



Why innovators need a new change paradigm

By Jeffrey Phillips and Paul Hobcraft

16th June 2015

In previous articles we've demonstrated that many innovations, regardless of their purpose or intended outcome, create change for three constituents: customers, markets and competitors and for the innovator themselves. That's because many innovations create new channels, change customer expectations of service or delivery, or directly or indirectly impact business models. This leads us to conclude that many innovations, even incremental innovations, are business model innovations or can lead to business model innovations.

In our last post we argued that we should flip perspectives.

Today most innovation is focused on creating new products or services. These new innovations frequently change or modify operating models and business models, often not by deliberate design. We'd stipulate that most innovation should be focused on updating and changing business models constantly and with increasing focus. With this focus new products and services become by-products or outcomes that support or sustain new business models for driving greater lasting sustaining competitive advantage. In short, ***most innovation should be focused on creating new business models, with new products or services serving as enablers to intentional business model innovation***, rather than the other way round. This is what we mean by flipping perspectives.

If innovation continues at a high pace, and forces change across customers, the market and the innovator, as well as creating new business models, then we can easily accept that innovators must be good at planning for and executing change. Innovation and change are somewhat symbiotic: sustained innovation cannot occur without good change capability, and innovation creates demand for change.

When we add in the interplay across innovation, business models and change it's evident that change is a constant, and will only increase. Yet there is a significant problem:

existing change models that describe how we think about and implement change no longer seem valid, given the nature and the pace of change.

Unfreeze-Change-Refreeze- the need to move from an old model

Perhaps one of the most classic change models is a three phase model, introduced by Lewin in 1947, and the basis for many subsequent change models. Lewin's change model seeks to "unfreeze" the existing conditions, in order to allow "change or transition" to occur to then arrive at a new state of hopefully higher capability or competence, at which point the operating model is again "frozen". This model anticipates a long period of stasis in existing conditions, interrupted by a short, difficult and traumatic change activity, concluding with achievement of a new, long-lasting level of performance to become the 'new' stable.

We believe this model is becoming very outdated and somewhat dangerous from an innovation perspective, for two reasons. First, the model anticipates resistance to change rather than engagement with change. Second, the model assumes an eventual "refreezing" state, where the company remains in stability, without change. Increasingly, we believe, ***corporations that thrive will do so not because they expect and depend on long periods of "steady state" existence with intermittent and unfortunate requirements for change, but because they are capable and ready for constant evolution and change.*** Today we are in need of being in a state of constant operating model and business model evolution.

Most existing change models are based on a similar premise: a multi-phase model that assumes the operating models and expectations of the corporation are somehow out of sequence with new expectations or competition, and must be radically changed to a new and different state. These ideas of "states" of being are derived from a time when change was far less frequent and far less traumatic.

When trade barriers were high, and channels to customers were relatively limited, and the cost of entry to a market was relatively high, change happened more slowly. With the advent of the internet and other new channels, the lowering of trade barriers, the increase in messaging through social media and an ever growing and diversifying customer base, change happens constantly and the nature and scale of change is more dramatic than in the past, unpredictable and multi-dimensional acting across systems, processes and people.

So our past assumptions are mostly not relevant any more

In the past we considered a “change” activity as moving from one relatively stable state to another relatively stable state through a brief period of transition and disruption. In the older three step model the organization had to be told about the need for change, typically using external threats or a “burning platform” to engage the personnel and the culture, who would then understand the need for change and support the transition. Engaging the culture and people meant convincing them of the need to change, helping them understand the potential future state and working with them to ensure they supported the change and could endure the brief transition to the new state. Also embedded in this model was an implicit promise of a short, sharp shock of change followed by a long period of stability.

The implicit promise in the unfreeze-transition-refreeze process to employees and the corporate culture was that once the difficult transition was complete, the organization would remain in the new steady state for a long period of time. The premise of existing change models holds that change happens only occasionally, needs significant preparation and provides a guarantee that once a new state is obtained, the company will be insulated from change for an extended period of time, and won't change until forced to because change is risky, uncertain, distracting and difficult. We'll explore the reasons why we think this prevailing model of change is risky and needs to be changed.

Innovators need a new change model

We innovators need a new model of change, for at least seven important reasons:

1. As innovators we aren't simply responding to external change, we are creating change, both for customers and for our companies and markets. (inside, proactive change vs external, reactive)
2. External change is far more unpredictable, in global markets new threats emerge from anywhere, at any time and often delivered in totally unpredicted business models
3. The pace and nature of change isn't slowing, but is accelerating and will continue to accelerate. (increasing pace, frequency and amplitude of change)
4. As we've demonstrated, most innovation has the potential to be business model innovation, which will require change. (As more innovation becomes focused on business model innovation, this will create even more change)

5. We recognize that change is no longer an occasional threat but a constant companion (shift from the idea of change as a threat to change capacity as a competitive advantage)
6. The idea that companies can achieve a protected steady state where change won't affect them doesn't seem to apply anymore (long periods of stasis are no longer possible. Must be able to change/evolve constantly)
7. We need to think of change as a capability that we constantly deploy, rather than a threat we typically avoid. (Need to develop change as a capability, to build skills, reduce barriers)

For these reasons the concept of unfreezing and refreezing does not seem appropriate anymore. As change becomes more constant, and as we ourselves create change through innovation and business model development we must be much more open to, and welcoming of, change. Rather than viewing change as an occasional nuisance or hurdle, we must build capabilities that allow us to implement change constantly, building barriers for other companies that don't embrace change or can't change quickly and capably.

Factors that must change

Perhaps the biggest change to status quo thinking about change is the concept of a protected steady state where the organization can "freeze" and resist or deflect change for a long period of time. The nature of competition is so fierce that we cannot wall off a market, a segment or a company and avoid change. Rather we need to create capabilities, systems and knowledge that allows us to embrace change and use it to our advantage, whether we create the change through new innovation or the change is thrust upon us from external factors or competitors.

Another concept that must be *rejected* is the idea that change is difficult, distracting and problematic. In the older unfreeze-refreeze model the goal is to experience a significant amount of change in the shortest amount of time, moving as quickly to the new steady state as possible. This signals a lack of engagement, resistance to change and avoidance. Why would we reinforce avoidance of change when the winners in the future markets will be the firms that can embrace and manage change, who are constantly creating change through new innovation? We need to create the belief that change is a positive experience and change capacity creates a positive differentiator for those who invest in the skills and methods.

The old change model indicates signals that a company must endure a brief change activity to win a long period of quiet in the new operating state. This promise of eventual stability is misleading and based on historical data, not future trends and indicators. The older model makes promises that competitive forces contradict. New realities suggest

that we need to be constantly adapting to emerging opportunities and threats, and building change capabilities. Perhaps a new model for change is:

Unfreeze the Rigid – Build change capabilities/reduce cultural barriers – Create change/Promote Fluid

In this suggested change model we recognize that rather than adapting to a new reality, we need to build and sustain change capabilities to be prepared for any eventuality. In the new “state” we don’t expect to sustain a new status quo but to create change and remain capable and be constantly fluid, embracing change and innovation consistently.

To succeed in future markets that will possess far more change, at a much higher rate than before, with far more innovation, *we need a new model for change that shifts the concept of change from an occasional, painful interruption to a consistent, evolving capability*. First we need to understand the existing barriers and challenges associated with change. Then we’ll need to build change capabilities, and finally create a new operational and cultural structure to sustain change.

Fluidity is becoming our growing need of understanding today

There is considerable discussion around changing structures and models to become more adaptive, agile and fluid. With such an increasing level of complexity and environmental turbulence that organizations are having to master, most of their existing systems, processes and approaches are facing increasing challenges. The solutions of fluid, agile and adaptive are aiming to develop highly flexible and fluid organizations as an attractive answer to move towards.

There is so much change being undertaken, the growing call for quick improvisation and ad hoc responses all needs to take us away from those rigid processes into open and fluids ones.

There is no doubt a classic change model that needs an update

We need to ‘unfreeze’ through *recognition of our present rigidity* > We should make a *‘transition’ through experiment and exploration* > Finally we should not ‘refreeze’ as the recognition of past views have offered, *we need to build the adaptive, agile and fluid abilities required for today from learning, collaborating and embracing change*.

To achieve a more organic fluidity, moving from hierarchies to networks, from formal rules and high levels of coordination into far more spontaneous interactions, improvised processes that resolved specific issues and the constantly forming and dissolving project teams where far more lateral organization-wide communications take place is a set of real challenges.

It is this need to create continuously new combinations of resources, with the notion of dynamic capabilities featuring within this. We are seeing more fluidity in relationships where the knowledge is flowing within, across and between organizations. The boundaries are blurring, that increasing fuzziness needs shifting our style of decision making and solution finding.

There is also this growing sense that innovation is endless, it never stops but simply shifts from one stage to another, with the resources being recycled back into a new innovation concept to push these through the system.

There is this feeling of relentless destruction or disturbance, the very opposite of the stable equilibriums we seemed to enjoy in the past. Those that become capable of managing the constant change and disequilibrium will thrive.

We are facing a paradox of fluidity and stability though.

Those growing conditions of uncertainty and complexity also need boundary building, identity formation and problem solving architectures that are stable and can provide replication of essential actions or activities. We need to seek out and maintain yet constantly challenge to “undo” and redesign.

We are still struggling with the dominant linear logic of much of what we do in organizations, and often this constrains innovation, restricts us to provide radically different business models and limits our abilities to change fast enough. We are learning to be far more adaptive in our learning but this is constantly meeting up with resistance of this linear logic.

Emerging Frameworks that help us manage change and fluidity

Fortunately there are a couple of concepts that can help us move toward the new model.

The first is ADKAR, a change facilitation philosophy designed to help people understand the rationale for change, and to support the change. ADKAR is an acronym in which each of the letters stands for the first letter in an action verb that describes the change process:

- Awareness – of the need to change
- Desire – to participate and support the change
- Knowledge – understanding how to change
- Ability – to implement the change
- Reinforcement – the change will be sustained and reinforced

The ADKAR® model is regarded as a more up to date model of change as it is more explicit about the step of *Reinforcement* as one of the phases to establish. As companies consider embracing more change with higher frequency, or the concept of fluidity, the employees will need to be fully engaged and will need to move through the ADKAR process to ensure their buy-in and support.

Beyond the process of change itself, we need a new model that describes the future operating model and business model state. Using change models from the past, we'd suggest that the future state was “frozen”, which allowed the organization to establish and reinforce new processes, build bureaucracy and siloes that would develop more efficiency and resist change until the next cataclysmic change requirement.

As we've discussed, the concept of “freezing” the future state is no longer viable. We need to describe what the potential future state looks like in this new “fluid” model, to define its traits and attributes.

This idea of fluidity introduces an anomaly or the opportunity?

Most organizations are structured for high efficiency, constantly repeating the same processes to gain proficiency. This constant reinforcement improves effectiveness and efficiency, but comes at the cost of narrowing capabilities, resistance to change and the development of siloes.

Creating a “fluid” organizations means sacrificing some experience and proven models, potentially increasing costs and losing some efficiency in order to remain more nimble and fluid. Thus, to sustain nimbleness, agility and “fluidity” we need new philosophies and approaches, and we may need to sacrifice some efficiency.

Three potential methodologies describe how to sustain fluidity in the future state once a firm has committed to sustained fluidity rather than resorting to the unfreeze/refreeze model.

The first model is called Organizational Ambidexterity.

The authors have been searching for an acceptable and working model for ambidexterity, as there are different approaches and possible solutions that need greater reinforcing and designing. This refers to a simultaneous pursuit of fluidity on one hand and efficiency and stability on the other hand. To do this, we need to design organizations, structures, people and processes to be either efficient or change oriented.

As Georg Schreyögg and Jörg Sydow note in their paper entitled “***Organizing for Fluidity- Dilemmas of New Organizational Forms***” (2010), “the pursuit of flexibility has been associated with organic structures reflecting loose coupling and improvisation, whereas maintaining efficient routines is assumed in conjunction with mechanistic structures, reflected in tight coupling, routinization, control and bureaucracy”.

The authors note that in this model one can follow structural ambidexterity, or contextual ambidexterity. Structural ambidexterity means exactly what it says – parallel structures or capabilities which can be deployed as needed. That is, two structures, one which is focused on efficiency and exploiting existing models, with a second parallel structure which is focused on exploration and innovation.

Then you have Contextual ambidexterity

As opposed to structural ambidexterity, which emphasizes competing structures for ambidexterity, contextual ambidexterity emphasizes fluidity in appropriate contextual settings or situations.

The authors note that contextual fluidity requires “*smoothly switching between the different paradigms in everyday behavior*”. The authors further note that it seems difficult to imagine “*organizational behavior as plastic as is assumed*” in this discussion. They note that “organizational behavior...imprinted by occupational history and organizational features, which are both subject to all these institutional and self-reinforcing dynamics which...bring about inertia and path dependence”.

In other words there are real barriers to constantly switching between different points of view. People will do what comes naturally and what their training, existing processes and culture reinforce. The existing processes will resist change and current staff probably don't have the flexibility or skills to constantly switch between roles.

Frank Mattes and Ralph-Christian Ohr built a nice table describing some of the challenges and differences between exploration and exploitation in a recent [paper](#).

Then we have countervailing processes

Another potential framework for fluidity is described by the same authors as “*countervailing processes*”. This model relies on excellent feedback and learning mechanisms to read signals and make determinations as to when to use rely on

established models and capabilities and when to leverage new learning and new capabilities.

The authors refer to this as a “*combination of learning and “non-learning”*”. They further note that this “*reflexive monitoring is only effective if the evolved patterns of organizational activities are still reversible, not yet completely frozen*”. In other words, a rapid reading and reflexive change model only works if the patterns and processes are lightly imprinted, and everyone accepts they are always subject to change. In this model, the authors note that “*Organizations are not relentlessly changing systems; they have the option of adaptation (learning) or nonadaptation (non-learning)*”.

Finally, the authors (Schreyögg and Sydow) note this about countervailing processes: “*..does not favor a regime in which the two functions, exploitation and exploration, are delegated to different subunits and are kept separate, coupled by some structural integration efforts. Instead, it builds on the idea of balancing a countervailing set of processes within an organization.*” They go on to say that “*Organizational designers cannot know in advance which routine processes will need to be changed and which will need to be retained...This seems to us a potentially more promising model than structural separation because it facilitates, beyond routines, the adaptation and learning of the entire organization*”.

One conclusion of the paper is especially important from our perspective.

Schreyögg and Sydow note that “*most organizational theories are still based on a linear logic. Consistency is still among the predominant design principles. However, we need a nonlinear logic to capture countervailing processes*”. This is exactly right. For too long we’ve used simple, linear models with artificial and explicit tradeoffs, favoring stability and predictability over fluidity and nimbleness. These latter attributes become far more important as the pace of change increases, business models evolve and innovation frequency increases.

Providing a caveat as we are all not yet on the same page

We believe there are no definitive models that describe “fluidity” yet that can help us. We have provided some approaches above that have increasing value and usage. At this point they are primarily still academic creations and philosophies, but they need to be explored and given opportunity to be implemented and tested, because the need for new change models and new change capabilities is increasing every day. It is becoming a real imperative.

We tend to favor the fluid concept and outline below a selection of the change models that help you recognize, build and sustain fluidity – these are being tested and investigated but becoming accepted practice. We also believe there are many discussions and debates on defining the new state where innovation, change and business models combine in a new interplay around more agile, adaptive and fluid design.

What can help us build a more fluid organization?

Firstly we have to recognize that major shifts require that skills, capabilities and cultures become more capable for change, more consistently, what we've defined as "fluid".

Let's identify a few enablers and define what they can provide to develop fluidness or how their absence restricts companies in maximizing performance because we remain too rigid and tied to established ways.

Platforms are increasing where we are managing external relationships, we are participating as these platforms have a more likely complexity and participation is partly to reduce and share this across many. We are dealing with a greater horizontal entrepreneurship where each party is bringing different skills, ideas and commitments to the platform. As these evolve they open up possibilities often beyond the existing concept of the platform that lead to the ability to extend and explore a number of adjacencies that add increasing value to our thinking and business. We are learning to apply platform thinking as a new lens of business, society and organization change in a connected world. Using these lenses of Platform engagement allows us to reframe more and reimagine solutions from a globally accessible network contributing potentially a sum greater than the whole of your own organization, contributing the network effect.

Ecosystems are becoming the "new sum of" much for us to reach out and tap into expertise up and down the value chain and we can move across the horizontal by appreciating growing dependencies and exploring or exploiting so much easier through the technology frameworks available to make the connections. Working in a world where the value is appreciated in the connections. One which appreciate the values of working and collaborating across industries, institutions, entrepreneurs, citizens, customers, government and centers of excellence, who can all interact alongside the lines of complexity, cooperation, competence, competition and communication to produce the 'right' interaction to turn ideas into solutions. The essential point is they need to interact fluidly as open networks, searching for bolder, more creative thinking, stimulating cross-collaboration. Here you seek to interconnect and gain complimentary knowledge or new insights to turn into greater value to what you are seeking to do, ones that require that broader universe.

Connectors are those people inside and outside the organization. We are seeking out to extend our networks. The more we tap into them the more we adapt and learn, we absorb, capture, translate and defuse knowledge faster than before. These flows of knowledge grow the more we form relationships, establish diverse networks and tap into the technology available to us for making this global.

Digital and Cloud are radically altering our ability to switch and adapt and influence the rate of adoption. We can undertake far more low cost experimentation through the use of the cloud and tapping into the digital power so we can increase the flow of data and apply improving analytical methods, we can set up for more option-based strategies and design alternative portfolios of options.

The impact of new systems, the ability to tap into different and diverse platforms of opinion and knowledge, to draw into deepening conversations with customers and stakeholders gives us a higher fluidness. We can adopt, learn, adapt, experiment, adjust, explore in so many faster ways but this fluidness can still work within selected existing boundaries and systems.

These shifts are shaping new forms of organization design, based on a growing fluidity, adaptive and agile skill set but still framed with the organizations boundaries and abilities to absorb and translate this into new knowledge (absorptive capacity) for improving the innovation potential. It certainly does partly depends on the organizations readiness to push the boundaries of innovation and that lies in the interplay appreciation.

Further, we should examine characteristics or factors that create barriers for fluidity

Overreliance on past models – when the near future closely resembles the recent past, relying on existing models to determine appropriate actions and investments is rational. Given the increase in the pace of change and the amount and impact of innovation and its impact on business models, it's evident that the near future does not resemble the recent past, which means that we cannot rely on past models. Instead companies must assess the amount and amplitude of change, driven from external factors and created by internal and external innovation, to understand the importance of change and to allow employees to reduce the reliance on existing models.

Change proficiency/capability – in most companies, people receive training and develop skills based on their specific roles and responsibilities, but rarely develop skills that enable or accelerate change. We cannot expect companies and cultures to change frequently and capably if people don't have the skills, capabilities or proficiency to change effectively.

Preferences for stability over change – people, organizations and cultures prefer stability to change. Change is uncertain and demands new learning and new expertise, while stability reinforces existing knowledge and skills. Over time, the desire for stability leads to inertia and active resistance to change. Companies must create a preference for more change, reducing inertia and building change capabilities.

Focus on short term profits rather than longer term viability – Since change is uncertain and distracts from efficient day to day operations, and there is an ever increasing focus on short term profitability, change always takes a back seat to efficient operations and short term profits. Longer term viability suffers because of an overreliance on an increasingly out of date business model, infrequent innovation and a lack of change capacity.

The other recognition is what is making up the competencies of fluid?

Here we provide a list that has many aspects or enabling attributes to them you might recognize. Embracing all of them is not the answer but taking a more detailed and thoughtful approach to those capabilities, competencies and capacities to build fluid into your organization becomes important.

Today we are all on the search for new adaptive infrastructures. We should be participating in platforms and building our ecosystems to extract outside knowledge to learn how to recombine it in new ways. Nothing today stands still; we are in that need to constantly redefine, to build in flexibility and this adaptive skill. We should encourage thinking and challenging present orthodoxies and explore ways to rewire and rethink much of the prevailing system and processes as it has far too much built in rigidity built in.

Today we are losing predictability on much that was a constant in the past, we have a speed of development that needs to constantly be reduced down for competitive advantage or getting our innovation to market earlier.

Specifics we recommend to embed for becoming more fluid.

We are all becoming far more digital, fluid and fast, we are absorbing and responding at faster rates and we are adapting to a constant, multifaceted world of connections, systems and knowledge piecing to combine up into different ‘wholes’.

- To get there we need to be far more nimble, we need to learn navigation skills far more, we are increasingly assignment driven, less exploratory in many things, and technology is taking on this role.
- We need to become increasingly agile, iterative, be experimenting, and constantly determined to execute to drive our results and value-add.
- We need to seek empowerment, focus on delivery and collaboration outcomes far more resolutely.
- We need to grasp the make-up of value creation and why innovation is becoming new business models in its potential.
- We need to establish within ourselves and the working environment we operate within a sound conflict resolution pathway and strive for authenticity and trust within the places we operate.
- Lastly a real willingness to seek out diversity, to be visible, and be wanting to have this constant entry and exit to project and challenges to drive our personal satisfaction and worth up.

In summary we need to relentlessly challenge and push out our own boundaries and knowledge and be “**designed to exploit constantly**” adapting, exploiting and simply responding to the need, being fluid.

Innovators themselves need this change capability the most

While every firm can benefit from recognizing the need for a new change model, innovators need new change models, capacities and future state designs more than ever. Innovators require a new change model because they are not only responding to external, environmental and consumer change, but they are also creating internal and external change through new products, services and business models.

The essential message here is that ***without sustained change capability and capacity, innovators cannot deliver new value to their customers easily***. Without capable change, they cannot adapt and disrupt their existing and adjacent markets, they are constrained within industry or business model conventions, unless or until they are willing to embrace more change.

Therefore, those companies that hope to innovate need new change models and tools, and need to understand how to build change capacities. Further, innovators increasingly will create change, for their customers and themselves, while also needing to react to market change and competitive actions.

Those innovators that push the boundaries will be best positioned.

From our conclusions so far we can gather that the best companies and best innovators will be those that can push significantly beyond today's change constraints to 1) create meaningful products that 2) create change for customers and themselves and 3) adapt and use those changes to create barriers for other competitors while 4) constantly changing and adapting their own structures, processes and models.

Change, innovation and the increasing emphasis on searching for new business models on a constant basis requires us to broaden our thinking. We need to fully 'account for' the impact and change that innovation brings about on three constituents: the *consumer*, *markets and competitors* and finally the *innovator*.

Further, as we've described, a significant amount of innovation is also, perhaps unintentionally, business model innovation, which increases the scope and nature of change. From this we can conclude that external forces are creating change at the same time as innovators create disruptive change, across all three constituents. These simultaneous and unscripted change forces create unappreciated and unanticipated change dynamics. Old models of change that rely on fixed notions of stability occasionally interrupted by change were not built to address this heightened pace and amplitude of change.

Good innovators should be the first to recognize this tidal wave of change, and begin the search for new more flexible models that sustain fluidity and can constantly evolve operating models and business models. Rigid adherence to older models based on long periods of stability will create barriers and roadblocks to necessary change capabilities.

Finally, returning to the Bigger Picture

From our initial white paper "called "*the critical interplay among innovation, business models and change*" and *the series of* posts discussing the different aspects of the interplay of innovation, business models and change, it's possible to open the aperture to contemplate the interplay of these factors with two other sets of factors, to understand the entire scope of change and the need for new change models.

In the interplay discussion we've illustrated the high level of interaction and influence that exists between innovation, business models and change. Let's examine two other sets of factors influenced by the interplay.

One set of factors to consider is the range of impacts innovation can have: incremental, breakthrough and disruptive, represented in our posts as part of the use of the Three Horizons framing. Innovation will happen in all of these dimensions, *across time and*

applicability, creating change in products, services, business models, experiences and more. These dimensions demonstrate the scalability of innovation, and illustrate the impact innovation can have in each dimension. As innovation proceeds from incremental to disruptive, the change it can create scales, as does the impact innovation has on business models.

Another set of factors to consider is the constituents who experience the change: customers, markets and competitors and finally the innovator itself. Most innovation creates change for all three constituents, requiring them to adapt to new realities and adopt new products or services or adjust to new business models. As a new innovation enters the market, it creates change for customers and competitors. However, these constituents don't merely sit still. They are either forced to change to adopt to new realities, or, in the case of competitors may create new solutions or innovations in reaction to the initial innovation, which simply introduces more change.

When examined in its full context we can see why new change models are so vital to sustain a fluid capability to either create new innovations or adapt and adjust to external change or innovation. Companies that understand this and adopt new change models will gain the opportunity to compete in a market defined by almost constant change and increasing innovation. Companies that ignore the need to adopt change models will be unable to innovate and unable to keep pace with faster, more nimble and more fluid competitors.

Jeffrey Phillips and Paul Hobcraft, published this White paper “*Why Innovators Need a New Paradigm*” following on from the recently released Paper “*the critical interplay among innovation, business models and change*” *alongside a series of blog posts relating to the interplay construct.* 16th June 2015

Restricted rights for full or part re-production apply; permission to quote can be sought from the writers. Intellectual Property of Agility Innovation Specialists, & Ovo Innovation

Paul Hobcraft (paul@agilityinnovation.com)

Jeffrey Phillips (JPhillips@OVOInnovation.com)

To obtain BOTH White Papers you can DOWNLOAD by going to

<https://ovoinnovation.wordpress.com/thought-leadership/> or

<http://paul4innovating.com/insights-thinking/>