



POLITECNICO DI TORINO
Repository ISTITUZIONALE

The Innovation Design Canvas: a management tool to move from innovative research to business

Original

The Innovation Design Canvas: a management tool to move from innovative research to business / Gaiardo, Andrea. - ELETTRONICO. - (2018), pp. 289-302. ((Intervento presentato al convegno Next Wave - The 21st DMI: Academic Design Management Conference Proceedings tenutosi a Londra nel 1/2 agosto 2018.

Availability:

This version is available at: 11583/2720018.6 since: 2018-12-06T12:37:32Z

Publisher:

2018, 38 Chauncy Street, Boston, MA Suite 800 Boston, MA 02111 USA (in stampa)

Published

DOI:

Terms of use:

openAccess

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)



Next Wave

This conference proceedings version was produced on 18 July 2018

©2018 DMI and the Authors. All rights reserved

ISSN – The ISSN application for these proceedings is in process. We will update this space soon.

Published by the Design Management Institute
38 Chauncy Street, Boston, MA
Suite 800
Boston, MA 02111
USA

The Design Management Institute (DMI) is an international membership organization that connects design to business, to culture, to customers— and to the changing world. Founded in 1975, DMI brings together educators, researchers, designers, and leaders from every design discipline, every industry, and every corner of the planet to facilitate transformational organizational change and design driven innovation. DMI focuses its mission in three areas: education, design valuation and connection.

The 21st DMI: Academic Design Management Conference Next Wave was hosted by Ravensbourne University London and organized by DMI

LEGAL NOTICE: The publisher is not responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

CONFERENCE ORGANIZATION

Carole Bilson, President, DMI

Chris Hancock, Conference Program Coordinator

CONFERENCE HOST

Ravensbourne University

DMI Leadership

Jerry Kathman, *Chair, DMI Board, President/CEO, LPK*

Bob Schwartz, (Chair, DMI Board), *GM, Global Design & User Experience, GE Healthcare*

Carole Bilson, *President Design Management Institute*

Iain Aitchison (Chair, Advisory Council), *Program Director, Institute of Design Innovation, The Glasgow School of Art*

John Geishecker (Secretary), *Managing Director, Phillips Screw Company*

Jerome Kathman, *Emeritus DMI Board Chair & Finance Chair, Chairman, LPK*

Kevin Bethune, *Founder & Chief Creative Officer, dreams • design + life*

Michael Gallagher, *Vice President, Design, Crown Equipment Co.*

Betsy Goodrich, *VP/Co-Founder, MANTA Product Development Inc.*

Mauro Porcini, *SVP, Chief Design Officer, Pepsico*

Ernesto Quinteros, *Chief Design Officer, Johnson & Johnson*

DMI Founder

William J. Hannon, *Professor Emeritus, Massachusetts College of Art and Design*

The Innovation Design Canvas: a management tool to move from innovative research to business.

Andrea GAIARDO^{*a}

^a ISMB - Istituto Superiore Mario Boella

The fundamental role of innovation as a process to reach results of value, meaning and sustainable impact are well known. A job that today, more than ever, is the direct expression of the possibilities to face and overcome, in a pragmatic, constructive and entrepreneurial way, the changes, the opportunities and the new needs expressed by the modern society. The different actors involved in the innovation journey, as the innovation designers, strive every day to search for sharper and more useful methodologies, approaches, processes, and tools able to help them to meet these expectations better. This paper, starting from this foreword, wants to present the research endeavour behind the development of the Innovation Design Canvas.

The objective of this on-going research is to develop a concrete and useful tool able to drive the designers into the design of sustainable and meaningful innovative initiatives moving from the research, with the contextual analysis of need (problem design), through the solutions generation (meta-innovation design), until its innovative business rollout (product/service design).

The Innovation Design Canvas was developed following the basis of the Systemic Innovation Design Methodology, and it has been tested with a user test conducted on a spectrum of 50 prospects.

Keywords: Innovation Design; Design Tool; Design Management.

* Corresponding author: Andrea Gaiardo | e-mail: gaiardo@ismb.it

Introduction

The need for change runs over all the sectors of modern society. In that context the innovation seems to be the only real, accurate and systematic answer to meet this challenge in a sustainable and bonanza way (Nidumolu at al. 2009; Adams et al., 2015). New technological possibilities, new user needs, new contextual opportunities and a continuous knowledge democratisation paired with a better consciousness on sustainability and social aspects influence the real likelihood of outliving and prosperity of the new and established organisations that have to face levels of increasing complexity and uncertainty.

Therefore, the need to operate and manage business initiatives in an ephemeral and uncertain context is opening the traditional specialist organisation vision to consider the effects and the opportunities of their action also in a broader level (Chesbrough, 2003; Rifkin, 2014) with a need to new tools able to manage the outcoming complexity.

The innovation research field is then exploring new models, tools, and visions able to meet and manage this complexity with a dual view of the project. The first one with a vertical perspective - or individual one, where the focus is on the project or enterprise itself - and the other with a horizontal perspective - or holistic one, where the focus is on the relative impact of the project or enterprise in the context of action - (Kolko, 2015) (Furr & Dyer 2014). Starting from the new raising role of design in the innovation environment, expressed by the position of the innovation designer, this research aims to involve this field through their practices and approaches, into the heart of the innovative business and the entrepreneurial actions to meet and give an answer to this need.

The innovation design, in its essence, don't focus only on the capture of value for the organisation itself, with the ideation, the development and the managing of the value creation process within the organisation, but it also has to meet the contextual (or external) expectation on the economic, social and environmental side where the organisation acts.

That is opening a sort of golden age of design (Walker, 2014) where the new generation of designers has to drive, design and manage "innovative ideas" more than just dress them up as it happened in the past (Brown, 2008). Evidence of this is the fact that the Institutions and Company are requesting today to the designer not only to support them in the traditional fields, where already the designers are operating but also to be involved and contribute to all the innovation process chain, from the research phase to the business rollout. In order to accomplish and manage this request, the innovation designer requires a range of skills, from engineering to business, and a mindset able to juggle within a holistic vision which must work and feed together with project needs and constraints to meet tangible results without getting lost (Brown & Martin 2015).

The idea to develop the Innovation Design Canvas (IDC) comes from the need to find a way to simplify and support innovation designers to better trade-off all the skills and operative actions required to support an innovative project. The IDC tool was designed starting from the innovation design research conducted in the Innovation Design Lab of the Politecnico di Torino and refined within the Innovation Development Area of the ISMB. The purpose of this canvas is to summarise the theory, the experiences and the approach of the Systemic Innovation Design Methodology by providing an instrument to mitigate the complexity of the project and to manage it. The resulting tool takes into account all the aspects involved in an innovative initiative with a sustainable and entrepreneurial perspective, from the ideation to implementation, with a systemic and nonlinear view.

This paper would present the theory and the research framework behind the design of the canvas, the explanation of how it works, and the results come out from the first experimentation test conducted with a sample of 50 different people.

Systemic Innovation Design Methodology

The Innovation Design Canvas was designed as a practical tool based on the approach and process of the Systemic Innovation Design Methodology (SIDM), (Figure 1). This methodology focuses on the innovation design process with a narrow vision and methods mostly different from the established innovation engineering perspective. As the last one is traditionally focused on the "how" perspective of the innovation process, taking into account firstly the technology opportunities of development of one innovation, the design perspective starts from the "why". The design approach, as the SIDM, starts its innovation path by identifying an impactful and meaningful need or opportunity with design-led research (Norman & Verganti, 2014) activity before to point out a solution with the "how" it could be solved. (Gaiardo & Tamborrini, 2017). The SIDM was developed starting from the

Systemic Design Approach (Bistagnino, 2009) and a broad research and literature review with the analysis of 66 innovation methodology frameworks (Figure 2) and the practical experience in the design process in the different innovative projects inside and outside our department (Gaiardo, 2016) on the academic research and entrepreneurial consultancy fields.




Figure 1 Systemic Innovation Design Methodology – (Gaiardo, Tamborrini, Peiretti 2016)

The SIDM follows a tight process to meet three preminent aspects, defined from the Human-Centred Approach (IDEO, 2011), within his action:

- desirability aspect - by design project that people need and want;
- sustainability aspect - by reaching a solution economic, social and environmentally sustainable;
- feasibility aspect - by developing an outcome technologically and suitable for business.

The methodology resulted in attempts to add market, environmental and social value on the contest of its action by driving the innovation process from an idea to the final innovation product or service passing through three iterative main phases:

- the research phase - with an extensive exploration of the problem/need/opportunity to answer. (Design Thinking)
- the design phase - where conceptualise the best solution to meet the expectation of the project. (Lean Approach)
- the exploitation phase - where the outcome is launch in the context to measure and capture the value generated. (Agile Approach)



Figure 2 Systemic Innovation Design Methodology – (Gaiardo, Peiretti 2016)

The methodology is able to drive the innovators from a project context (consisting of users, needs and resources) towards a generation of possible solutions (product or service) with an entrepreneurial perspective (with the creation of value through business and technology feasibility) in a systemic way by putting in relation all these aspects for reach an innovative and sustainable outcome.

The Innovation Designer

The core of the SIDM process is to identify the compound interactions between different actors (individuals, society, enterprise, shareholders and stakeholders) and the related cultural, economic and community area, market or territory resources to create a valued network relationship (Allee, 2008) to possibly unlock, mix and exploit new innovative value creation actions. To accomplish that the SIDM needs, first of all, a reliable person able to manage with all the fields, the tools, and the practices involved, from engineering to business, into the different perspectives of meaning involved in the innovation process. For this reason, today a new figure is emerging in the field of innovation able to meet this need: the Innovation Designer (Kuznicki, 2017).

This figure has the explicit purpose to design and drive the innovation aspects as vision, goals, methodologies, approaches and tools in the innovation project from the world of innovation expectation (demanded by people, institutions and enterprises) to the world of real innovative outcomes. The Innovation Designer has to transmit and release the value and the vision of the sustainable innovation initiatives (not harmful and with a long-term perspective) with an entrepreneurial behaviour (practical, oriented and evidence-based) in each field involved in the project, from research to production. In that context, the innovation designer has no longer only to dress up the ideas and the innovation outcomes. It has, instead, the specific aim to analyse and identify the needs of the people and the related context during the exploration phase, by transforming the results in valuable concepts for launch them in a market with a business perspective. For that reason, we could say, the innovation designer is closer to an entrepreneurial figure than a traditional designer, in which it assumes and takes strategic decisions ever and ever more crucial for the whole project succeeds. (Epperson 2016).

Not a straightforward job.

Consequently, the research work on the Innovation Design Canvas born was set up to find a tool to help this growing role to manage all the different aspect of the innovation process in more simple, visual and prompt way.

Innovation Design Canvas

The definition of the Innovation Design Canvas was deeply inspired by the business modelling processes and the design of business model innovation. In recent years, the business model topic has become increasingly more popular in the innovation ecosystem for its capacity to simplify the planning and definition of new business proposals, by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the business itself, and for its ability to improve an existing business. Another good point in favour of the business model usefulness is his affinity to the sustainable themes. Indeed, despite the fact that the sustainability is earning ever more space in the innovation environment in

these years, we have not witnessed to development of disruptive tools able to assist the innovator in the design of sustainable business modelling (Bocken,2013). Many existing approaches to sustainability are useful for specific aspects of design and delivery, but at the moment there is lack of strategies able to look at the sustainability at the whole.

Therefore today, the business model innovation seems to be one best tool to act towards a sustainable balance those sum up the three dimensions of sustainability (social, environmental and economic) (Schaltegger et al. 2011) with a more holistic perspective than other approaches developed in these years. These values arise from the triple bottom line approach (Hall, T. J. 2011) and they not only drive the purpose of the stakeholders involved in the project but are also the baseline to measure the performance and the influence of the project in the environment and the society (Stubbs and Cocklin, 2008).

The design, or redesign, of a business model, gives the possibility to focus on the creation of higher environmental and social value, meanwhile delivering economic viability. That will improve sustainable performance in the innovation ecosystem radically, as suggested by Stubbs and Cocklin (2008), Porter and Kramer (2011), Yunus et al. (2010), and FORA (2010).

For that reason, in the past years, many different well-known authors have contributed with different contributes to the literature to rise of the business modelling topics as Chesbrough and Rosenbloom (2002) Richardson (2008) Spieth et. all (2014). The last contribution edited, and probably the best known, are the canvas tool designed by Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010). In this canvas, the authors tried to simplify through a visual tool the description of the main elements present in a business model as the customer segments and the value proposition, channels, customer relations; key resources, activities and partnerships, revenues streams and cost structure. Collect all these information in one canvas allows to understand the existing relations from all the elements and it allows to highlight the importance of the system perspective in the business model by viewing the business model as a network (Zott et al. 2011) able to identify, to create and to capture a value proposition.

All these contributions were the starting point and underlying assets to set the vision and the practical features of the design of the innovation canvas tool with other further elements: the management purpose and the hard-headed entrepreneurial "modus operandi".

Why another canvas?

Design a meaningful and sustainable innovation means creating value through the understanding of context of action, a pragmatic operation and a focused management able to extend and deliver positive value to all the stakeholders involved or better touch by the related outcome (Wirtz, 2011). To meet these needs, as in business model tools field, many authors tried to develop several tools to assist the design of product and service with a sustainable perspective (Baumann et al., 2002; Byggeth and Hochschorner, 2006; Bocken et al., 2011; Schaltegger et al. 2012.). However, only a few of them have been shown to assist the innovative actors in the practical design of the value propositions in the whole process of innovation. The difficulty in finding tools that can at the same time consider different levels of analysis, one more specific (meso) and the other one more general (macro) is embedded in the innovation process itself.

Existing tools tend to focus on just one dimension of sustainability at a time. All of these do not create a holistic perspective that incorporates all three dimensions of sustainability within the innovation process able to manage it with a whole vision. Be conscious of the whole picture is fundamental to manage and design an innovative project by mitigating uncontrolled team inside-in action and outside-in influences that can lead to undesirable outcomes across the system environment and innovation failures.

The desire to create a new tool is born through this challenge. The idea of the IDC is to help Innovation Designers to pursue and manage a more targeted creation of sustainable value projects within their innovative and entrepreneurial activities.

The canvas Framework

The Innovation Design Canvas (Figure 3) aims to provide a tool to mitigate the increasing complexity aspects involved in an innovative project, from technology and business to design and management. The IDC aim is to support the innovation designer to elaborate the best and suitable solutions for the project issues with sustainable, meaningful and entrepreneurial perspectives

This tool tries to suggest a model for redefining the goals and optimally employing resources to drive the project into the best and feasible solution possible with a systemic and nonlinear view (Potter, 1980). In the canvas, all the features and themes are described to explore and develop the development process of the innovative

design concept. The IDC is divided into three main areas with different boxes to compile. In each box, there are specific questions that help the designer, during the compilation, to reason and assess on the features of the proposed solution concept.

All the boxes are linked together. One influences the other. This relationship and communication between all the parties of the project are visualised and readable in one glance. The IDC may help all the actors participating in the design phase to take into account several different perspectives of the project to anticipate possible problems right from the start (Kalbach, 2012).



Figure 3 - Innovation Design Canvas – (Gaiardo, 2016)

Canvas Framework – Introduction and Project Evidence Brief

The first section of the canvas focuses on a brief introduction of the project: name, version of the document, data and team involved. This part is crucial for the traceability of the design flow and to build, with several iterations a logbook the project. The second section of the IDC is called Project Evidence Brief. In this part, the innovation designer has to sum up the need/problem/opportunity in which he or she is working on by re-framing and synthesising the salient points of the project. In these boxes, the project is outlined with the leading characteristic information as the need/problem it is trying to solve (goal box), the vision of the solution that helps the team involved to have a well-known, shared and coherent direction.

Instead, inside the context box, the compilers have to describe and highlight the essential characteristics, resources present in the context of action (could be a territory or a market) that might influence the realisation of our project positively or negatively.

This part summarises the "call to action" of the innovative initiative. This part of the canvas represents the first go/no-go step to overcome by the innovation designer where he or she has to highlight the "why" (meaning), then "what" (vision) and "where" (context project boundaries) it is going to start to work. If the innovation designer does not find a robust and structured evidence brief from the start, it will probably design weak and not successful solutions. In that case, it is better to backtrack into the preliminary research to conduct a more specific and accurate analysis before to move to the next steps.

Canvas Framework – Generation and Consistency Concept

In the third part of the IDC is the Generation and Consistency Concept (figure 4), where the innovation designer has to outline "the how" of the project. The first box to fill out is User Identification box with reference audience target of the project.

The second box is a preliminary description of the assumed solution (Idea/solution description box). Here the innovation designer must describe the salient and operative features of the solution and how they are essential points to achieving the supposed results.

The third box, the Existing Alternative Identification, is where to list the similar projects working on the topic. They could be first competitors, with the providing of a similar solution, indirect competitors, with a similar solution to a different audience, or replacement competitors, with a substitute solution that is currently satisfying somehow the need to our audience. In the fourth step of the IDC, the designer has to assess all the answers indicated before under the lens of the approach coherence of the Systemic Innovation Design Methodology. Operationally this part of the IDC should highlight and sum up the core elements of desirability, sustainability and feasibility of the hypothesised solution.

In the case of the desirability, we have to spot if our audience requires or expects our concept solution. For instance, the main desirable characteristic could come from favourable aspects (e.g. time and money), functional

aspects (e.g. comfort and easiness) and emotional aspects (e.g. experience and accessibility). After pointing them out, the innovation designer has to objectify the sustainable level of them. The desired concept solution should not affect the social, economic and environmental context aspect negatively with its introduction. Only after the sustainable analysis, the innovation designer can start to think of the feasibility phase of the approach. At this point, the innovation designer has to rely on the entrepreneurial approach by finding a balance of the technologic, design and business needs to reach a real output with the development phase.

Figure 4 – Innovation Design Canvas – Part 1 – Project Evidence Brief and Project Generation and concept consistency (Gaiardo, 2016)

Two further analyses represented in the last two steps of the generation and consistency concept part of the IDC. The fifth point is defining what kind of value, and related impact, the hypothesised solution aspires to reach and introduce with its adoption. In its last steps, the canvas asks to define what kind of challenges or barriers the project concept poses for its design since its introduction and use. These types of challenges are identified as potential barriers of entry for the development of the innovative initiative at a physical level (tools, spaces), financially (money, laws), human (time, knowledge) and policies.

Canvas Framework – Concept Development Analysis.

The Concept Development Analysis of the IDC collects all the core operational steps and resources needed to transform and manage the innovation project sketch in the project generation and concept consistency into a tangible solution (Figure 5).

The first point to deal with is the identification of the technologies and tools required to build the project idea. These aspects introduce the next step where the innovation designer has to identify the skills and knowledge needed to develop the project in an operational, technical, managerial and theoretical way. In these two points, the IDC want to help the Innovation Designer to examine the soundness and consistency of the team, the roles played by each one and the resources available to effectively develop the solution. This operation will help to understand what the possible pitfalls are and how to go about resolving them, for instance, either by looking for external partners and resources or with the acquisition and the search for specific skills to integrate inside the team.

This point leads directly to the next step with the identification of potential stakeholders and partnerships possible for the project implementation and acceleration. In the tenth point of the IDC, it is necessary to examine the business strategy to reach economic sustainability. For the formulation of the business model, the Innovation Designer can rely on other specific types of consolidated canvases as the business model canvas (Osterwalder et al., 2010).

The eleventh point is another strategic aspect and non-trivial one linked to the concept development: the users/target audience acquisition.

INNOVATION DESIGN CANVAS - FROM RESEARCH TO CONCEPT

project name	team	version	date
--------------	------	---------	------

CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS

technologies and tools	skills & team	stakeholders & partners	business model
user acquisition & communication	metrics identification	MVP validation	strategy and roadmap

Figure 5 - Innovation Design Canvas – Part 2 – Concept Development Analysis (Gaiardo, 2016)

The Innovation Designer has to start immediately to consider how to reach the target audience with the communication and marketing initiatives, which channels and tools he or she intends to use to raise awareness of the project and make it accessible and understandable to target users.

In the next point of the analysis concept development, the IDC focuses on the most managerial aspects of the project. In the Metrics Identification box, the Innovation Designer defines the set of indicators (KPIs) aimed to monitor and predict the trend of the main criticisms of the project variables (e.g. cost, time, quality, resources, process, impacts, scope changes, success). Linked to the point of definition of metrics, the MVP and Validation following box asks to indicate which is the type and the shape of the Minimum Viable Project and which is the strategy of the customer validation link to it (Blank & Dorf, 2012).

In the last point, the Innovation Designer sets one first roadmap of actions, milestones and deadlines for the various activities that the team have to perform to reach the goal of the project.

Innovation Design Canvas User Test

After defined and designed the IDC in all its aspects, the study has continued with a user test phase for understanding the significance and the possible utility of the IDC tool to directly support the prospects of this tool in the innovation design process.

The evaluation of the IDC started with the identification of the prospect group in different segment groups as typology (entrepreneur, researcher, student) age, applying project (course project, research project, entrepreneurial project and personal idea) and project maturity level (idea, early stage, concept or mature project). The sample was also divided per modality of use, in compilation team or single compiler. The rationale of this selection derived from a direct experience of the uses of canvas tools and from the willingness to focus only on three main well-known target groups.

IDC was provided with a user test kit composed of three attachments and a final survey and distributed after a public and on-line call where all the participants were accepted or less if they eventually fitted in one of the prospect groups. Two of the three attachments expressly covered an in-depth instruction guide to the compilation of each box with some driving/trigger questions to facilitate the tester to understand which content he had to include. The third attachment was a further specification of the Systemic Innovation Methodology approach for a better comprehension of the approach coherence box.

The last part of the kit consisted of a survey to fill out in ten sections and divided into open and closed questions. The sections of the survey included an initial screening of the compiler per age range, role, type of

project, maturity and procedure of compilation by the compilers. Then the survey asked to fulfil some open-ended questions focused on assessing the level of experience and get direct feedback about the IDC and their possible willingness or not to use the canvas in the future or for a further project.

The last part included an INDEX survey where we asked users to give a rating from 1 to 5 on the following questions:


- EASINESS INDEX - Easiness and Understanding of canvas compilation
- GLOBAL VISION INDEX - Did the IDC help you to understand/have a better global vision of your project?
- CREATION INDEX - Did the IDC help you to create a new project idea/solution?
- GAP POINT INDEX- Did IDC help you to fill out gap/blind points of your project?
- PIVOT INDEX - Did IDC help you to change the idea/or part of your project?
- USEFULNESS INDEX How do you rate the usefulness of this tool for you?

Test Results and Analysis.

The User Test took about two months of research to reach 50 compilers. How we can see the IDC was compiled mostly from students followed by entrepreneurs and researchers (chart 1). The most compilers were from 20 to 30 years old, so we intercepted a pretty young public (chart 2) who compile the canvas about a course or entrepreneurial project (chart 3) while, in the end, we have a substantial balance on the modality of compilation (chart 4).

The study concerned the analysis of qualitative data of the open answers, and the examination of the quantitative data comes out from the 6 INDEX survey.

The quantitative data have been normalised to compare them on one general scale and capture strengths and weaknesses of the IDC with more meaningfully. Every INDEX category it was assigned a range value from 0-100, where a 0-25 range means poor value, 25-50 a fair value, 50-75 good value, 75-100 excellent value.



In general, the first results show (Chart5) the canvas has given good results about support in understanding the overall vision of the project with the Global Vision Index, followed shortly, with good rate points, by the Easiness Index of filling the canvas and the Usefulness Index utility. The great result of this last index was also underlined by different positive qualitative feedback and perception about the value of the canvas as a supporting tool in the open questions.




Figure 5 - Overall Index Values (points/100) of IDC. Source: Gaiardo (2017).

In the medium average rate of satisfaction, we find the Gap Index followed, with a little inflexion, by the Pivot Index. Lastly, the lower Index of the survey was the Change Index with the lower score.

So, in general, we can point out a fair satisfaction results of use of IDC. Furthermore, the open questions highlight a keen interest in the IDC tool with 80% of compilers that declare the intention to reuse the canvas for their future innovative design projects.

As a first general conclusion, the IDC show of to be useful in the comprehension of the general vision of all the parts involved in the innovation project while it does not seem helpful in the creation phase of the idea and even less in the changing (or pivot) the scope of the project.

However, observing the results in deep and through the lens of the different segmentations, the data take on different meanings. As we can see in the chart 6 where the data were ordered from the type of project view, the Easiness Index has a significant reduction for the Course Project (53/100) and the Personal Idea (55/100).




Figure 6 - Overall Index Values (points/100) per type of project. Source: Gaiardo (2017).

Another interesting aspect in the same view, it is the higher Creation Index, which stands at 72/100, for the entrepreneurial project and an overall high score for the research project in the gap index. So, in this case, we can assume that the IDC is addressed more for an entrepreneurial or research project than a personal idea or course project.

Looking at the maturity level (chart7), we can observe a noticeable average lowering interest in this tool for the already working projects. On the contrary, the high range in all the index, with three indexes at the maximum level, register a very interest of the IDC at the project at the concept phase.

For what concerns the idea and personal project we notice good points on the of global vision and usefulness indexes but lower points in the easiness of compilation, creation and pivot indexes. With the support of the feedback of the open questions, it comes out that the main problem from the compilers was too difficult to fill out some management and more technical canvas boxes of the IDC gives due the immaturity of the project.

Looking at the data from the perspective of the role (chart 8), we can see that the highest values, in general, have been assigned from the students, followed by the researchers and then by entrepreneurs.




Figure 7 Overall Index Values (points/100) per project maturity. Source: Gaiardo (2017).

The entrepreneurs reported a good score on the usefulness of this tool, but without achieving significant features in the other indices. The researchers found this canvas an easy tool to wrap-up all the research vision and helpfully to fill out the management gaps in their project.

Finally, the students were the more enthusiastic of the IDC as a tool to clearly and concretise the whole innovation design process theory and as a useful tool (like a checklist) to drive them into their first innovation project.

The last analysing of the data collected concerning the modality of use of the IDC to find out if the modality of compilation can affect the performance of the tool (chart 9). In general, we can notice no significant differences, if not those detected in the easiness index and useful index with a substantial difference of almost 10 points. In that case, the open questions did not give elements of more analysis except for the increase of the time of compilation due probably a more confrontation inside the team.




Figure 8 - Overall Index Values (points/100) per role. Source: Gaiardo (2017).



Figure 9 - Overall Index Values (points/100) per modality of compilation. Source: Gaiardo (2017).

Conclusion

The Innovation Design Canvas is the result of extensive work of study, research and experimentation. It born with the basic idea to design a tool to allow the innovation designer to analyse, design, and develop most promising innovation solution in a faster, comfortable and easiness way, overcoming the complexity of this job.

The feasibility transcript of the concept with the description of the technological, design, business and management elements helps to have the first overall vision of the project relationship through these elements.

The first attempt of this Canvas seems to have nailed it. In fact, thanks to the test conducted on IDC, this tool resulted to be useful to gather a global vision of the project as a valuable "to-do-list" to analyse, manage and set up all the aspects involved to starting a new innovative initiative.

The test also recorded good feedback from the students, and new teams in general, where the IDC was perceived as a useful tool to better understand, in some more practical terms, what it means to design an innovation project.

If the test confirmed the Innovation Design Canvas as a high potential tool for support the design and management activity of the Innovation Designer project endeavours, it also highlights weaker parties. The IDC shows better results on the concept phase than in others, where only some part of seems to be useful, e.g. for the

entrepreneurial projects, already launched, where his perspective assumes a kind of sum up of all activities already done, with no more other advantages perceived. Substantially the IDC did not help too much the Innovation Designer to pivot or create new ideas related to their on-going project. So, a further study on the IDC will see also more depth research on boxes implementation depending on the user characteristic and related needs with a modular perspective.

In conclusion, if it is true that, as Tim Brown said, "Each design process is more complicated and sophisticated than the one before it" the IDC study want to work on the contrary direction. IDC tool is the first step to translate these complex processes in a practical and accessible way, by democratising best practices and enabling the innovation designer to manage the innovation projects most straightforwardly and successfully.

References

- Adams, R., Jeanrenaud, S., Bessant, J., Denyer, D., Overy, P., 2015. Sustainability oriented innovation: a systematic review. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* 18 (2), 180e205.
- Allee, V. (2008). Value network analysis and value conversion of tangible and intangible assets. *Journal of intellectual capital*, 9(1), 5-24.
- Baumann, H., Boons, F. and Bragd, A. (2002), "Mapping the green product development field: engineering, policy and business perspectives", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 10, pp. 409-425.
- Bistagnino, L. (2009). *Design sistemico: progettare la sostenibilità produttiva e ambientale. Slow food.*
- Blank, S., & Dorf, B. (2012). *The startup owner's manual: The step-by-step guide for building a great company.*
- Bocken, N., Allwood, J., Willey, A. and King, J. (2011), "Development of an ecoideation tool to identify stepwise greenhouse gas emissions reduction options for consumer goods", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 19 No. 12, pp. 1279-1287.
- Bocken, N., Short, S., Rana, P., & Evans, S. (2013). A value mapping tool for sustainable business modelling. *Corporate Governance*, 13(5), 482-497
- Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. *Harvard business review*, 86(6), 84.
- Brown, T., & Martin, R. (2015). Design for Action. *Harvard Business Review* (September 2015), 55-64.
- Byggeth, S. and Hochschorner, E. (2006), "Handling trade-offs in Ecodesign tools for sustainable product development and procurement", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol.14, pp. 1420-1430.
- Chesbrough, H. and Rosenbloom, R. (2002), "The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spinoff companies", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 529-555
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003). A better way to innovate. *Harvard business review*, 81(7), 12-3.
- FORA (2010), "Green business models in the Nordic Region: A key to promote sustainable growth", FORA, Denmark. Available at: http://www.danishwaterforum.dk/activities/Water_and_green_growth/greenpaper_for_a_211010_green_business_models.pdf (accessed on 13 May 2013).
- Gaiardo, A., & Tamborrini, P. (2017). From Eco-to Sustainable Innovation: Approach and Methodology to Guide Design Initiative into the Innovation World. In *Sustainability Through Innovation in Product Life Cycle Design* (pp. 691-704). Springer, Singapore.
- Gaiardo, A. (2016). *Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Design. A methodology proposal for sustainable innovation initiatives* (Doctoral dissertation, Politecnico di Torino).
- Hall, T. J. (2011). The triple bottom line: what is it and how does it work?. *Indiana business review*, 86(1), 4.
- IDEO (2011). *Human-Centered Design Toolkit 2nd Edition*. Retrieved from <http://www.ideo.com/work/human-centered-design-toolkit>.
- Josh Epperson (2016, December) - Innovation is Design and Design is Innovation

- Kalbach J. (2012 August 5) - The Project Canvas. Retrived from <https://experiencinginformation.wordpress.com/2012/08/05/the-project-canva>
- Kolko, J. (2015). Design thinking comes of age. *Harvard Business Review*, 93(9), 66-71.
- Kuznicki, M. (2017, January 10). What is an Innovation Designer? [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://medium.com/the-moment-is/what-is-an-innovation-designer-d56eb7c02d3c>
- Nidumolu, R., Prahalad, C. K., & Rangaswami, M. R. (2009). Why sustainability is now the key driver of innovation. *Harvard business review*, 87(9), 56-64.
- Norman, D. A., & Verganti, R. (2014). Incremental and radical innovation: Design research vs. technology and meaning change. *Design issues*, 30(1), 78-96.
- Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2010), *Business Model Generation: A Handbook for Visionaries, Game Changers, and Challengers*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Porter, M. and Kramer, M. (2011), "Creating Shared Value", *Harvard Business Review*, January, pp. 1-17.
- Potter, N. (1980). *What is a designer: things, places, messages*. Hyphen Press.
- Retrived from <https://www.prophet.com/thinking/2013/10/innovation-is-design-and-design-is-innovation/>
- Richardson, J. (2008), "The business model : an integrative framework for strategy execution", *Strategic Change*, Vol. 17 No. 5-6, pp.133-144
- Rifkin, J., 2014. *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: the Internet of Things, the Collaborative Commons, and the Eclipse of Capitalism*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Schaltegger, S., Lüdeke-freund, F. and Hansen (2011), *Business Cases for Sustainability and the Role of Business Model Innovation Developing a Conceptual Framework*, Lueneburg: Centre for Sustainability Management (CSM), Leuphana University of Lueneburg, Lueneburg.
- Schaltegger, S., LüdekeFreund, F., Hansen, E.G., 2012. Business cases for sustainability: the role of business model innovation for corporate sustainability. *Int. J. Innovation Sustain. Dev.* 6 (2), 95e119.
- Spieth, P., Schneckenberg, D., Ricart, J.E., 2014. Business model innovation e state of the art and future challenges for the field. *R&D Manag.* 44 (3), 237e247.
- Stubbs, W. and Cocklin, C. (2008), "Conceptualizing a "Sustainability Business Model", *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 103-127.
- Stubbs, W. and Cocklin, C. (2008), "Conceptualizing a "Sustainability Business Model", *Organization & Environment*, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 103-127.
- Teece, D. (2010), "Business model, business strategy and innovation", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 43 No. 2-3, pp. 172-194.
- Walker, B. (2014) *A Golden Age of Design*. New York Times. Online 22nd Sept. 2014
- Wirtz, B. W. (2011). *Business model management. Design–Instrumente–Erfolgsfaktoren von Geschäftsmodellen*, 2.
- Yunus, M., Moingeon, B. and Lehmann-Ortega, L. (2010), "Building Social Business Models: Lessons from the Grameen Experience", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 43 No. 2-3, pp. 308-325
- Zott, C., Amit, R. and Massa, L. (2011), "The Business Model: Recent Developments and Future Research", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 1019-1042.