on applied business cases (e.g. art criticism, education, etc.) there is a good chance it could work. However, the main challenge for this idea was creating a sustainable revenue model. Although it may be entirely feasible to create a platform, which includes paid-for content or subscriptions, the big danger is that it turns into a one-off experience for users and thereby prohibits any meaningful recurring revenue sources. The platform in principle could be relatively straightforward to create, and it may lean well towards further R&D or a publicly-funded grant to test the concept and gauge user reactions. In comparison with the final team, however, it was felt that the likelihood of success was lower given the high degree of competition and difficulty in achieving sustainable revenue sources.

5.1.3 We Make Known
It was therefore decided to proceed into Incubation with We Make Known (formerly Mnemosyne), a product to improve the cultural heritage browsing experience and encourage serendipitous discovery. The product simply uses a “seven layers of separation” methodology that would allow users to harness linked data and curatorial knowledge to uncover more information and works related to one specific work.

Although there was still significant risk that a fully-functioning prototype hadn't yet been developed, it had a reasonably strong team complete with technical know-how. It was concluded that, providing the technology was fully developed, the main requirements were to develop a solid set of application or use cases plus effective packaging. Furthermore, given the B2B nature of the product, a clear cut scenario can be quickly reached to determine market demand from institutions.

A blog recapping the workshop can be found at: http://www.digitalmeetsculture.net/article/first-business-modeling-workshop-of-europeana-space/

5.2 WORKSHOP 2: 15 JANUARY 2016 (DANCE)

This BMW highlighted some of the challenges that emerge from the hackathon model, as the appetite of entrants in the hackathon for developing a sustainable enterprise based on Dance was extremely limited, thereby seriously restricting options for the BMW process. Only two teams attended the BMW as one team, Subtle Dance that focussed on dance performances with Kinect, decided to withdraw from the process immediately before the workshop.

One of the teams, In the Moment, was looking to explore interactive stereo3D virtual space but struggled to convert this into a tangible product or service for further development in Incubation. Despite very strong guidance throughout the BMW, their model unfortunately did not evolve further beyond a research interest, and as a result was deemed unsuitable for further progression.
5.2.1 Nous
The third and winning team, Nous, had a product concept of a platform utilising new BCI (Brain Computer Interface) and EEG (Electroencephalography - measures brain activity) technologies to measure brain activity and thereby understand how users subconsciously react and perceive art works as a method for institutes to change their curation and exhibition (online and offline) work processes. However, the technology and R&D needed for it to be effectively deployed is out of the scope of E-Space Incubation as it is based on creating a software model to map brainwaves against emotions. Whilst the technology may be out of scope, the concept could easily be applied to cultural heritage environments and a significant element of its development relates to refining and testing a proposition and building community engagement in advance of launching.

The Project Board (including all the WP Leaders, Project Manager, Project Coordinator, Technical Coordinator) debated the outcomes of this workshop. The Project Coordinator and WP3 Leader, who had both attended the workshop, contributed to the decision, alongside Remix and the WP5 Leader, to proceed with team Nous into Incubation, on the understanding that technical support was out of scope in the Incubation.

5.3 WORKSHOP 3: 4 MARCH 2016 (OPEN AND HYBRID PUBLISHING)

Three teams attended following the Publishing hackathon, with two eliminated:

5.3.1 Sink A Future
Sink a Future required an interesting adaption of the workshop process to reflect its mission relating to social action. Rather than monetisation objectives, the emphasis evolved to explore audience engagement and reaching the critical mass necessary to effect change. However, despite this structure offered to them, the team struggled to balance their artistic motivations with the need to build an audience. They therefore decided to withdraw from the process after the workshop.

5.3.2 Cook-Lee
Cook-Lee was judged to have strong market potential riding on trends in art/food and the very popular area of foodie gifts, but potentially suffered from an over-complicated product, incorporating app, tech-enabled apron and book. It was concluded that to succeed in the gifting market, the idea would need major simplification (e.g. limiting to book and apron), as well as realistic pricing. The team were unfortunately unable to adapt accordingly to this feedback. A final consideration was their heavy reliance on exceptional editorial quality, but with no content samples provided, this made the option extremely high risk and as such it was decided not to proceed with them into Incubation.

5.3.3 Vivi.io
The winning team, Vivi.io, aims to create the best digital and print editions of literary classics. It does so by editorially mining content from the book, making it available to readers and creators in a best-of-breed book in browser format - the digital reading environment in which a user can read, learn, play and explore. The first classic will be Tom Sawyer, with a stable of others to follow shortly afterwards.
The team produced very polished presentation materials suggesting good sense of aesthetic consumer expectations, and had a well-developed core product (book in browser), ready to launch their first version within a few months. They needed support in developing ancillary products (e.g. merchandise and related sales) within the book universe being created, and in business development to target and approach suitable markets.

5.4 WORKSHOP 4: 16 MAY 2016 (PHOTOGRAPHY/MUSEUMS)

This workshop was a combination of Photography and Museums hackathon winners. This is because the workshop for winners of the Photography hackathon needed to be cancelled at late notice due to terrorist attacks in Belgium, so the three winners were combined with two other BMWs already scheduled for 16 and 25 May 2016.

Four teams attended this workshop, and after deliberating on the outcomes of both this workshop and the one that followed on 25 May, three were selected to proceed to Incubation.

5.4.1 YourMuseum

The unsuccessful team, YourMuseum, had a concept to enable the user to view a museum through the eyes of an expert, struggled to differentiate its product in an extremely saturated marketplace of guide apps for museums. Since many museums of all sizes are producing proprietary apps, or using services such as those offered by the Google Cultural Institute, space for a new aggregated app without strong differentiation is limited. Furthermore, even assuming this could be overcome, finding the right position to market it to a large-enough demographic (and escape the limitations of just specialist or academic users) could be difficult and have a direct impact on the likelihood of successfully developing sustainable revenue streams. A decision was therefore taken not to proceed with them to Incubation.

5.4.2 PostArt (Pro-vb)

The first of the successful teams PostArt, is focussed on creating digital products for the booming market of museum postcard sales. The exact proposition requires further work in the Incubation process, but the combination of a clear, attractive entrepreneurial opportunity in a proven market, combined with strong technical and marketing capabilities of the team made this a compelling entrant.

5.4.3 Nora (Spiced App)

Nora (formerly Lilith) is creating a cultural heritage online magazine with a unique tone of voice to attract young, urban female professionals. Although a simple concept, it is currently an opening in the market, and if well produced, could develop a sustainable revenue model and loyal community of engaged audiences. Like PostArt, the project benefitted from a strong, well-balanced group of team members that made successful implementation likely.
5.4.4 StoryPix

**StoryPix** is developing a web-based storytelling service for billboards. The displays will show an artwork from Europeana Collections with an odd question or stimulating remark. By connecting to the StoryPix website the user can further interact with the artwork. The service will allow to create thematic storytelling routes in a specific area or a whole city.

In addition to the strength of the team and concept, StoryPix was added as an extra incubated project because it had also won the Europeana Challenge immediately after the E-Space Photography hackathon, securing a EUR15,000 budget. Since many of the other incubated projects struggle with resource, it was felt that to have one fully funded project within E-Space meant that the extra support provided through Incubation could go much further. This situation also led to further collaboration with Europeana.

5.5 WORKSHOP 5: 25 MAY 2016 (PHOTOGRAPHY/GAMES)

The remaining project from the Photography hackathon, Picasso’s Cat, plus three winners of the Games hackathon, attended this workshop.

5.5.1 Picasso’s Cat

**Picasso’s Cat** (previously called **Mixed Art**) was selected to proceed into Incubation. As well as a competent and committed team, it had a very simple yet strong consumer proposition, a fun reimagining of art history through cat pictures, and so had the potential to attract hard-to-reach demographics for cultural heritage organisations. The precise proposition needed further development, not least to ensure long-term sustainability for the project and avoid it becoming a short-lived fad. However, it was felt that there was a significant opportunity to engage new audiences for cultural heritage through a fun and addictive game with art education at its core.

5.5.2 Games Hackathon Winners

The three winners from the Games hackathon, Slumlords, Zen days and Mortal Combat, proved particularly challenging to adapt for Incubation since none of the participants were motivated to create a financially sustainable project. This is a result of the hackathon, where an emphasis was placed on the artform of gaming rather than the applied use of games for cultural heritage. It was therefore decided that the projects failed to engage to any extent with cultural heritage, and ultimately as pure art installations were not strong enough.

5.6 PERSPECTIVE OF THE SELECTED TEAMS

When interviewed at the Europeana Space conference in Berlin, the teams that had been selected to progress to the Incubation stage reflected upon their experiences of the Business Modelling Workshops:

“At the workshop, we talked about the business model and transforming the loose idea to something sustainable. It was really interesting and helpful.”

We Make Known
“The Business Modelling Workshop was very exciting. There were many people trying to guide the process. The mentoring before and during the day was very helpful.”

Nous

“We had no idea about the exact structure of the Business Modelling Workshop but we were given handouts and the things we were supposed to do were demoed to us. We had already developed a BM canvas but what we did there was improvise, to better morph our final proposition. It was really helpful, also seeing what other teams were doing. We also collaborated with them, helped each other to develop the ideas further from a user’s perspective.”

Vivl.io

“After the hackathon our idea changed a lot. At first we thought our programme would be an app for a museum. The aim was the same as Nora, engaging with people who are not familiar with this world. With the Business Modelling Workshop we realised we had to focus on a particular target, and we understood that the magazine was the real goal of Nora.”

Nora

“At the Business Modelling Workshop we started with museums, but then we included galleries and artists, and focused on the benefits for artists who are not yet well established. So we work for the artists.

PostArt

“The Business Modelling Workshop was something completely new, so it’s a different way of thinking. It was really helpful to understand that you have to come to a core idea and really polish it until you know what your product is about. Making little drawings, drawing out the storyline of your product was really helpful, and also rethink the stages you need to go through to actually build this product. It was very helpful, so you don’t just think about creating something beautiful, but you actually create something beautiful that can work and grow in the future.”

StoryPix

“The Business Modelling Workshop had a number of elements. We narrowed it down to only paintings with cat pictures. We needed a model of how to communicate with other businesses. During the London workshop we polished the ideas. After London we had a clear idea of what it would look like from a users’ perspective, where the money would come from and what should we make.”

Picasso’s Cat
6 PILOTS BUSINESS MODELING WORKSHOP

The Business Modelling Workshops had a specific focus to serve the hackathon winners and not on project outcomes like the pilots and educational demonstrators. However, the DoW expressly states that the ideas explored in the pilots should be capitalised on through these BMWs. It was then decided that a BMW be held specifically for the pilots and demonstrators so that their products and ideas could get the same treatment that the hackathon winners received during their respective workshops. Thus a 7th BMW was added to the schedule, the day before the project General Assembly meeting, held in Brussels on 10 May 2016.

Project partners modelling their business ideas

The BMW largely followed the same format as the other BMWs, with the addition of a consumer trends briefing that other participants would have seen at the hackathon stage. The workshop was attended by at least one representative from each pilot and demonstrator.

Several aspects of the pilots and demonstrators are suitable for launching as standalone enterprises or new products within existing organisations. These benefitted from the business modelling process, and in particular by clearly articulating their value propositions and identifying target customers. For other participants, where market-readiness or monetisation was a less appropriate objective, the process was adapted to model broader sustainability outcomes. In all cases, taking time to work with other pilots to identify synergies and areas of common interest, and then planning next steps for sustainability or further development was deemed a highly valuable exercise.

The exercise also helped the project to evaluate its work in a different way and helped to identify a number of areas where work could be sustained in the future.
7 LESSONS LEARNED

The workshop exercises can be subtly adapted for variations in the preferred objectives of participants. For those aiming for social action (building a movement for change), or for those aiming to disseminate to particular audiences, or build strategies for sustainability, many of the techniques and strategies required are identical. Since entrepreneurship places understanding and response to audiences at the heart of its approach, this aspect of the workshop relating to purpose, communications, audience insights and value propositions is highly transferrable to a range of requirements.

Creating a sustainable enterprise is an exceptionally difficult endeavour, and it is worth remembering that nine out of ten start-ups fail. It is considerably more difficult in the creative and cultural industries, where access to finance, networks and specialist knowledge is much more limited, and motivations are often blurred between commercial, artistic and social objectives.

It is therefore critical to ‘catch’ potential cultural entrepreneurs through the open hackathon process, and help shape or inspire them through the Business Modelling Workshops and Incubation. However, the success rate will inevitably be limited, and an important lesson is to focus resource flexibly on those with the greatest chance of success. Starting the process with a requirement to find six new enterprises is a difficult endeavour, and will inevitably result in some stronger and some much weaker candidates. As many of the participants testify, therefore, the process of the workshop is as important as the outcome: whilst a current idea may not be successful or lead to Incubation, the process undertaken and tools used to frame and evaluate ideas in the workshop can be used over again in the lifetime of an entrepreneur. Furthermore, smaller groups - where ideas can be critically evaluated in some detail - are much more beneficial for this type of workshop.

Finally, peer-to-peer discussion and learning has been an essential ingredient of the Business Modelling Workshop. Pitching an idea to an audience of peers as well as experts helps sharpen the communications, and evolving it over the course of a day together with interested parties builds both stronger ideas and new bonds between workshop participants. These in turn could easily progress into fruitful new collaborations on ideas beyond those discussed in the workshop. This is especially the case where participants come from a range of backgrounds and disciplines, from developers to artists, and are simply united around a common interest.
8 PROJECTS SELECTED FOR INCUBATION

The projects proceeding through to Incubation are therefore:
1. We Make Known - a serendipitous browsing experience for archives;
2. Nous - using brainwaves to map emotional responses to art;
4. Nora - a digital arts magazine for young female professionals;
5. PostArt - a platform for sending art postcards on-demand;
6. StoryPix - connecting audio storytelling with art on billboards;
7. Picasso’s Cat - reimagining art history through cat pics.
9 CONCLUSION

This document has provided an overview and analysis of the crucial Business Modelling Workshops that served as a quality filter between hackathons and Incubation, guaranteeing the best teams with the best ideas and the strongest chance for success progressed towards Incubation. The document provides assessments of all the teams and explanations as to why or why not they did not move forward to Incubation. There is discussion over this process, problems encountered and the lessons learned.

9.1 RESULTS

The project’s collective conclusion is that having the Business Modelling Workshops as a second step between hackathon’s and Incubation allowed for the ideas to grow and develop outside of the hackathon context. If hackathons are pressure cookers for creativity and innovation the BMWs are meant for critical thinking, second guessing and re-assessment. By combining these two aspects Incubation becomes solely for progressing forward not questioning or debating. This is crucial for business development and entrepreneurship.

9.2 IMPACT

The results from the Business Modelling Workshops fed into the Incubation process of the project. It was also decided that the BMW model was so effective and beneficial that it be offered up to the project’s pilots and demonstrators. Additionally, even the teams that were not chosen for Incubation benefited from the Workshops having experienced the intensive evaluation of ideas. This is a process that commercial brands and companies go through regularly and therefore, such a process should be added to every project in several stages to ensure that the ideas and progress are examined with a critical eye, unbiased and experience in this sector of business development in the creative/cultural world.
APPENDIX: SELECTION CRITERIA

Within D5.4 – Selection Criteria – the following selection criteria was presented. It is replicated here as a reminder of the selection process that was used to select projects to progress from Business Modelling to Incubation.

SECTION 1: Use of digitised cultural heritage objective

| 1. | Does the proposition use or re-use (or facilitate the use or re-use) of digitalised cultural heritage material? |
| 2. | How innovative is the proposition in relation to this objective? |
| 3. | How important is developing the proposition for the cultural heritage sector? |
| 4. | What potential does the proposition have to deliver data and research findings that are of relevance and value to the cultural heritage sector? |

SECTION 2: Job creation objective

| 5. | What is the composition and size of target market(s) for this proposition? |
| 6. | What is the likelihood of job creation as a result of this proposition? |
| 7. | What social, economic, political and technological trends could support this proposition? |
| 8. | What social, economic, political and technological trends could threaten this proposition? |
| 9. | Who are the current and likely competitors to this proposition, and to what extent does the proposition demonstrate high barriers to entry, first-mover advantage or high-quality differentiated products? |

SECTION 3: Likelihood of success

<p>| 10. | How likely is the proposition to be adopted by users? |
| a. | Relative advantages to the user over other current options |
| b. | Compatibility with the normal values and behaviours of the user |
| c. | Low complexity for the user |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Ability for users to engage on a trial basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. To what extent does the team possess and demonstrate:

| a. | Effective communication skills |
| b. | Technical competency |
| c. | Experience within relevant industries |
| d. | Skills and capacity to successfully accomplish launch |
| e. | A long-term desire to build the proposition as a new business |

12. Does the proposition have a realistic and sound financial plan?

13. Does the proposition have a realistic time plan for launch and growth?

14. To what extent has the proposition formulated a sound business strategy for growth?

Points 12-14 are only considered at the Business Modelling Workshop when deciding which team progresses to the Incubation phase and not during hackathon deliberations.