



## A Sample Title - The SocioEconomic Aspects of Stock Assessments

*with non-English diacritics in the author names. See documentation.*

Christiaan Verhoef<sup>1,2</sup> and Kirsten Coppoolse<sup>3</sup>

1. Windesheim University of Applied Sciences, Campus 2, 8017 CA Zwolle, The Netherlands
2. Social Chicken, Research
3. Universiteit van Amsterdam, Thorbeckelaan 35F, 3741 TR Baarn, The Netherlands



Social Chicken  
Tools for Open Science  
<https://github.com/nmfs-opensci>

# 1 Product Dossier: [Agile Through Simulation]

## 1.1 Executive Summary

## 1.2 Executive Summary

Agile Through Simulation is a practical workshop for non-technical teams, project groups, educators, researchers, SMEs, and operations teams that struggle with unclear priorities, slow handovers, too much work in progress, weak feedback loops, or recurring coordination problems. The product uses Agile principles, but avoids the usual trap of becoming a Scrum lecture, Jira training, certification course, or framework-heavy consultancy session.

The core idea is simple: people understand Agile better when they experience why it matters. Instead of starting with terminology, roles, ceremonies, or theory, the session starts with a simulation. Participants experience how work gets stuck, how queues form, how unclear priorities create waste, how feedback arrives too late, and how small changes in collaboration can improve flow. After the simulation, the team connects those lessons to its own work and turns the insights into a practical output.

The market is active, but crowded. Agile training, Scrum training, and Agile coaching are widely available, which means this product should not compete as “another Agile training”. The opportunity is to position it as a practical, simulation-based Agile workshop for mixed and non-technical teams. This matters because many Agile adoption problems are not caused by a lack of terminology, but by unclear priorities, organizational resistance, poor collaboration, and business teams not fully understanding how Agile helps work move better (Digital.ai 2024).

The product is also useful because many teams use Agile language without actually experiencing better flow. They may have stand-ups, boards, or retrospectives, but still suffer

## *1 Product Dossier: [Agile Through Simulation]*

from overloaded people, unclear ownership, too much work in progress, weak feedback, and slow delivery. This workshop helps teams move from “we are doing Agile things” to “we understand how work flows, where it gets stuck, and what we can improve next.”

In plain language, this product helps a team move from “we are busy, but we do not really understand why work keeps getting stuck” to “we can see the bottlenecks, we understand the effect of our working habits, and we have a first practical agreement for improving collaboration.”

Participants walk away with more than awareness. They leave with a shared experience, a simple language for discussing flow and bottlenecks, a visual map of how work moves through the team, a list of improvement points, and a first working agreement for better collaboration. Depending on the group, the output could be a workflow board, a bottleneck map, a retrospective format, a work-in-progress agreement, or a short action plan.

This product is worth developing because it fits several important requirements. It can be delivered in a maximum of four hours, it is accessible to a mixed group, it can be searched for online through terms such as Agile workshop, Agile training, Agile for non-technical teams, workflow workshop, and Agile simulation, and it has a clear differentiator. The strongest version is not “learn Scrum”, but “experience flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and team improvement through simulation.”

For me, this product is a strong fit because it combines facilitation, teaching, simulation, systems thinking, storytelling, group energy, and visible impact. It gives me room to create a learning experience instead of only explaining concepts. It also protects against the wrong kind of work: generic Agile coaching, abstract process advice, or endless transformation consulting without clear boundaries.

The main risk is that the product gets pulled into the crowded Agile market and becomes too generic. The word Agile is useful because people search for it, but dangerous because many people associate it with corporate jargon, ceremonies, or failed transformations. That risk should be managed by making the positioning concrete: this is a practical Agile workshop where teams experience flow problems, identify bottlenecks, and leave with a first working agreement for better collaboration.

The product succeeds if participants leave saying: “Now I understand why our work gets stuck, and I know one thing we can change.” It fails if they leave with only Agile vocabulary.

## 2 1. Research Summary

### 2.1 1.1 Product Hypothesis

---

Field	Answer
Product name	Agile Through Simulation
Category	Agile / Training / Simulation / Team Development
Type	Workshop with training elements
Target group	Non-technical teams, project teams, educators, researchers, SMEs, operations teams, and mixed teams that struggle with unclear priorities, handovers, flow, and collaboration
Max duration	4 hours including introductions and breaks
Main promise	Participants experience how work gets stuck, understand core Agile principles through simulation, identify bottlenecks in their own teamwork, and leave with a first practical working agreement or improvement action
Current status	Candidate

---

### 2.2 1.2 One Sentence Product Pitch

A four-hour simulation-based Agile workshop where teams experience flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and work-in-progress problems, then translate those insights into practical improvements for their own collaboration.

### 2.3 1.3 Why This Product Might Be Worth Researching

## 2 1. Research Summary

Reason	Evidence Needed	Notes
People search for this	Search terms such as Agile workshop, Agile training, Agile for non-technical teams, Agile simulation, workflow workshop, bottleneck workshop, process improvement workshop	The word Agile is searchable, but crowded. The strongest angle is not generic Agile training, but a practical simulation-based workshop for teams that want to improve flow, handovers, priorities, and collaboration.
The problem is urgent	Workflow pain, unclear priorities, overloaded teams, slow handovers, failed Agile adoption, need for faster learning and feedback	Many teams are busy but not effective. They may use Agile language, boards, or meetings, but still struggle with work getting stuck. The urgency comes from wasted time, frustration, slow delivery, and weak collaboration.
Existing offers are weak	Competitor scan of Agile trainings, Scrum workshops, certification courses, consulting offers, pricing, duration, and practical outputs	Many Agile offers focus on Scrum roles, ceremonies, certification, frameworks, or tooling. The gap is a practical workshop where teams experience flow problems directly and translate that experience into one useful team improvement.

## 2 1. Research Summary

---

Reason	Evidence Needed	Notes
I can deliver it well	Existing experience with facilitation, simulations, Beer Game, teaching, Agile, systems thinking, workshop design, and team learning	This fits my strongest pattern: helping groups learn through experience. I can make abstract concepts such as flow, feedback, bottlenecks, and work-in-progress visible and practical.
It fits my energy	Interaction, simulation, group learning, storytelling, visible insight, practical team output	This product gives me live energy, facilitation, movement, and visible impact. It is less likely to become lonely technical work, as long as it stays a bounded workshop and does not turn into endless Agile coaching.

---

## **3 2. Personal Fit**

### **3.1 2.1 Why This Is a Good Idea for Me**

This product fits me because it combines several things I naturally do well: facilitation, simulation, systems thinking, storytelling, teaching, and helping groups understand complex work by experiencing it.

I am not at my best when I only explain frameworks or give abstract advice. I am stronger when I can create a situation where people feel the problem, reflect on it, and then connect it to their own work. Agile Through Simulation does exactly that. It lets participants experience bottlenecks, unclear priorities, handover problems, too much work in progress, and delayed feedback instead of only hearing about them.

This product also fits my background. I have experience with simulations, the Beer Game, supply chain thinking, Agile concepts, education, research teams, and practical workshop design. That gives me enough material to create a session that feels alive and useful instead of generic.

The product also protects me from becoming a standard Agile coach. I do not want to sell vague transformation advice, Scrum theatre, or endless consultancy. The strongest version of this product is a bounded workshop with a clear experience, a clear reflection, and a concrete team output.

The most important reason this product fits me is that it creates visible learning. People can enter the room thinking Agile is vague or annoying, and leave understanding why flow, feedback, focus, and collaboration matter. That kind of shift gives me energy.

### **3.2 2.2 Energy Fit Check**

### 3 2. Personal Fit

Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Would I enjoy giving this more than once?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is highly repeatable because each group will create different dynamics, bottlenecks, and insights.
Is there enough interaction with people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The product depends on group interaction, simulation, reflection, and shared discussion.
Is there enough room for creativity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is room for storytelling, playful simulation design, visual exercises, and adapting examples to the group.
Is the technical work bounded?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The workshop can run with paper, post-its, cards, or a simple online board. No fragile technical setup is required.
Does it avoid becoming endless support?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, if sold as a bounded workshop. Follow-up coaching or implementation should be scoped separately.
Does it create visible value in one session?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Participants can leave with a workflow map, bottleneck list, improvement actions, or first working agreement.

### 3 2. Personal Fit

---

Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Does it connect to my existing work?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It connects to simulations, Agile, the Beer Game, education, supply chain thinking, workflow design, and team facilitation.

---

### 3.3 2.3 Do Not Sell This If

---

Warning Sign	Present	Notes
It becomes generic consulting	<input type="checkbox"/>	This should be sold as a clear workshop with a start, end, exercise, reflection, and output. Not as vague Agile transformation advice.
It requires too much custom preparation	<input type="checkbox"/>	The simulation and reflection structure should be reusable. Only examples and framing should be adapted per client.
It depends on fragile technical setup	<input type="checkbox"/>	Avoid dependency on complex tools. The physical version should work with simple materials. Remote can use a lightweight online board.
It turns me into helpdesk support	<input type="checkbox"/>	This is not Jira setup, Scrum tooling, workflow software implementation, or ongoing team coaching unless separately scoped.

### 3 2. Personal Fit

---

Warning Sign	Present	Notes
It has no clear output after 4 hours	[ ]	Every session must end with at least one concrete output: workflow map, bottleneck overview, improvement list, or working agreement.
It is too generic to market online	[ ]	The offer must not be called only “Agile training”. It should be positioned as simulation-based Agile for teams that want better flow and collaboration.
It becomes Scrum certification training	[ ]	Avoid certification language. The point is not Scrum roles and ceremonies, but experiencing flow, feedback, and team improvement.
It attracts clients who only want Jira/process tooling	[ ]	Make clear that the product is about team learning and workflow improvement, not tool configuration.
It becomes too playful without business value	[ ]	The simulation must always connect back to real work, bottlenecks, handovers, priorities, and concrete improvement actions.

---

## 4 3. Market Research

### 4.1 3.1 Market Problem

Describe the real problem this product solves.

Question	Answer
What is the current pain?	
Who feels this pain?	
Why is this problem happening now?	
What happens if they do nothing?	
What are they already trying?	
Why are current solutions not enough?	

### 4.2 3.2 Market Drivers

Driver	Relevance	Evidence	Source
Regulation	Low / Medium / High	[Example: AI literacy obligation]	[Source]
Cost pressure	Low / Medium / High	[Example: replacing paid tools]	[Source]
Skills gap	Low / Medium / High	[Example: teams lack practical skills]	[Source]
Productivity pressure	Low / Medium / High	[Example: reporting and admin workload]	[Source]
Privacy concern	Low / Medium / High	[Example: local AI demand]	[Source]
Digital transformation	Low / Medium / High	[Example: SME adoption gap]	[Source]

### 4.3 3.3 Search Demand

The search phrases below are buyer-oriented phrases that potential clients might use when looking for a practical Agile or workflow improvement session. The strongest terms combine

### 4 3. Market Research

recognizable market language such as Agile training with the actual problem this product solves: flow, bottlenecks, collaboration, and work getting stuck.

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Agile training for teams	Learn / Buy	Strong	Clear buyer intent and easy to understand, but crowded. Needs simulation-based differentiation.
Agile workshop	Learn / Buy	Strong	Broad and searchable. Useful as an entry term, but too generic on its own.
Agile training for non-technical teams	Learn / Buy	Strong	Strong fit because the product is designed for mixed teams that do not want software-heavy Agile language.

### 4 3. Market Research

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Agile simulation workshop	Learn / Buy	Strong	Strong match with the product format and differentiator. Likely lower search volume, but higher relevance.
Scrum workshop for teams	Learn / Buy	Medium	Searchable, but risks pulling the product toward Scrum ceremonies and certification language. Use carefully.
Workflow improvement workshop	Solve problem / Buy	Strong	Strong buyer pain language. Good for teams that do not identify with Agile but do want smoother work.

### 4 3. Market Research

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Bottleneck workshop	Solve problem	Medium	Relevant to the product, but may be less common as a search phrase. Useful in supporting copy.
Process improvement workshop	Solve problem / Buy	Strong	Searchable and practical, but broader than Agile. Good for operations, SMEs, and non-technical teams.
Team collaboration workshop	Solve problem / Buy	Medium	Relevant, but broad. Needs sharper framing around workflow and flow.

### 4 3. Market Research

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Kanban workshop	Learn / Buy	Medium	Relevant because of visualizing work and limiting work in progress, but may attract people looking for a specific method.
Agile for business teams	Learn / Buy	Strong	Good fit for non-technical and mixed teams. Emphasizes that Agile is not only for software teams.
Agile retrospective workshop	Learn / Buy	Medium	Relevant as a possible subtopic, but too narrow for the full product.
Lean Agile workshop	Learn / Buy	Medium	Searchable, but may attract framework-heavy expectations. Use only if the product is positioned carefully.

### 4 3. Market Research

---

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Team workflow workshop	Solve problem / Buy	Strong	Strong fit with the real product promise: helping teams see and improve how work moves.

---

### 4.4 3.4 Search Intent Analysis

---

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want a training	[x]	Search terms such as “Agile training for teams”, “Agile training for non-technical teams”, and “Kanban workshop” suggest that buyers are looking for structured learning.
People want a workshop	[x]	This is the strongest format fit. Search terms such as “Agile workshop”, “workflow improvement workshop”, and “Agile simulation workshop” match a practical half-day session.

### 4 3. Market Research

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want implementation help	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Some buyers may want help improving how their team actually works. This product should not promise full Agile transformation, but can deliver a first workflow map, bottleneck overview, and improvement agreement.
People want comparison of tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tool comparison is not the main intent. Some participants may ask about Trello, Jira, Kanban boards, or planning tools, but the product should stay focused on behavior, flow, and collaboration.
People want compliance support	<input type="checkbox"/>	Compliance is not relevant for this product. The driver is team performance and workflow pain, not regulation.
People want cost reduction	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cost reduction may be present indirectly. Teams lose time through waiting, rework, unclear priorities, and overloaded workflows. The product should frame this as reducing waste and improving flow rather than direct financial savings.

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want privacy or control	<input type="checkbox"/>	Privacy is not a central search intent for this product. It may matter if real work examples are used, but the workshop can work with fictional or anonymized cases.
People want better collaboration	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is a major intent. Buyers may not search for “flow”, but they often recognize problems such as poor handovers, unclear ownership, meeting overload, and slow decision-making.
People want less Agile jargon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is a key hidden intent. Some teams are tired of Agile terminology but still need the underlying principles: visibility, feedback, prioritization, and continuous improvement.

## 4.5 3.5 Competitor Scan

The competitor scan shows that Agile training is a crowded market. There are many Scrum, Agile, SAFe, Kanban, and certification-oriented offers. This confirms demand, but it also creates a clear positioning risk: **Agile Through Simulation** must not become another generic Agile or Scrum training.

The opportunity is to position the product as a short, practical, simulation-based workshop for mixed and non-technical teams. The product should compete less on certification or framework knowledge, and more on lived experience, flow, bottlenecks, collaboration, and a concrete team improvement output.

### 4.3. Market Research

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
Scrum Academy	Agile and Scrum LEGO Simulation (Scrum Academy 2026a)	Teams wanting to learn Agile and Scrum through play, team building, and practice	1 day	Proposal-based	Strong experiential format with LEGO simulation, team building, and reflection	Longer than 4 hours and more explicitly Scrum and LEGO focused; less positioned around non-technical workflow bottlenecks
Scrum Academy	Agile in 1 Day (Scrum Academy 2026b)	Teams that want to learn Agile and Scrum by experiencing it	1 day	Proposal-based	Strong “learn by living it” positioning and focus on focus, flow, and fun	Full-day format; likely broader Agile and Scrum introduction rather than compact bottleneck-focused workshop
Agile Scrum Group	Agile Scrum Workshop (Agile Scrum Group 2026)	Organizations considering Scrum, groups from 5 participants	Short workshop	€1,650 excluding VAT, credited against in-company follow-up services	Strong introductory offer, practical project application, and clear in-company focus	Positioned as a funnel into further services; more Scrum-method focused than simulation-based flow learning

### 4.3. Market Research

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
OpenValue Training	Agile/Scrum Training (OpenValue Training 2026)	Professionals and teams wanting Agile/Scrum training	Not clearly visible in scan	€395 excluding VAT per attendee	Clear pricing, practical delivery locations, and tailored in-house options	More standard Agile/Scrum training; less clearly differentiated around simulation, non-technical teams, or bottleneck discovery
Bilginç IT Academy	Introduction to Agile and Scrum Workshop (Bilginç IT Academy 2026)	Organizations and professionals seeking a practical Agile and Scrum introduction	1 day	From €1,033 plus VAT	Interactive one-day workshop with simulated Agile environment and hands-on exercises	Higher price and full-day format; more formal training-provider feel and more Scrum framework oriented
Springest marketplace	Scrum training listings in Amsterdam (Springest 2026)	Individuals and organizations comparing Scrum and Agile trainings	Varies	Examples visible from €449 to €799 and higher	Shows strong market demand and many available providers	Market is crowded, certification-heavy, and comparison-based; difficult to stand out with generic Agile training

### 4.3. Market Research

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
Dimensions via Springest	Agile Scrum Training for Non-IT (Springest 2026)	Non-IT professionals and teams	Not clearly visible in scan	€799 listed on Springest	Directly validates the “non-IT Agile” market angle	Competes directly on non-IT positioning; our differentiation must be simulation, flow, and concrete team output
Gladwell Academy	Agile, SAFe and Agile Coaching Trainings (Gladwell Academy 2026)	Professionals, Agile coaches, leaders, and scaling organizations	Often full-day or multi-day	Examples visible around €2,995 to €3,495	Strong brand, broad Agile and SAFe training portfolio, professional credibility	Expensive and more advanced/certification/scaling oriented; less suitable for accessible half-day team learning
Agile Strides	LEGO Simulation Scrum Workshop (Agile Strides 2026)	Teams wanting to experience Scrum through a LEGO city-building exercise	Not clearly visible in scan	Not publicly visible	Clear experiential Scrum-by-playing format	Strong overlap on simulation; however, it appears more Scrum and LEGO specific, leaving space for broader workflow and bottleneck simulation

### 4.3. Market Research

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
Lagant	Scrum training with simulation games and real-life cases (Lagant 2026)	Scrum learners and professionals	Not clearly visible in scan	Not clearly visible in scan	Uses experiential learning, simulation games, and real-life cases	More tied to Scrum training and certification pathways than a short, non-technical team workshop

The main market gap is not the absence of Agile training. The market is clearly crowded. The gap is a compact, practical, simulation-based workshop that helps mixed teams experience why work gets stuck and then translate that experience into a concrete improvement agreement.

**Agile Through Simulation** should therefore avoid competing directly with certification courses, full-day Scrum introductions, SAFe training, or Jira-oriented implementation support. Its strongest market position is:

A four-hour practical Agile workshop for mixed and non-technical teams that uses simulation to make flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and collaboration visible.

### 4.6 3.6 Saturation Check

Question	Answer
Are there many offers with this exact topic?	There are many Agile, Scrum, Kanban, SAFe, and Agile coaching offers. The general Agile training market is crowded. However, fewer offers are positioned as a short, simulation-based workshop for mixed or non-technical teams focused on flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and practical team improvement (Springest 2026; Scrum Academy 2026a; Agile Strides 2026).

### 4 3. Market Research

Question	Answer
Are most offers generic or specific?	Many offers are specific to Scrum, SAFe, certification, Agile coaching, or framework adoption. This creates a risk if the product is marketed only as Agile training. The opportunity is to be specific in a different way: simulation-based Agile for teams that want better flow and collaboration without framework-heavy language (Gladwell Academy 2026; Lagant 2026; Bilginç IT Academy 2026).
Are most offers online courses or live workshops?	There is a mix of classroom training, in-company workshops, certification courses, and marketplace-listed trainings. Several competitors offer live or in-company formats, which means the format itself is not unique. The differentiator must be the experience, the simulation, and the concrete team output (Scrum Academy 2026b; Agile Scrum Group 2026; Springest 2026).
Are most offers practical or theoretical?	Many competitors claim practical or experiential learning, and some already use simulations or LEGO-based exercises. This means the product cannot rely only on being “hands-on”. It must be sharper: a compact workshop where teams experience workflow problems and leave with a bottleneck map, improvement actions, or working agreement (Scrum Academy 2026a; Agile Strides 2026; Lagant 2026).
Are prices visible?	Prices are partly visible. Some providers show public prices, such as OpenValue at €395 excluding VAT per attendee, Bilginç from €1,033 plus VAT, and Springest listings with examples from several hundred euros upward. Other in-company or simulation-based offers are proposal-based. This suggests room for a transparent fixed-price half-day product (OpenValue Training 2026; Bilginç IT Academy 2026; Springest 2026).

### 4.3. Market Research

---

Question	Answer
Is there space for a hands-on 4-hour version?	Yes, but only with sharp positioning. The space is not “another Agile training”. The space is a four-hour simulation-based workshop for mixed or non-technical teams that want to understand why work gets stuck and what they can improve first. The product should compete on clarity, accessibility, facilitation, and concrete team output rather than certification or framework depth.
What is the main saturation risk?	The product could disappear into the crowded Agile and Scrum training market if it is described too generically. The word Agile is useful for search, but the offer must quickly signal that it is practical, simulation-based, and not a standard Scrum course.
What is the strongest opening in the market?	The strongest opening is a compact, non-certification workshop where teams experience flow problems, identify bottlenecks, and translate the lesson into a practical improvement agreement. This is especially relevant for teams that need better collaboration but do not identify with software-focused Agile training.

---

### 4.7 3.7 Market Gap

---

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Too theoretical	[x]	Many Agile trainings explain roles, ceremonies, frameworks, or principles, but teams often need to feel the problem before they understand it. This product should make flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and work-in-progress visible through simulation rather than explanation alone.

### 4 3. Market Research

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Too technical	[x]	Some Agile offers are tied to software teams, Jira, Scrum roles, SAFe, or delivery frameworks. The gap is an accessible version for mixed and non-technical teams that need better collaboration without software-development language.
Too generic	[x]	“Agile training” is a crowded and generic market. The product needs to avoid sounding like another Scrum course. The sharper position is simulation-based Agile for teams that want to understand why work gets stuck and what to improve first.
Too expensive	[x]	Some Agile and Scrum trainings are priced per participant or positioned as formal professional courses. A fixed-price half-day team workshop can be easier to buy for SMEs, education teams, research groups, and small organizations.
Too long	[x]	Many offers are full-day, multi-day, certification-based, or part of larger transformation programs. A four-hour version lowers the threshold and makes the product easier to pilot.

### 4 3. Market Research

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Not local or privacy-friendly	[ ]	This is not a major gap for this product. Agile Through Simulation does not depend on sensitive data or external tools. The session can use fictional, anonymized, or team-generated examples.
Not designed for researchers or SMEs	[x]	Many Agile offers are aimed at software teams, Scrum professionals, enterprise scaling, or certification markets. There is room for a practical version for researchers, educators, SMEs, and mixed teams that need better flow but do not identify with software Agile.
No concrete output	[x]	Some trainings may create understanding, but not always a usable artifact. This product should end with a workflow map, bottleneck overview, improvement list, or first team working agreement.
Too framework-focused	[x]	A lot of Agile training starts with Scrum, SAFe, Kanban, roles, or ceremonies. This product should start from lived experience: work gets stuck, feedback arrives late, priorities are unclear, and teams need to see the system.

### 4 3. Market Research

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Too certification-oriented	[x]	Certification can be useful for professionals, but it is not the need here. Mixed teams need practical shared understanding and usable improvement actions, not exam preparation.
Too much Agile baggage	[x]	Some teams are tired of Agile language because they associate it with meetings, management pressure, or failed transformations. The simulation format can bypass some of that resistance by making the value visible before introducing terminology.

## 4.8 3.8 Buyer Persona

Persona	Description
Role	Team lead, project manager, research coordinator, lecturer, education coordinator, operations lead, SME owner, innovation coordinator, or department manager
Sector	Education, applied research, public sector, SME, operations, logistics, supply chain, administration, and mixed knowledge-work teams
Main pain	The team is busy, but work still gets stuck. Priorities are unclear, handovers are slow, feedback comes too late, meetings do not solve the real problem, and people may already be tired of Agile language without seeing better collaboration.
What they want	A practical session that helps the team see how work actually flows, where bottlenecks appear, and what small changes could improve collaboration. They want less theory and more shared insight, preferably with a concrete output after one session.

### 4.3. Market Research

---

Persona	Description
What they fear	They fear buying yet another Agile training that talks about Scrum roles, ceremonies, or frameworks without changing how the team works. They may also fear resistance from team members who are cynical about Agile or tired of process changes.
What would make them buy	A clear four-hour format, simulation-based learning, no certification language, practical examples, fixed price, visible output, and a promise that the session ends with a workflow map, bottleneck overview, or first team working agreement.
What would stop them	If the offer sounds too generic, too much like Scrum training, too playful without business value, too expensive, too long, or too dependent on follow-up consulting. It may also fail if the buyer cannot quickly understand how the simulation connects to real work problems.

---

### 4.9 3.9 Willingness to Pay Estimate

---

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Problem is urgent	[ ]	[x]	[ ]	The pain is real, but not always urgent until the team is visibly stuck, frustrated, missing deadlines, or tired of meetings that do not improve work. Urgency is strongest when the buyer already sees bottlenecks or Agile fatigue.

### 4 3. Market Research

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Has budget owner	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget may sit with team leads, project managers, HR, learning and development, innovation, operations, or department management. The buyer exists, but the budget owner may differ per organization.
Saves time or money	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The product can expose waiting time, rework, unclear priorities, overloaded people, and poor handovers. These are expensive problems, even when teams do not measure them directly.
Supports compliance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Compliance is not a meaningful driver for this product. This should not be sold through a regulation or compliance angle.
Helps team capability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This is the strongest value signal. The workshop helps teams build shared understanding of flow, bottlenecks, feedback, priorities, and collaboration.

### 4 3. Market Research

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Easy to explain	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	“Agile Through Simulation” is understandable, but still needs a clear subtitle. The best explanation is: a practical workshop where teams experience why work gets stuck and leave with concrete improvement actions.
Easy to buy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A four-hour fixed-price workshop is easier to buy than a large Agile transformation. However, it must be positioned around a recognizable pain, not just Agile learning.
Differentiated from competitors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The simulation angle is useful, but not unique by itself. The differentiation becomes stronger when focused on mixed teams, non-technical teams, bottlenecks, and concrete output.

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Repeatable delivery	[ ]	[ ]	[x]	The workshop can be repeated with reusable exercises, timing, worksheets, and reflection structure. Only the examples and framing need light adaptation.

## 4.10 3.10 Market Research Conclusion

Research Question	Answer
Is there visible demand?	Yes
Is the market oversaturated?	Partly
Is there a clear niche?	Yes
Can I explain the value quickly?	Yes, with the right subtitle
Should this move to execution design?	Yes

Short conclusion:

There is visible demand for Agile training, Scrum workshops, workflow improvement, and team collaboration support. The market is crowded, especially around Scrum, certification, SAFe, and generic Agile training. That means this product should not be sold as “just another Agile training”.

The clear niche is a short, simulation-based Agile workshop for mixed and non-technical teams that want to understand why work gets stuck and what they can improve first. The strongest buyer pain is not “we need Agile theory”, but “our work does not flow, priorities are unclear, and collaboration keeps breaking down”.

The product can be explained quickly if the title is supported by a practical subtitle: **Agile Through Simulation: a hands-on workshop where teams experience flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and better collaboration.** This makes the value clearer than a generic Agile label.

The product should move to execution design, but with one condition: the session must end with a concrete output. A simulation alone is not enough. Participants should leave with a bottleneck map, workflow insight, improvement actions, or a first team working agreement.

## 5 4. Product Positioning

### 5.1 4.1 Product Promise

After this session, participants will be able to:

- explain in plain language why work gets stuck, delayed, or overloaded
- recognize common flow problems such as unclear priorities, too much work in progress, slow handovers, late feedback, and hidden bottlenecks
- experience the difference between pushing work through a system and improving flow as a team
- connect simulation insights to their own work situation
- identify at least one real bottleneck or collaboration issue in their team
- create a first improvement action or working agreement for better flow, feedback, and collaboration

### 5.2 4.2 Unique Selling Proposition

A practical simulation-based Agile workshop where mixed and non-technical teams experience why work gets stuck and leave with concrete improvement actions instead of generic Scrum theory.

### 5.3 4.3 Positioning Table

Dimension	This Product
Practical vs theoretical	Strongly practical. Theory is used only to explain what participants just experienced in the simulation.
Beginner vs advanced	Beginner to mixed level. Designed for teams that need practical understanding, not Agile certification.
Tool-focused vs workflow-focused	Workflow-focused. Tools such as Trello, Jira, or Kanban boards may be mentioned, but they are not the core of the product.
Generic vs niche	Niche enough to stand out: simulation-based Agile for mixed and non-technical teams that want better flow and collaboration.

---

Dimension	This Product
Training vs implementation	Training with practical workshop output. It creates insight and first actions, but does not promise a full Agile transformation.
Individual vs team-based	Team-based. The value comes from shared experience, shared language, and a first team-level improvement agreement.

---

## 5.4 4.4 What This Product Is Not

This product is not:

- a generic Agile inspiration session without practical output
- a Scrum certification course
- a Jira, Trello, or tooling workshop
- a SAFe or scaling framework training
- a full Agile transformation project
- unlimited Agile coaching
- a long theoretical course about frameworks
- a vendor sales pitch for a specific method or platform
- a workshop where people only play a game without connecting it to real work
- a replacement for management decisions about priorities, capacity, or team structure
- a promise that one workshop will solve all collaboration problems

## 6 5. Execution Template

### 6.1 5.1 Delivery Format

---

Item	Choice
Preferred format	Physical
Can be remote	With changes
Can be hybrid	Only with co-facilitator
Needs online environment	Optional for physical, required for remote or hybrid
Needs laptops	No for physical, yes for remote or hybrid
Needs post-its	Yes for physical, optional for remote
Needs participant data or examples	Optional

---

### 6.2 5.2 Group Size

---

Group Size	Suitability	Notes
1 to 5	Medium	Possible for a small pilot or leadership session, but too small for strong group dynamics.
6 to 12	High	Ideal size. Enough people for simulation dynamics, discussion, reflection, and subgroup work.
13 to 20	Medium	Possible, but needs stricter facilitation, clear roles, and possibly multiple simulation groups.

## 6 5. Execution Template

Group Size	Suitability	Notes
21 plus	Low	Not recommended as the standard format. Requires redesign, extra facilitation, and a more event-like setup.

Recommended group size:

The ideal group size is 6 to 12 participants. This is large enough for the simulation to create real dynamics, but small enough to keep reflection personal and practical. For groups of 13 to 20, the session should use subgroups and stricter timeboxing. For groups above 20, the product should be redesigned as a larger facilitated event rather than the standard workshop.

### 6.3 5.3 Required Materials

#### 6.3.1 Physical Materials

Material	Required	Notes
Post-its	[x]	Used for workflow mapping, bottleneck notes, observations, and improvement actions.
Markers	[x]	Needed so notes are readable during group work and plenary discussion.
Flip-over	[x]	Useful for explaining the simulation, capturing lessons, and summarizing team agreements.
Whiteboard	[ ]	Helpful if available, but not required if flip-over sheets are used.
Printed worksheets	[x]	Needed for simulation instructions, observation notes, bottleneck mapping, and action planning.

## 6 5. Execution Template

---

Material	Required	Notes
Timer	[x]	Essential for keeping simulation rounds and reflection blocks short and energetic.
Name cards	[ ]	Optional, useful if participants do not know each other.
Voting stickers	[x]	Useful for prioritizing bottlenecks and selecting the most important improvement actions.
Simulation cards or task cards	[x]	Core material for the simulation. These should be prepared before the session.
Role cards	[x]	Needed if the simulation uses roles such as requester, worker, reviewer, coordinator, or customer.
Tape or wall space	[x]	Needed to create a visible workflow board or place simulation outputs on the wall.

---

### 6.3.2 Digital Materials

---

Material	Required	Notes
Facilitator laptop	[x]	Needed for slides, timing, examples, and optional remote backup.
Presentation	[x]	Keep short and visual. Use it to frame the simulation, not to lecture.
Online whiteboard	[ ]	Optional for physical sessions, required for remote or hybrid delivery.

## 6.5. Execution Template

---

Material	Required	Notes
Shared document	[x]	Useful for capturing final bottlenecks, working agreements, and action points.
Example dataset	[ ]	Not required. This product is about workflow and collaboration, not data analysis.
Example workflow	[x]	Useful as a simple reference before participants map their own workflow.
Feedback form	[x]	Needed to evaluate whether the simulation created useful insight and practical next steps.
QR code	[x]	Useful for quick access to the feedback form, shared document, or resources.
Digital timer	[x]	Useful backup for strict timeboxing during simulation rounds.
Export template	[x]	Needed if the facilitator sends a summary after the session.

---

### 6.3.3 Participant Materials

---

Participant Brings	Required	Notes
Laptop	[ ]	Not required for the physical version. Required for remote or hybrid delivery.
Charger	[ ]	Only needed if laptops are used.

## 6 5. Execution Template

Participant Brings	Required	Notes
Headset	[ ]	Required for remote participants, recommended for hybrid participants.
Own example	[x]	Participants should bring one real workflow problem, such as unclear priorities, slow handovers, too many open tasks, or recurring delays.
Access to tools	[ ]	Not required. The workshop should not depend on Jira, Trello, Teams, or any specific workflow tool.
Account created beforehand	[ ]	Not required for the physical version. Only needed if a remote version uses Miro, Mural, FigJam, or another online board.

### 6.4 5.4 Online Environment

Tool	Use Case	Preferred
Miro	Sticky notes and visual workshop	[x]
Mural	Sticky notes and visual workshop	[ ]
FigJam	Visual collaboration	[x]
Excalidraw	Simple open visual board	[x]
Microsoft Whiteboard	Microsoft organizations	[x]
Google Docs	Simple shared writing	[x]

## 6 5. Execution Template

Tool	Use Case	Preferred
Nextcloud document	Open-source collaboration	[x]
Obsidian Canvas	Knowledge mapping	[ ]

Chosen setup:

For the physical version, the preferred setup is paper-based: post-its, printed task cards, role cards, wall space, and a flip-over. This keeps the workshop energetic and prevents the simulation from becoming tool-focused.

For remote or hybrid delivery, use one online whiteboard and one shared document. The online whiteboard is used for the simulation, workflow map, bottleneck map, and improvement actions. The shared document is used for the final working agreement and action list.

Best default setup:

Situation	Recommended Setup
Physical	Post-its, task cards, role cards, flip-over, wall space
Remote	Miro or FigJam plus Google Docs or Nextcloud document
Hybrid	Miro, FigJam, or Microsoft Whiteboard plus shared document, only with co-facilitator
Open-source preference	Excalidraw plus Nextcloud document

Setup needed before session:

- Board or physical wall structure created
- Simulation task cards prepared
- Role cards prepared if used
- Workflow stages prepared
- Bottleneck mapping area prepared
- Improvement action area prepared
- Working agreement document created
- Instructions added
- Access tested for remote or hybrid delivery
- Backup link ready
- Timer ready

## 7 6. Detailed Session Design

### 7.1 6.1 Four Hour Version

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
10:00 to 10:10	Welcome	Start safely and set the tone	Short introduction by facilitator	Group ready
10:10 to 10:20	Expectations	Understand what participants want to improve	Quick round or sticky notes	Expectations and pain points list
10:20 to 10:35	Problem framing	Make clear why flow and collaboration matter	Short story, practical example, and team-workflow framing	Shared reason for the session
10:35 to 10:50	Agile without jargon	Explain the core ideas without framework overload	Short teaching block on flow, feedback, focus, work-in-progress, and learning	Basic shared understanding
10:50 to 11:05	Simulation briefing	Prepare participants for the exercise	Explain rules, roles, task flow, and goal	Participants understand the simulation
11:05 to 11:30	Simulation round 1: current system	Let participants experience work getting stuck	Group simulation with normal pressure and limited coordination	First experience of bottlenecks and delays
11:30 to 11:45	Break	Reset energy	Break	
11:45 to 12:05	Reflection round 1	Extract what happened in the first round	Guided discussion and observation capture	First insight list
12:05 to 12:30	Simulation round 2: improved system	Let participants test changes to improve flow	Same simulation with one or more improvements	Comparison between chaotic flow and improved flow

## 7.6. Detailed Session Design

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
12:30 to 12:45	Reflection round 2	Identify what changed and why	Guided discussion	Flow principles made visible
12:45 to 13:05	Own workflow map	Translate simulation insights to real work	Participants map their own workflow or team process	Draft workflow map
13:05 to 13:20	Break	Reset energy	Break	
13:20 to 13:40	Bottleneck mapping	Identify where work gets stuck in the real team	Small group work using workflow map	Bottleneck overview
13:40 to 13:55	Improvement actions	Turn insights into practical next steps	Prioritization and action design	First improvement action list
13:55 to 14:00	Closing	Commit to one next step	Check-out round	Final action per participant

## 7.2 6.2 Two Hour Pilot Version

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
10:00 to 10:10	Welcome	Start and frame the session	Short introduction	Group ready
10:10 to 10:25	Problem framing	Explain why work gets stuck	Short story and practical example	Shared problem
10:25 to 10:40	Agile without jargon	Teach the basic idea clearly	Short explanation of flow, feedback, and work-in-progress	Basic understanding
10:40 to 10:50	Simulation briefing	Prepare participants for the exercise	Explain roles, rules, and task flow	Participants ready
10:50 to 11:15	Simulation round	Let participants experience bottlenecks and coordination problems	Short group simulation	First insight
11:15 to 11:30	Reflection	Extract learning from the simulation	Guided discussion	Insight list
11:30 to 11:45	Own workflow	Translate to participant work	Simple workflow mapping template	Mini workflow map

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
11:45 to 11:55	First improvement action	Decide one practical next step	Action card or shared document	First improvement action
11:55 to 12:00	Closing	Gather feedback and commitment	Check-out	Evaluation

### 7.3 6.3 Session Logic

The session follows this learning flow:

Step	Question	Output
Experience	What happens when work moves badly through a system?	Simulation experience
Reflect	What did we notice?	Insight list
Explain	Which Agile principles explain what happened?	Shared language
Translate	Where does this happen in our own work?	Workflow map
Improve	What can we change first?	Improvement action or working agreement

### 7.4 6.4 Minimum Viable Output

The session is only complete if participants leave with at least:

- one shared insight about how work gets stuck
- one simple workflow map
- one identified bottleneck
- one concrete improvement action
- one agreed next step

If participants only played the simulation but did not connect it to their own work, the product has not delivered its promise.

## **8 7. Facilitation Script**

### **8.1 7.1 Opening Script**

Today is not a lecture about Agile, and the goal is not to turn everyone into Scrum experts. The goal is to make flow, feedback, focus, and collaboration practical enough that you can use them in your own work.

We will keep the theory short. Most of the learning will come from doing. You will experience how work gets stuck, how bottlenecks appear, how feedback changes the system, and how small choices in teamwork can make work easier or harder.

By the end of the session, you should have a clearer understanding of why Agile principles matter, where work gets stuck in your own team, and what first improvement action you can take.

### **8.2 7.2 Problem Framing Script**

Many teams are busy, but being busy is not the same as making progress. Work can pile up, priorities can change, handovers can slow things down, and feedback can arrive too late.

This is where Agile often gets misunderstood. Agile is not valuable because of meetings, boards, ceremonies, or terminology. Agile is valuable when it helps teams make work visible, learn faster, reduce overload, and improve collaboration.

In this session, we make the problem visible. First, we experience it through a simulation. Then we connect that experience to your own work. The goal is not to create a perfect process today. The goal is to understand one real pattern and choose one practical next step.

### **8.3 7.3 Transition to Simulation**

You do not need to get this perfect. In fact, the first round is allowed to be messy.

The goal of the simulation is to make the system visible. Pay attention to where work waits, where people become overloaded, where information gets lost, where feedback arrives too late, and where the group starts making assumptions.

Do not only focus on your own role. Watch the whole system.

## 8.4 7.4 Transition to Reflection

Before we explain anything, let's first look at what happened.

What did you notice? Where did work pile up? Where did people wait? Where did communication break down? Where did the team lose sight of the goal?

We are not looking for blame. We are looking for patterns.

## 8.5 7.5 Transition to Own Work

Now we connect the simulation to your real work.

The question is: where does this same pattern show up in your team?

Maybe it is too much work in progress. Maybe it is unclear ownership. Maybe feedback comes too late. Maybe everything feels urgent. Maybe the real bottleneck is not where people think it is.

Use the workflow map to make that visible.

## 8.6 7.6 Transition to Action Design

Now we move from insight to action.

Do not try to fix everything. A good first action is small, clear, and testable.

Ask:

- What is one bottleneck we can reduce?
- What is one handover we can improve?
- What is one type of work we should make more visible?
- What is one rule that would reduce confusion?
- What is one feedback moment we can add earlier?

## 8.7 7.7 Closing Script

The value of this session is not that we played a simulation or learned Agile words. The value is that you now have a shared experience, a clearer view of how work gets stuck, and one practical improvement to test.

Before we close, choose one concrete action you can take in the next week. Keep it small enough that you can actually do it.

The goal is not to become perfectly Agile. The goal is to improve how work flows, one useful step at a time.

## 9 8. Outputs and Deliverables

### 9.1 8.1 Participant Output

At the end of the session, participants have:

- a shared experience of how work gets stuck, delayed, or overloaded
- a basic understanding of flow, bottlenecks, feedback, work-in-progress, and team coordination
- a simple workflow map of how work moves through their own team or process
- a first bottleneck overview showing where work waits, slows down, or creates rework
- a short list of practical improvement actions
- one agreed next step the team can test within one or two weeks

The most important participant output is not the simulation itself. The simulation is only the learning vehicle. The real output is a clearer shared view of the team's work and one concrete improvement action.

### 9.2 8.2 Facilitator Output

After the session, I deliver:

Deliverable	Included	Notes
PDF summary	[x]	Short summary of the session, key insights, bottlenecks, and agreed next steps.
Photo or export of board	[x]	Export or photos of workflow map, bottleneck map, simulation observations, and improvement actions.
Workflow map	[x]	Clean version or photo-based version of how the team mapped its current work.

## 9 8. Outputs and Deliverables

---

Deliverable	Included	Notes
Bottleneck overview	[x]	Summary of where work gets stuck, delayed, overloaded, or unclear.
Action list	[x]	List of concrete improvement actions selected by the team.
First working agreement	[x]	Optional but recommended. Captures one or more team rules around flow, handovers, work-in-progress, or feedback.
Resource list	[x]	Short list of practical resources on Agile, flow, Kanban, retrospectives, and team improvement.
Follow-up advice	[x]	Short advice on what the team should test next, without turning it into open-ended coaching.
Optional implementation offer	[ ]	Only offered if there is a clear follow-up need, such as improving the workflow board, designing a retrospective, or running a follow-up improvement session.

---

## 10 9. Remote and Hybrid Design

### 10.1 9.1 Remote Feasibility

Requirement	Needed	Ready
Video call link	[x]	[ ]
Online board	[x]	[ ]
Shared document	[x]	[ ]
Clear instructions	[x]	[ ]
Backup plan	[x]	[ ]
Shorter exercise blocks	[x]	[ ]

Remote design notes:

This product can be delivered remotely, but the remote version should not simply copy the physical workshop. The simulation needs to be redesigned for an online board, shorter rounds, clearer roles, and stricter facilitation.

Remote delivery works best when every participant has their own laptop, the online board is prepared in advance, and the simulation is kept simple. The facilitator should avoid long explanations and use shorter blocks with clear instructions.

Remote adjustments:

- use a prepared online board with workflow stages
- use digital task cards instead of physical cards
- assign clear roles before the simulation starts
- keep simulation rounds shorter
- use breakout rooms only when the group is larger than 8
- capture observations during the simulation
- use a shared document for the final workflow map and improvement actions
- keep a backup version of the exercise as a simple shared spreadsheet or document

The remote version is feasible, but the physical version is stronger because the energy, movement, and visible team dynamics are easier to create in a room.

### 10.2 9.2 Hybrid Feasibility

Requirement	Needed	Ready
Good room microphone	[x]	[ ]
Camera on room	[x]	[ ]
Shared digital board for everyone	[x]	[ ]
Co-facilitator	[x]	[ ]
Remote participant check-ins	[x]	[ ]

Hybrid recommendation:

Only with co-facilitator

Reason:

Hybrid is possible, but it is the riskiest format for this product. The simulation depends on participation, timing, observation, and group energy. If remote participants only watch while the physical group interacts with cards, post-its, and wall space, the session will fail for them.

For hybrid delivery, everyone should use the same shared digital board, including people in the physical room. A co-facilitator should monitor the remote participants, chat, technical issues, and inclusion. Without that support, the physical group will naturally dominate the session.

Hybrid works only if:

- remote participants have active roles in the simulation
- the physical group also works digitally
- the audio is good enough for natural discussion
- the facilitator regularly checks in with remote participants
- there is a co-facilitator watching the online side

Hybrid should not be offered as the default version. The preferred format is physical. Remote is acceptable with redesign. Hybrid is only acceptable when the client can provide the right setup.

## 10.3 10. Pricing and Packaging

### 10.4 10.1 Possible Versions

## 10.9. Remote and Hybrid Design

---

Version	Duration	Output	Price	Notes
Pilot	2 hours	Mini simulation, short reflection, one bottleneck, one improvement action	€450 excluding VAT	Good for testing with a friendly team or first client
Standard	4 hours	Full simulation, workflow map, bottleneck overview, and first improvement action list	€950 excluding VAT	Main product and best default offer
Extended	2 times 4 hours	Workshop plus application session, improved workflow map, team working agreement, and follow-up advice	€1,750 excluding VAT	Higher value version for teams that want to apply the insights to real work

---

### 10.5 10.2 What Is Included

Included:

- intake call of max 30 minutes
- preparation of the simulation
- light adaptation to the target group
- live delivery of the workshop
- physical or digital workshop materials
- simulation task cards
- role cards if needed
- workflow mapping template
- bottleneck mapping template
- improvement action template
- basic PDF summary
- photo or export of workshop outputs
- follow-up email with resources and next steps

Not included:

- unlimited Agile coaching
- Scrum certification training

- Jira, Trello, or workflow tool setup
- full Agile transformation
- custom software development
- ongoing team coaching
- full process redesign
- management consultancy beyond the workshop scope
- extra sessions without agreement
- implementation support without separate scope

## 10.6 10.3 Packaging Logic

The pilot version is designed to test whether the simulation works with a specific audience. It should be small, energetic, and easy to schedule. The goal is not to solve all workflow problems, but to validate whether participants recognize the pain and find the simulation useful.

The standard version is the main commercial product. It provides enough time to experience the simulation, reflect on what happened, map the team's own workflow, identify bottlenecks, and select practical improvement actions.

The extended version is for teams that want to go beyond insight. The first session creates the shared experience and identifies bottlenecks. The second session applies the lessons to the team's real workflow and turns the insights into a more concrete working agreement.

## 10.7 10.4 Pricing Notes

The price should stay fixed and simple. This makes the offer easier to understand and prevents it from turning into vague Agile consulting.

The product should not be sold per hour. It should be sold as a bounded team workshop with a clear output.

Custom follow-up work should be scoped separately. If a client wants ongoing Agile coaching, workflow redesign, tool setup, or implementation support, that should become a separate offer.

## 11 11. Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Topic too broad	Medium	High	Keep the promise narrow: teams experience flow problems, identify bottlenecks, and choose one practical improvement action. Do not try to cover all of Agile.
Too technical	Low	Medium	Avoid Jira, tooling, software delivery jargon, and framework-heavy explanations. Use simple language, physical materials, and recognizable work examples.
Too generic	Medium	High	Do not market it as generic Agile training. Position it as simulation-based Agile for mixed and non-technical teams that want better flow and collaboration.
Low market demand	Low	High	Demand exists, but the generic Agile market is crowded. Validate the niche through pilots with education teams, project teams, SMEs, and non-technical departments.
Too much preparation	Medium	Medium	Create reusable simulation cards, role cards, workflow templates, bottleneck templates, and action-planning worksheets. Only lightly adapt examples per client.

11 11. Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Remote energy drops	Medium	Medium	Prefer physical delivery. For remote sessions, use shorter rounds, clear roles, a prepared online board, and frequent check-ins.
Becomes support work	Medium	High	Define the product as a bounded workshop. Ongoing Agile coaching, tool setup, workflow redesign, or implementation support must be sold separately.
Becomes generic Scrum training	Medium	High	Avoid centering the session on Scrum roles, ceremonies, and certification. Use Agile principles only to explain what participants experienced in the simulation.
Simulation feels too playful	Medium	High	Always connect the simulation back to real work: bottlenecks, handovers, priorities, delays, overload, and feedback. The game is a learning vehicle, not the product.
Participants resist Agile language	Medium	Medium	Lead with workflow pain rather than Agile jargon. Use terms like flow, bottlenecks, feedback, priorities, and collaboration before introducing Agile labels.
No concrete output	Medium	High	End every session with a workflow map, bottleneck overview, improvement action list, or first team working agreement.
Client expects transformation	Medium	High	Make clear that this is a first-step workshop, not a complete Agile transformation. The goal is insight, alignment, and one practical improvement to test.

## 11 11. Risk Analysis

---

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Group too large	Medium	Medium	Keep the standard group size between 6 and 12. For groups above 12, use subgroups. For groups above 20, redesign as a larger facilitated event.
Wrong buyer expectation	Medium	High	The sales page must clearly state what the product is and is not. It is not certification, tooling, SAFe, Jira, or ongoing coaching.
Weak follow-through after session	Medium	Medium	Include one concrete next step, owner, and test period. Offer an optional follow-up session only if the client wants support applying the improvement.

---

# 12 12. Pilot Plan

## 12.1 12.1 Pilot Audience

Possible pilot groups:

- colleagues at Windesheim
- research teams
- education teams
- student project groups
- Value Chain Hackers teams
- small project teams
- SME contacts
- Social Chicken network
- logistics or operations students
- teams that already tried Agile but did not experience real improvement

Best first pilot audience:

A group of 6 to 10 people who are already experiencing coordination problems, unclear priorities, slow handovers, or too much work in progress. The best pilot group is not a group that wants an abstract Agile introduction. The best pilot group is a real team or project group that recognizes the pain of work getting stuck.

Avoid as first pilot:

- very large groups
- people who only want Scrum certification
- people who only want Jira or tool setup
- groups that do not have a shared work process
- groups where the buyer only wants entertainment

## 12.2 12.2 Pilot Goal

The pilot should answer:

Question	Answer
Do people understand the offer?	Test whether “Agile Through Simulation” and the subtitle clearly communicate that this is a practical workshop about flow, bottlenecks, and collaboration, not generic Scrum training.
Do they find it relevant?	Check whether participants recognize the pain of unclear priorities, overloaded workflows, handovers, delays, and late feedback.
Is the level right?	Validate whether the workshop works for mixed and non-technical participants without becoming too simple or too jargon-heavy.
Does the timing work?	Test whether the simulation, reflection, workflow mapping, and first action step fit within the 2-hour pilot and can scale to the 4-hour version.
Is the output useful?	Check whether the workflow map, bottleneck overview, or first improvement action feels practical enough to use after the session.
Would they recommend it?	Ask whether participants would recommend this to another team, project group, manager, educator, or SME owner.
Does the simulation create insight?	Test whether participants actually experience flow problems rather than only “playing a game”.
Does the session avoid Agile fatigue?	Check whether the workshop feels useful even to people who are skeptical of Agile terminology.

### 12.3 12.3 Pilot Feedback Form

Ask:

- What was most useful?
- What was unclear?
- Was the level too easy, right, or too hard?
- Did the simulation help you understand how work gets stuck?
- Did the session feel practical enough?
- Did the workshop avoid too much Agile jargon?
- What part connected most clearly to your own work?

- What would you change?
- Was the output useful?
- Would you recommend this to another team?
- Who do you think this workshop is best suited for?
- What title would make you click on this workshop?
- What subtitle would make the value clearer?
- What would make this worth paying for?

## 12.4 12.4 Pilot Success Criteria

The pilot is successful if:

- participants understand the product within 2 minutes of explanation
- participants recognize the workflow pain being addressed
- the simulation creates visible discussion and insight
- participants can connect the simulation to their own work
- the group identifies at least one real bottleneck
- the group leaves with at least one concrete improvement action
- participants do not experience the session as generic Agile training
- at least 60 percent of participants say they would recommend it to another team

## 12.5 12.5 Pilot Version to Test First

Recommended first pilot:

Element	Choice
Duration	2 hours
Group size	6 to 10 participants
Format	Physical
Core activity	Short flow simulation
Main output	One bottleneck and one improvement action
Feedback method	Short form plus 10-minute discussion
Follow-up	Ask whether they would join or buy the 4-hour version

## 12.6 12.6 Pilot Decision After Running

After the pilot, decide:

## 12 12. Pilot Plan

---

Question	Decision
Did the simulation work?	Keep / Adjust / Replace
Did participants understand the product?	Yes / Partly / No
Did the Agile framing help or hurt?	Helped / Neutral / Hurt
Was the output concrete enough?	Yes / Partly / No
Should the product stay in the final shortlist?	Yes / Maybe / No
What should change before selling?	[Write changes]

---

## 13 13. Final Decision

Decision Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Clear market demand	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	There is clear demand for Agile training, Scrum workshops, team collaboration support, and workflow improvement. The market exists.
Not oversaturated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The general Agile market is crowded. The product only remains interesting if it is positioned as simulation-based workflow improvement for mixed and non-technical teams.
Fits my energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This strongly fits facilitation, simulation, teaching, systems thinking, storytelling, and visible group learning.

13 13. Final Decision

Decision Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Can be delivered in 4 hours	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A focused version can fit within 4 hours if it does not try to teach all of Agile or solve every team problem.
Has concrete output	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The session can produce a workflow map, bottleneck overview, improvement action list, or first team working agreement.
Can be sold clearly online	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	It can be sold clearly, but only with a strong subtitle. “Agile Through Simulation” alone may be too vague.
Should become finalist product	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, but only if the product avoids generic Agile training and focuses on flow, bottlenecks, and practical team improvement.

Final decision:

Move to final shortlist and build a 2-hour physical pilot first.

The product is promising, but the positioning must stay sharp. It should not be sold as generic Agile training, Scrum training, or certification preparation. The strongest version is a practical simulation-based workshop where teams experience why work gets stuck and

*13 13. Final Decision*

leave with one concrete improvement action.

## 14 14. Research Notes

Use this section for rough notes, links, observations, and ideas.

- Strongest title: Agile Through Simulation.
- Stronger subtitle: A practical workshop where teams experience flow, bottlenecks, feedback, and better collaboration.
- Searchable alternative title: Agile Workshop for Non-Technical Teams.
- The word Agile helps with search, but may create resistance because many people associate Agile with jargon, meetings, and failed transformations.
- The product should lead with workflow pain: unclear priorities, slow handovers, too much work in progress, late feedback, and bottlenecks.
- The simulation is not the product by itself. The product is the insight and team improvement action that comes after the simulation.
- Strongest output: workflow map, bottleneck overview, and one improvement action.
- Optional output: first team working agreement around flow, handovers, feedback, or work-in-progress.
- Avoid certification language.
- Avoid Jira, Trello, SAFe, and Scrum tooling as the center of the product.
- Do not make it too playful without business value. The simulation must always connect back to real work.
- Best first pilot group: 6 to 10 people who already experience coordination problems.
- Good pilot environments: Windesheim teams, Value Chain Hackers, education project teams, student project groups, SME contacts.
- The Beer Game can become a specialized variant later, especially for supply chain or logistics teams.
- Possible future variant: Supply Chain Flow Simulation.
- Possible future variant: Research Team Flow Workshop.
- Possible future variant: Agile for Education Teams.
- Main risk: crowded Agile market.
- Main mitigation: sell it as simulation-based workflow improvement, not generic Agile training.

Agile Scrum Group. 2026. “Gratis Agile Scrum Workshop.” 2026. <https://agilescrumgroup.nl/agile-scrum-trainingen/scrums-workshop/>.

Agile Strides. 2026. “LEGO Simulation Scrum Workshop.” 2026. <https://agilestrides.com/training/lego-simulation-scrum-workshop/>.

Bilginç IT Academy. 2026. “Introduction To Agile and Scrum Workshop Training in Amsterdam.” 2026. <https://bilginc.com/nl/training/introduction-to-agile-and-scrum->

- [workshop-10250-training/amsterdam/](#).
- Digital.ai. 2024. “17th State of Agile Report.” <https://2288549.fs1.hubspotusercontent-na1.net/hubfs/2288549/RE-SA-17th-Annual-State-Of-Agile-Report.pdf>.
- Gladwell Academy. 2026. “Agile, SAFe and AI Training.” 2026. <https://www.gladwellacademy.com/>.
- Lagant. 2026. “Scrum Master Training.” 2026. <https://lagant.nl/en/certification/scrum/>.
- OpenValue Training. 2026. “Agile/Scrum.” 2026. [https://openvalue.training/agile\\_scrum/](https://openvalue.training/agile_scrum/).
- Scrum Academy. 2026a. “Agile and Scrum LEGO Simulation.” 2026. <https://scrumacademy.nl/en/training/agile-and-scrum-lego-game/>.
- . 2026b. “Agile in 1 Day.” 2026. <https://scrumacademy.nl/en/training/agile-in-1-dag-team-training-incompany/>.
- Springest. 2026. “36 Scrum Trainingen in Amsterdam.” 2026. <https://www.springest.nl/kwaliteit-projectmanagement/agile-scrum/amsterdam>.