A Sample Title - The SocioEconomic Aspects of Stock Assessments

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

Christiaan Verhoef[1,2] and Kirsten Coppoolse[3]

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: [Practical AI Literacy for Teams]

Practical AI Literacy for Teams is a four-hour training for teams, researchers, educators, SMEs, and knowledge workers who know that AI is becoming important, but do not yet have a shared understanding of how to use it safely, practically, and responsibly. The internal working title is AI Fundamentals Without Hype, but the market-facing promise is more direct: help teams move from scattered experimentation and uncertainty toward shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first working agreement for AI use.

The product is designed for mixed groups. Participants do not need to become AI specialists, programmers, or prompt engineers. They need to understand enough to make better decisions in daily work. The session explains what generative AI can and cannot do, why AI output can sound convincing but still be wrong, where risks such as hallucinations, privacy issues, bias, overreliance, and unclear accountability appear, and how teams can judge whether a task is useful, risky, or unsuitable for AI support.

The market timing is strong. Organizations now have a practical reason to care about AI literacy: Article 4 of the EU AI Act entered into application on 2 February 2025 and requires providers and deployers of AI systems to take measures to ensure a sufficient level of AI literacy among staff and others working with AI systems on their behalf (European Commission 2025a). AI adoption in the Netherlands is also rising. CBS reported that 22.7 percent of Dutch companies with ten or more employees used one or more AI technologies in 2024, nearly 9 percentage points more than in 2023 (Statistics Netherlands 2025b). This creates a clear need for practical, accessible training that helps organizations act before AI use becomes unmanaged, inconsistent, or risky.

The training is not a generic AI inspiration session, not a prompt-tricks workshop, and not a legal compliance audit. It supports AI literacy and responsible use, but does not claim to replace legal, privacy, or security review. The strongest version of the product is a bounded learning experience with a clear beginning, a clear end, and a concrete team output. It should

not try to deliver the full AI learning journey, local AI setup, workflow automation, RAG, system design, or advanced research tooling in the first session. Those can become follow-up products later.

The session is built around doing, not just listening. Participants first build a plain-language understanding of AI. They then explore realistic examples of where AI helps and where it fails. After that, they sort real or realistic work tasks into useful, risky, and unsuitable AI use cases. Finally, they translate the discussion into a practical team artifact: a use-case map, a responsible AI checklist, and a first AI working agreement.

In plain language, this product helps a team move from "AI is important, but we do not really know what to do with it" to "we understand the basics, we know where AI can help, we know where to be careful, and we have a first agreement for using it responsibly." That agreement is the core output. Awareness alone is not enough. The session should leave participants with something they can actually use the next day.

For me, this product is a strong fit because it combines explanation, facilitation, systems thinking, practical tools, and visible impact. It allows me to translate a complex and overhyped topic into something human, useful, and actionable. It also protects me from the wrong kind of work: endless technical support, vague AI consulting, or custom implementation without clear boundaries. The product should stay focused on helping teams take their first responsible, practical step with AI.

The main risk is that the product becomes too broad or too generic. The AI training market is already crowded, especially around generative AI courses, ChatGPT training, and prompt engineering. The differentiation must therefore be clear: this is practical AI literacy for teams, with a concrete responsible-use output. The product succeeds if participants leave with shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first AI working agreement. It fails if it becomes another broad AI lecture without a usable result.

2 Research Summary

2.1 Product Hypothesis

Field	Answer
Product name	Practical AI Literacy for Teams
Internal working title	AI Fundamentals Without Hype
Category	AI / Training / Digital Skills / Responsible Use
Type	Training with practical workshop elements
Target group	Teams, researchers, educators, SME staff, project teams, and knowledge workers who need to understand AI without becoming technical specialists
Max duration	4 hours including introductions and breaks
Main promise	Participants understand what AI can and cannot do, recognize common risks, identify useful and risky AI use cases in their own work, and leave with a first team agreement for responsible AI use
Current status	Candidate

2.2 One Sentence Product Pitch

A four-hour practical AI literacy training where teams learn what AI can and cannot do, identify useful, risky, and unsuitable use cases, and create a first working agreement for responsible AI use without turning the session into generic prompt training or technical theory.

2.3 Why This Product Might Be Worth Researching

Reason	Evidence Needed	Notes
People search for this	Search terms such as AI literacy training, AI training for employees, responsible AI training, AI workshop for teams, practical AI training, and AI Act AI literacy training	The product uses language that buyers already understand, but should avoid becoming another generic AI or ChatGPT training. The strongest search angle is practical AI literacy for teams.
The problem is urgent	EU AI Act literacy obligations, rising AI adoption in Dutch companies, skills gap, uncertainty around safe use, and unmanaged experimentation	Article 4 of the EU AI Act started applying on 2 February 2025, creating a practical reason for organizations to care about AI literacy. CBS reports that 22.7 percent of Dutch companies with 10 or more employees used AI in 2024, up nearly 9 percentage points from 2023 (European Commission 2025a; Statistics Netherlands 2025b).
Existing offers are weak	Competitor scan of AI trainings, duration, target group, content depth, pricing, practical outputs, and team-level deliverables	Many AI trainings appear to be too generic, too focused on prompt tricks, too technical, too compliance-oriented, or too inspirational. The gap is a practical session that ends with a usable team artifact, such as an AI-use checklist, use-case map, or first team agreement.

Reason	Evidence Needed	Notes
I can deliver it well	Existing experience with AI tools, teaching, workshops, research workflows, OpenWebUI, local AI infrastructure, Quarto, and practical examples	This fits my existing strengths: explaining complex tools, building practical exercises, facilitating discussion, and helping mixed groups understand technology without needing them to become specialists.
It fits my energy	Interaction, explanation, exercises, practical output, group learning, visible impact, and no endless technical support	This product gives me a people-facing training format with room for facilitation, examples, and useful group output. The scope must stay bounded so it does not turn into ongoing AI support, legal advice, or tool troubleshooting.

3 Personal Fit

3.1 Why This Is a Good Idea for Me

This product fits me because it lets me do what I am naturally good at: making complex systems understandable for normal people. AI is surrounded by hype, fear, jargon, and unrealistic expectations. I can help people cut through that and understand what is actually useful, risky, and practical.

It also fits my preferred way of working. I do not want to only give abstract advice or present slides for hours. This product gives me room to teach, facilitate discussion, use practical examples, and help a group produce something concrete by the end of the session.

The product also connects strongly to my existing work. I already use AI tools, experiment with local AI infrastructure, work on research workflows, build reporting systems, and think about responsible technology adoption. That gives me enough real experience to make the session grounded and credible.

Most importantly, this product can become a bounded learning experience. It does not need to turn into unlimited technical support. If the scope stays clear, I can deliver a useful, energetic, and repeatable training that opens the door to deeper follow-up products later.

3.2 Energy Fit Check

Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Would I enjoy giving this more than once?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The topic is broad enough to stay interesting, especially if examples are adapted per group.

Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Is there enough interaction with people?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The training should include discussion, exercises, group reflection, and practical use cases.
Is there enough room for creativity?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The session can use stories, examples, exercises, simulations, and simple frameworks.
Is the technical work bounded?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The product should focus on AI literacy and practical use, not tool installation or support.
Does it avoid becoming endless support?	[ ]	[x]	[ ]	Only if the offer clearly excludes ongoing tool support and implementation.
Does it create visible value in one session?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	Participants can leave with a checklist, team guideline, or first AI-use map.
Does it connect to my existing work?	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	It connects to AI training, research workflows, local AI, reporting, and responsible tool use.

3.3 Do Not Sell This If

Warning Sign	Present	Notes
It becomes generic consulting	[ ]	This should be sold as a clear 4-hour training, not open-ended advice.
It requires too much custom preparation	[ ]	Examples can be adapted, but the core structure must stay reusable.
It depends on fragile technical setup	[ ]	Avoid live dependency on complex tooling. Use simple tools and prepared examples.
It turns me into helpdesk support	[ ]	Make clear that the training is not IT support, account setup, or software troubleshooting.
It has no clear output after 4 hours	[ ]	Every session should end with a team AI-use checklist, use-case map, or practical guideline.
It is too generic to market online	[ ]	Position it around practical AI literacy, not generic prompting or vague inspiration.

4 Market Research

4.1 Market Problem

AI is no longer only an experimental topic for specialists. It is entering daily work through tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Claude, and AI features inside existing software. In many organizations, this adoption is happening before teams have a shared language, safe-use boundaries, or clear agreements about responsible use.

The core problem is not simply that people "do not know AI". The real problem is that teams are experimenting unevenly. Some people use AI confidently, some use it carelessly, some avoid it completely, and many are unsure what is allowed. This creates confusion around quality, privacy, accountability, sources, and trust.

Practical AI literacy is therefore a team capability problem. Teams need enough shared understanding to decide where AI is useful, where it is risky, and where it should not be used. They also need a first working agreement so responsible AI use becomes concrete rather than vague.

Question	Answer
What is the current pain?	Many organizations know that AI matters, but their teams do not yet have a clear shared understanding of what AI is, what it can do, what it cannot do, and how to use it responsibly. This leads to scattered experimentation, unsafe use, unrealistic expectations, unclear accountability, and uncertainty about quality, privacy, sources, and reliability.
Who feels this pain?	Teams, researchers, educators, SME staff, managers, support staff, project teams, and knowledge workers who are expected to work with AI but have not received clear practical guidance. This is especially relevant in organizations where people already use tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, or Claude informally, without shared rules or a common language.

Question	Answer
Why is this problem happening now?	AI adoption is increasing, while regulation and organizational expectations are also becoming more concrete. Article 4 of the EU AI Act has made AI literacy a practical responsibility for providers and deployers of AI systems, and Dutch company adoption of AI is rising (European Commission 2025a; Statistics Netherlands 2025b).
What happens if they do nothing?	Teams may continue using AI in inconsistent and risky ways. This can lead to poor-quality output, privacy mistakes, overreliance on AI-generated text, unclear accountability, reputational risk, and missed opportunities for useful productivity improvement. Organizations may also struggle to show that they have taken AI literacy seriously.
What are they already trying?	Many people experiment individually with ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Claude, or AI features in existing software. Some organizations provide generic AI inspiration sessions, prompt lists, internal policy documents, or tool access. However, this often does not create shared understanding, practical judgement, or team-level agreements.
Why are current solutions not enough?	Much existing AI training is either too generic, too focused on prompting tricks, too technical, too compliance-oriented, or too abstract. Teams need a practical session that explains the basics, shows realistic examples, discusses risks, and ends with a concrete output such as an AI-use checklist, safe-use map, or first team agreement.

4.2 Market Drivers

Driver	Relevance	Evidence	Source
Regulation	High	Article 4 of the EU AI Act requires providers and deployers of AI systems to take measures to ensure a sufficient level of AI literacy among staff and others using AI systems on their behalf. This makes AI literacy a practical organizational responsibility. The product should support AI literacy and responsible use, but should not be presented as a legal compliance audit.	European Commission (2025a)
Rising AI adoption	High	AI use is increasing in Dutch organizations. CBS reports that 22.7 percent of Dutch companies with 10 or more employees used one or more AI technologies in 2024, up nearly 9 percentage points from 2023. This means more teams are likely to encounter AI in daily work, even before they have clear agreements about responsible use.	Statistics Netherlands (2025b)

Driver	Relevance	Evidence	Source
Skills gap	High	Many organizations are adopting AI faster than employees can develop shared understanding, practical judgement, and responsible-use habits. The need is not only technical skill, but team capability: knowing what AI is, where it helps, where it fails, and when human judgement remains essential.	OECD (2025)
Productivity pressure	High	Organizations are interested in AI because it may support administrative work, knowledge work, writing, analysis, and management tasks. However, without basic literacy, teams may waste time experimenting randomly or use AI in low-quality ways. Practical AI literacy helps teams identify realistic use cases before investing more deeply.	Statistics Netherlands (2025a)
Privacy and trust concerns	High	Teams are experimenting with generative AI tools, but many are unsure what information may safely be entered into external systems. This creates demand for training that covers privacy boundaries, reliability, verification, and accountability in plain language.	European Commission (2025a)

Driver	Relevance	Evidence	Source
Digital transformation	Medium	The European Commission recommends that the Netherlands strategically support SME adoption of digital technologies, especially AI. This supports demand for accessible AI training aimed at organizations that need practical first steps rather than technical specialization.	European Commission (2025b)
Team alignment	High	AI adoption often happens unevenly: some employees experiment actively, some use AI carelessly, and others avoid it completely. A team-level AI literacy product helps create shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first working agreement.	Internal product reasoning

4.3 Search Demand

The search phrases below are buyer-oriented phrases that potential clients might use when looking for practical AI literacy training. The strength column is a qualitative estimate based on clarity of intent, relevance to the product, and likelihood that the searcher is looking for a training or workshop.

The strongest terms are not only about "AI training", but about **AI literacy**, **employees**, **teams**, **responsible use**, and the **AI Act**. These phrases fit the product because the offer is not a generic prompt course. It is a practical team session that helps participants create shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first working agreement.

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
AI literacy training	Learn / Buy	Strong	Directly matches the product and connects well to the EU AI Act context.
AI literacy training for employees	Buy / Learn	Strong	Stronger than generic AI training because it points to organizational responsibility and staff capability.
AI training for employees	Buy / Learn	Strong	Clear organizational buyer intent. Good phrase for teams, SMEs, HR, and managers.
AI workshop for teams	Buy / Learn	Strong	Practical and accessible. Fits the four-hour workshop format well.

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
Practical AI training	Learn / Buy	Strong	Matches the product promise: useful, grounded, and not hype-driven.
Responsible AI training	Learn / Solve problem	Strong	Strong fit for organizations worried about safe, reliable, and accountable AI use.
AI training for non-technical teams	Learn / Buy	Strong	Very good fit because the product is designed for mixed groups that do not need deep technical knowledge.
AI Act AI literacy training	Solve problem / Buy	Strong	Specific, timely, and likely to attract organizations responding to AI literacy obligations.

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
AI basics training	Learn	Medium	Accessible search term, but may attract broad beginner audiences and individuals rather than team buyers.
AI awareness training	Learn	Medium	Useful for organizations starting from zero, but slightly less action-oriented than AI literacy or practical AI training.
Generative AI training	Learn / Buy	Medium	Relevant, but broader and more competitive. Needs clear positioning around responsible team use.

Search phrase	Buyer intent	Strong / Medium / Weak	Notes
ChatGPT training for employees	Buy / Learn	Medium	Searchable and familiar, but risks narrowing the product too much toward one tool.
AI compliance training	Solve problem / Buy	Medium	Relevant because of regulation, but may create expectations around legal advice or certification.
Responsible use of AI workshop	Learn / Solve problem	Medium	Good fit for the product promise, but may have lower search volume than broader terms.
AI policy workshop	Solve problem / Buy	Medium	Related to team agreements, but could imply formal policy writing. Better as a follow-up product.

4.4 Search Intent Analysis

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want a training	[x]	This is the strongest intent. Search phrases such as “AI literacy training”, “AI training for employees”, and “AI basics training” suggest that buyers are looking for structured learning.
People want a workshop	[x]	This is also strongly present. Search phrases such as “AI workshop for teams” and “practical AI workshop” fit the four-hour interactive format well.
People want implementation help	[x]	Some buyers may want help turning AI into real work practices. This product should not promise full implementation, but can offer a first practical step through a use-case map, responsible-use checklist, and first team agreement.

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want comparison of tools	[x]	Participants may want to understand the difference between tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Claude, and local AI tools. This should be handled briefly as context, but should not become the main product. The focus stays on responsible use, not tool shopping.
People want compliance support	[x]	The EU AI Act creates a reason to search for AI literacy and responsible AI training. The product can support AI literacy and responsible-use awareness, but should not present itself as legal advice, certification, or a full compliance audit.
People want cost reduction	[ ]	This may be a secondary motivation, but it is not the main search intent for this product. Cost reduction is more relevant for reporting automation, workflow automation, or open-source replacement products.

Intent	Is this present?	Notes
People want privacy or control	[x]	Privacy concerns are likely present because teams are unsure what information they can safely enter into AI tools. This should be addressed through practical safe-use boundaries and examples of what should not be shared.
People want team alignment	[x]	This is a key product opportunity. Many organizations do not only need individual AI skills, but shared team agreements about what AI may be used for, what must be checked, and what should remain off-limits.

4.5 Competitor Scan

The competitor scan shows that there is already visible supply for AI training, generative AI workshops, AI literacy courses, responsible AI training, and AI Act-related learning. This confirms that the market exists, but it also confirms the main risk: **Practical AI Literacy for Teams** must not become another generic AI training.

The opportunity is to position the product as a short, practical, team-based AI literacy session that ends with a concrete output: a use-case map, responsible AI checklist, and first team AI working agreement.

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
Wageningen University & Research	Basic Generative AI Skills (Wageningen University & Research 2026)	Professionals and university staff	3 hours	€395 regular, €355.50 WUR employees	Clear short format with visible pricing and education-sector credibility	Focuses on generative AI skills, less clearly positioned around team-level agreements or responsible-use boundaries
Radboud in'to Languages	Basic Generative AI Skills (Radboud in'to Languages 2026)	Radboud staff, students, alumni, and external participants	Not clearly visible in scan	€395 regular, free for Radboud staff, discounts for some groups	Strong institutional credibility and accessible entry point for university audiences	More course-based and institutional, less positioned as a practical team workshop with a concrete workplace artifact
Teamland	AI First Corporate AI Training for Amsterdam Teams (Teamland 2026)	Amsterdam teams and organizations	Not publicly clear	Not publicly visible	Strong corporate workshop positioning with shared AI foundation, use-case shortlist, and pilot-plan language	More corporate and polished, likely less research-oriented, less personal, and less explicitly anti-hype

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
AI.nl	AI Literacy Training / AI Workshops (AI.nl 2026)	Employees and organizations using AI	Not publicly clear	Not publicly visible	Strong AI Act and AI literacy positioning, directly connected to responsible organizational use	Could be perceived as broader AI consultancy or tool-focused training rather than a small, bounded learning experience
NobleProg	AI Workshop for Industries (NobleProg 2026)	Beginner to intermediate business professionals and team leaders	4 hours	Not publicly visible in scan	Strong fit on duration, practical cases, and hands-on exercises	Larger training-provider feel, less personal, and less focused on a team AI working agreement
The Knowledge Academy	Generative AI Course (The Knowledge Academy 2026)	Professionals such as analysts, project managers, operations managers, software developers, and business analysts	1 day	From €2695	Recognized training-provider structure, certification framing, and broad delivery options	Expensive, longer than four hours, and likely too broad or technical for accessible team-level AI literacy

Competitor	Product	Target group	Duration	Price	Strength	Weakness
OpenMinds Academy	AI Act and General AI Literacy (OpenMinds Academy 2026)	Companies needing AI Act and AI literacy training	Not clearly visible in scan	From 399 CZK per person for small teams, excluding VAT	Strong regulatory angle and clear AI Act literacy link	More compliance-course oriented, less focused on live facilitation, team discussion, and practical workplace application
TheGenAI	AI Team Workshops (TheGenAI 2026)	Teams and organizations that want hands-on AI training or prototyping	Not publicly clear	Not publicly visible	Strong hands-on and prototype-oriented positioning	More focused on AI prototyping and MVP development, which may be too advanced for teams needing basic AI literacy

The key market gap is not the absence of AI training. The gap is a practical, human, team-based AI literacy session that helps mixed groups make sense of AI together. Many competitors focus on generative AI skills, compliance, certification, corporate transformation, or prototyping. **Practical AI Literacy for Teams** should compete by being simpler, clearer, more grounded, and more directly useful after one four-hour session.

The strongest differentiator is the final artifact. Participants should not leave only with awareness or inspiration. They should leave with a first team AI working agreement that clarifies what AI may be used for, what must be checked, what information should not be entered, and what the team wants to test next.

4.6 Saturation Check

Question	Answer
Are there many offers with this exact topic?	Yes, there are many AI training and generative AI training offers, especially around AI basics, ChatGPT, generative AI skills, AI literacy, and responsible AI. However, fewer offers are clearly positioned as a short, practical, team-based AI literacy training that ends with a concrete working agreement (Wageningen University & Research 2026; Radboud in'to Languages 2026; AI.nl 2026; NobleProg 2026).
Are most offers generic or specific?	Most offers are still fairly generic. They often focus on generative AI, AI skills, ChatGPT, AI awareness, or broad AI literacy. Some offers are more specific around compliance, AI Act literacy, or prototyping, but there is still room for a practical "what does this mean for our team" version (AI.nl 2026; OpenMinds Academy 2026; TheGenAI 2026).
Are most offers online courses or live workshops?	There is a mix. Some competitors offer live workshops or classroom-style training, while others use course-based or certification-style formats. This creates an opportunity for a short, interactive, facilitator-led format that feels more like a practical team session than a standard course (Wageningen University & Research 2026; The Knowledge Academy 2026; Teamland 2026).
Are most offers practical or theoretical?	Many offers claim to be practical, but several still appear to focus on general AI skills, tool use, awareness, compliance, or certification. The opportunity is to make the practical output much sharper: a use-case map, responsible AI checklist, and first team AI working agreement (Wageningen University & Research 2026; AI.nl 2026; OpenMinds Academy 2026).

Question	Answer
Are prices visible?	Some prices are visible, but not all. Wageningen University & Research and Radboud list a regular fee of €395 for Basic Generative AI Skills, and The Knowledge Academy lists a much higher price point for a one-day Generative AI course. Several workshop providers do not show clear public pricing, which suggests room for a transparent, fixed-price half-day product (Wageningen University & Research 2026; Radboud in'to Languages 2026; The Knowledge Academy 2026).
Is there space for a hands-on 4-hour version?	Yes. The market is active, but not closed. The strongest space is not "another AI training", but a four-hour, plain-language AI literacy session for teams that need clarity, safe-use boundaries, and one concrete output. This positioning avoids competing directly with long certification courses, generic prompt training, or technical AI implementation workshops.
What is the main positioning risk?	The main risk is disappearing into the crowded AI training market. The product must therefore be framed around team-level responsible use, not around prompts, tools, or hype.
What is the strongest opening in the market?	The strongest opening is a practical AI literacy session for mixed teams that need shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first AI working agreement.

5 Market Gap

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Too theoretical	[x]	Several offers explain AI, generative AI, or AI literacy, but the practical translation to daily team behavior is often less clear. This product should avoid long theory and focus on usable examples, exercises, judgement, and decisions.
Too technical	[x]	Some AI training risks becoming tool-heavy, prompt-heavy, or implementation-focused. The gap is a plain-language version for mixed teams that need understanding before technical adoption.
Too generic	[x]	Many offers use broad labels such as AI training, generative AI training, or AI literacy. The opportunity is to position this product around practical AI literacy for teams, with a clear team-level output.

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Too expensive	[x]	Some formal courses and commercial training providers have high price points, especially for full-day or certification-style formats. A clear half-day offer can be more accessible for SMEs, research teams, education teams, and small organizations.
Too long	[x]	Some offers are full-day or course-based. A focused four-hour version is easier to book, easier to pilot, and less risky for organizations that are still exploring AI adoption.
Not practical enough about privacy	[x]	Many AI trainings focus on general tool use, while teams often worry about what information may safely be entered into external AI systems. This product can include practical privacy boundaries without becoming a legal, compliance, or technical security course.
Not designed for mixed teams	[x]	Many offers are aimed at either broad corporate audiences, individual learners, or institutional course participants. There is room for a version designed for mixed teams with different levels of confidence, skill, and skepticism.

Gap Type	Present	Notes
Not designed for researchers, educators, and SMEs	[x]	Many offers are broad corporate trainings or generic AI courses. There is room for a version that speaks directly to researchers, educators, SMEs, and small professional teams that need usable guidance rather than abstract transformation language.
No team agreement	[x]	This is the strongest gap. Many sessions may create awareness, but do not help the team decide what they will actually do differently. This product should end with a first AI working agreement that defines allowed uses, risky uses, checking rules, and next steps.
No concrete output	[x]	The product should not end with inspiration only. Participants should leave with a use-case map, responsible AI checklist, safe-use boundaries, and a first team AI working agreement.

5.1 Buyer Persona

Persona	Description
Role	Team lead, research coordinator, lecturer, innovation coordinator, SME owner, project manager, or department manager
Sector	Education, applied research, public sector, SME, consultancy, logistics, operations, and knowledge work

Persona	Description
Main pain	They know AI is becoming important, but their team has no shared understanding of what AI can safely and usefully do. Some people are already experimenting, others are hesitant, and there are no clear agreements about quality, privacy, reliability, or responsible use.
What they want	A practical and accessible session that gives their team a common language, realistic examples, and a first safe way to use AI in daily work. They want clarity without hype, fear, or technical overload.
What they fear	They fear unsafe use of AI, privacy mistakes, low-quality AI-generated work, overreliance on tools, reputational damage, and wasting money on vague AI training that does not change behavior.
What would make them buy	A clear four-hour format, practical exercises, visible connection to the EU AI Act and AI literacy, concrete output after the session, accessible language, and a fixed scope.
What would stop them	If the offer sounds too generic, too technical, too expensive, too tool-focused, too much like legal compliance advice, or if it does not promise a clear result after the session.

5.2 Willingness to Pay Estimate

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Problem is urgent	[ ]	[ ]	[x]	AI literacy has become more urgent because organizations are adopting AI while also facing clearer expectations around responsible use and AI literacy. This makes the topic easier to justify than a generic inspiration session.

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Has budget owner	[ ]	[x]	[ ]	Budget ownership may sit with HR, learning and development, innovation, research support, compliance, or department management. This is promising, but the buyer may differ per organization.
Saves time or money	[ ]	[x]	[ ]	The product can help teams avoid wasted experimentation and unsafe use, but the direct financial return is less concrete than with reporting automation or process automation.
Supports compliance	[ ]	[ ]	[x]	The AI Act literacy angle gives organizations a practical reason to act. The product should support AI literacy and responsible use, while avoiding claims of full legal compliance.

Signal	Low	Medium	High	Notes
Helps team capability	[ ]	[ ]	[x]	This is the strongest value signal. The product helps teams build shared language, practical understanding, and safe first steps around AI use.
Easy to explain	[ ]	[ ]	[x]	"Practical AI literacy training for teams" is clear, searchable, and easy to understand. The anti-hype positioning makes it more distinctive.

5.3 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
Should this move to execution design?	Yes

Short conclusion:

There is visible demand for AI training, AI literacy, and responsible AI use. The market is active and partly crowded, especially around generic AI training, ChatGPT training, and generative AI courses. However, there is still a clear niche for a short, practical, non-hype AI literacy training aimed at mixed teams that need shared understanding and a concrete first output.

The strongest positioning is not "learn prompts" or "become an AI expert", but "understand AI well enough to use it responsibly in your own work". This connects to current market drivers such as AI adoption, AI literacy expectations, productivity pressure, and uncertainty

about safe use. The product is easy to explain, can be delivered within four hours, and can produce a clear output such as an AI-use checklist or first team guideline.

The main risk is that the offer becomes too generic and disappears into the crowded AI training market. That risk can be managed by keeping the title clear, the tone grounded, the exercises practical, and the output concrete. Based on the market scan, this product should move to execution design.

6 Product Positioning

6.1 Product Promise

After this session, participants will be able to:

- explain in plain language what AI can and cannot do
- recognize common risks such as hallucinations, privacy issues, bias, overreliance, privacy leakage, and unclear accountability
- identify realistic AI use cases in their own work
- decide which tasks are useful, risky, or unsuitable for AI support
- use a simple responsible AI checklist before relying on AI output
- discuss AI use with colleagues using shared language instead of hype or fear
- create a first team-level AI working agreement for responsible use

6.2 Unique Selling Proposition

A practical AI literacy training where mixed teams learn to understand AI, judge realistic use cases, and leave with a first team AI working agreement instead of generic prompt tips or abstract inspiration.

6.3 Positioning Statement

Practical AI Literacy for Teams is positioned as a grounded first step for organizations that want to use AI responsibly, but do not yet have shared language or clear team agreements. The product sits between generic AI awareness sessions and technical AI implementation projects.

It is more practical than an inspiration talk, more accessible than a technical course, and more concrete than a general AI policy discussion. The focus is not on mastering every tool, but on helping teams decide what AI can be used for, what must be checked, what should stay off-limits, and what they will try next.

6.4 Positioning Table

Dimension	This Product
Practical vs theoretical	Strongly practical, with only enough theory to understand the basics and make better decisions
Beginner vs advanced	Beginner to mixed level, designed for people who need clarity rather than technical specialization
Tool-focused vs workflow-focused	Workflow-focused, with tools used only as examples to understand real work situations
Generic vs niche	Positioned as practical AI literacy for teams, not broad AI inspiration or generic ChatGPT training
Training vs implementation	Training with a concrete team output, not full implementation or ongoing technical support
Individual vs team-based	Team-based, focused on shared understanding, safe-use boundaries, and a first AI working agreement
Compliance vs capability	Supports AI literacy and responsible use, but does not claim to be a legal compliance audit
Awareness vs action	Moves beyond awareness by producing a use-case map, checklist, and first working agreement

6.5 What This Product Is Not

This product is not:

- a generic AI inspiration session without practical output
- a prompt engineering tricks workshop
- a technical machine learning course
- a full AI implementation project
- a legal compliance audit for the EU AI Act
- a vendor sales pitch for a specific AI platform
- a local AI installation workshop
- a replacement for legal, privacy, or security review
- a complete AI strategy project
- the full five-level AI learning journey
- a session where participants are expected to become technical AI specialists

6.6 Best Market Position

The strongest market position is:

Practical AI literacy for teams that need shared language, safe-use boundaries, and a first working agreement for responsible AI use.

6.7 Best Short Sales Description

A four-hour hands-on training that helps teams understand AI without hype, identify useful and risky use cases, and create a first practical agreement for responsible AI use.

7 Execution Template

7.1 Delivery Format

Item	Choice
Preferred format	Physical
Can be remote	Yes
Can be hybrid	Only with co-facilitator
Needs online environment	Optional
Needs laptops	Optional
Needs post-its	Yes for physical, optional for remote
Needs participant data or examples	Optional

7.2 Group Size

Group Size	Suitability	Notes
1 to 5	Medium	Works for a small pilot or management session, but has less group energy and fewer perspectives.
6 to 12	High	Best size for interaction, discussion, exercises, and shared reflection.
13 to 20	Medium	Possible, but needs tighter facilitation, clearer timing, and possibly subgroup work.

Group Size	Suitability	Notes
21 plus	Low	Too large for a practical 4-hour session unless redesigned as a lecture with breakout groups and extra facilitation.

Recommended group size:

The ideal group size is 6 to 12 participants. This is large enough to create discussion and different perspectives, but small enough to keep the session personal, practical, and interactive. For groups larger than 12, the session should use subgroups and stricter timeboxing. For groups larger than 20, a co-facilitator is strongly recommended.

7.3 Required Materials

7.3.1 Physical Materials

Material	Required	Notes
Post-its	[x]	Used for use cases, risks, questions, and team agreements.
Markers	[x]	Needed for readable notes during group work.
Flip-over	[x]	Useful for explaining key concepts and capturing shared insights.
Whiteboard	[ ]	Helpful if available, but not required if flip-over is present.
Printed worksheets	[x]	Use for AI-use checklist, safe-use map, and action plan.
Timer	[x]	Important to keep the 4-hour session focused.
Name cards	[ ]	Useful for groups where participants do not know each other.

Material	Required	Notes
Voting stickers	[ ]	Optional for prioritizing use cases or risks.

7.3.2 Digital Materials

Material	Required	Notes
Facilitator laptop	[x]	Needed for slides, examples, and optional live demonstration.
Presentation	[x]	Keep short and visual. Avoid long theory blocks.
Online whiteboard	[ ]	Optional for physical sessions, recommended for remote or hybrid sessions.
Shared document	[x]	Useful for collecting final guidelines, use cases, and action points.
Example dataset	[ ]	Not required. This training focuses on AI literacy, not data analysis.
Example workflow	[x]	Used to show where AI can and cannot support real work.
Feedback form	[x]	Needed to evaluate relevance, clarity, and follow-up interest.
QR code	[x]	Useful for quick access to feedback form, shared document, or resources.

7.3.3 Participant Materials

Participant Brings	Required	Notes
Laptop	[ ]	Optional for physical sessions, required for remote sessions. Useful if participants will test tools or fill in a digital worksheet.
Charger	[ ]	Recommended if laptops are used.
Headset	[ ]	Required for remote participation, optional for hybrid participation.
Own example	[x]	Participants should bring one realistic work example, such as a writing task, research task, meeting summary, report, email, or decision process.
Access to tools	[ ]	Optional. The session should not depend on every participant having access to the same AI tool.
Account created beforehand	[ ]	Not required for the basic version. Only needed if the session includes hands-on tool testing.

7.4 Online Environment

Tool	Use Case	Preferred
Miro	Sticky notes and visual workshop	[ ]
Mural	Sticky notes and visual workshop	[ ]
FigJam	Visual collaboration	[ ]
Excalidraw	Simple open visual board	[x]
Microsoft Whiteboard	Microsoft organizations	[ ]
Google Docs	Simple shared writing	[x]
Nextcloud document	Open-source collaboration	[x]
Obsidian Canvas	Knowledge mapping	[ ]

Chosen setup:

For the first version, use a simple shared document plus an optional visual board. The safest setup is Google Docs or Nextcloud for the shared AI-use guideline, combined with Excalidraw if a visual map is needed. This keeps the session lightweight and avoids losing time on tool access problems.

Setup needed before session:

- ☒ Shared document created
- ☒ Sections prepared for use cases, risks, guidelines, and action points
- ☒ Instructions added at the top of the document
- ☒ Access tested before the session
- ☒ Backup link ready
- ☒ Optional Excalidraw board prepared for visual mapping

8 Detailed Session Design

8.1 Four Hour Version

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
10:00 to 10:10	Welcome	Start safely and explain the goal of the session	Short introduction by facilitator	Group ready
10:10 to 10:25	Expectations and concerns	Understand what participants hope for and worry about	Quick round or sticky notes	Expectations and concerns list
10:25 to 10:40	Why AI literacy matters now	Explain why teams need shared understanding and practical agreements	Short story, practical example, and AI Act context	Shared reason for the session
10:40 to 11:00	AI without hype	Explain what AI is, what it can do, and why it can be wrong	Short teaching block with simple examples	Basic shared understanding
11:00 to 11:20	What can go wrong	Make risks concrete without creating fear	Guided examples of hallucinations, privacy issues, bias, overreliance, and unclear accountability	Risk awareness
11:20 to 11:35	Exercise 1: AI myth or reality	Separate hype from practical reality	Group sorting exercise	Shared list of myths and realities
11:35 to 11:50	Break	Reset energy	Break	
11:50 to 12:25	Exercise 2: Useful, risky, unsuitable	Help participants judge realistic AI use cases	Small group sorting exercise using realistic tasks	Draft AI use-case map
12:25 to 12:50	Better prompt, better check	Teach basic prompting and verification without becoming a prompt engineering course	Short demonstration and participant exercise	Improved prompt and checking step

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
12:50 to 13:10	Apply to own work	Translate the ideas to participant examples	Individual or duo work with template	Personal or team example
13:10 to 13:25	Break	Reset energy	Break	
13:25 to 13:50	Team AI working agreement	Turn insights into practical team rules	Small group work on agreement template	Draft team AI working agreement
13:50 to 14:10	Share back and improve	Check whether the agreement is realistic and useful	Short presentations and peer feedback	Improved agreement and action points
14:10 to 14:25	Responsible AI checklist	Finalize practical checklist for daily use	Guided group discussion	Draft responsible AI checklist
14:25 to 14:40	Next step planning	Decide what the team can test after the session	Individual or team action card	First practical next step
14:40 to 14:55	Evaluation and reflection	Capture learning and improvement points	Short feedback form and discussion	Feedback and improvement notes
14:55 to 15:00	Closing	End with one concrete commitment	Check-out round	Final action per participant

8.2 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	Why AI literacy matters now	Explain the practical need for shared AI understanding	Story, example, and short context	Shared problem
10:25 to 10:45	AI without hype	Teach the basic idea clearly	Short teaching block with examples	Basic understanding
10:45 to 11:00	What can go wrong	Show common risks without creating fear	Guided examples	Risk awareness
11:00 to 11:25	Useful, risky, unsuitable	Apply the idea to realistic work tasks	Small group sorting exercise	Mini AI use-case map

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
11:25 to 11:40	Better prompt, better check	Practice one simple prompt and one verification step	Short hands-on exercise	Improved prompt example
11:40 to 11:55	First team agreement	Decide first practical rules	Shared document or worksheet	Mini AI working agreement
11:55 to 12:00	Closing	Gather feedback and next step	Check-out	Evaluation

9 Detailed Session Design

9.1 Four Hour Version

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
10:00 to 10:10	Welcome	Start safely and explain the goal of the session	Short introduction by facilitator	Group ready
10:10 to 10:25	Expectations and concerns	Understand what participants hope for and worry about	Quick round or sticky notes	Expectations and concerns list
10:25 to 10:40	Why AI literacy matters now	Explain why teams need shared understanding and practical agreements	Short story, practical example, and AI Act context	Shared reason for the session
10:40 to 11:00	AI without hype	Explain what AI is, what it can do, and why it can be wrong	Short teaching block with simple examples	Basic shared understanding
11:00 to 11:20	What can go wrong	Make risks concrete without creating fear	Guided examples of hallucinations, privacy issues, bias, overreliance, and unclear accountability	Risk awareness
11:20 to 11:35	Exercise 1: AI myth or reality	Separate hype from practical reality	Group sorting exercise	Shared list of myths and realities
11:35 to 11:50	Break	Reset energy	Break	
11:50 to 12:25	Exercise 2: Useful, risky, unsuitable	Help participants judge realistic AI use cases	Small group sorting exercise using realistic tasks	Draft AI use-case map
12:25 to 12:50	Better prompt, better check	Teach basic prompting and verification without becoming a prompt engineering course	Short demonstration and participant exercise	Improved prompt and checking step

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
12:50 to 13:10	Apply to own work	Translate the ideas to participant examples	Individual or duo work with template	Personal or team example
13:10 to 13:25	Break	Reset energy	Break	
13:25 to 13:50	Team AI working agreement	Turn insights into practical team rules	Small group work on agreement template	Draft team AI working agreement
13:50 to 14:10	Share back and improve	Check whether the agreement is realistic and useful	Short presentations and peer feedback	Improved agreement and action points
14:10 to 14:25	Responsible AI checklist	Finalize practical checklist for daily use	Guided group discussion	Draft responsible AI checklist
14:25 to 14:40	Next step planning	Decide what the team can test after the session	Individual or team action card	First practical next step
14:40 to 14:55	Evaluation and reflection	Capture learning and improvement points	Short feedback form and discussion	Feedback and improvement notes
14:55 to 15:00	Closing	End with one concrete commitment	Check-out round	Final action per participant

9.2 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	Why AI literacy matters now	Explain the practical need for shared AI understanding	Story, example, and short context	Shared problem
10:25 to 10:45	AI without hype	Teach the basic idea clearly	Short teaching block with examples	Basic understanding
10:45 to 11:00	What can go wrong	Show common risks without creating fear	Guided examples	Risk awareness
11:00 to 11:25	Useful, risky, unsuitable	Apply the idea to realistic work tasks	Small group sorting exercise	Mini AI use-case map

Time	Block	Purpose	Method	Output
11:25 to 11:40	Better prompt, better check	Practice one simple prompt and one verification step	Short hands-on exercise	Improved prompt example
11:40 to 11:55	First team agreement	Decide first practical rules	Shared document or worksheet	Mini AI working agreement
11:55 to 12:00	Closing	Gather feedback and next step	Check-out	Evaluation

9.3 Core Exercises

9.3.1 Exercise 1: AI Myth or Reality

Purpose:

Help participants separate hype from practical reality.

Participants sort statements into:

Category	Meaning
Myth	Sounds plausible but is misleading or false
Reality	Useful and broadly true
Depends	Context matters and judgement is needed

Example statements:

- AI always tells the truth
- AI can help draft text
- AI understands meaning like a human
- AI can produce biased output
- AI output must be checked
- AI can replace expert judgement
- AI can help brainstorm ideas
- AI should not receive sensitive information without clear rules

Output:

A shared list of myths, realities, and judgement calls.

9.3.2 Exercise 2: Useful, Risky, Unsuitable

Purpose:

Help participants decide where AI belongs in their own work.

Participants sort tasks into:

Category	Meaning
Useful	AI can support this task with normal checking
Risky	AI might help, but needs rules, review, or safeguards
Unsuitable	AI should probably not be used here

Example tasks:

- draft a first version of an email
- summarize public meeting notes
- brainstorm workshop ideas
- check grammar
- summarize confidential HR information
- process sensitive student data
- write a final legal decision
- generate policy text without review
- create a first research summary
- make a planning checklist

Output:

A first AI use-case map for the team.

9.3.3 Exercise 3: Better Prompt, Better Check

Purpose:

Teach basic prompting and verification without turning the session into prompt engineering training.

Simple prompt structure:

Prompt Part	Question
Context	What does the AI need to know?
Task	What should it do?
Constraints	What should it avoid or respect?
Output	What format should the answer have?
Check	What should be verified afterwards?

Output:

One improved prompt and one verification step.

9.3.4 Exercise 4: Team AI Working Agreement

Purpose:

Turn the session into a practical team artifact.

Participants answer:

Question	Team Answer
What may we use AI for?	
What should we not use AI for?	
What must always be checked?	
What information should never be entered?	
Who remains responsible for final output?	
What do we test next?	

Output:

A first team AI working agreement.

10 Facilitation Script

10.1 Opening Script

Today is not a lecture about AI, and the goal is not to turn everyone into a technical specialist. The goal is to make AI understandable and practical enough that your team can make better decisions about using it in daily work.

We will keep the theory short, work with realistic examples, and focus on what AI can and cannot do. By the end of the session, you should have a clearer understanding of AI, a better sense of the risks, and a first team AI working agreement that helps you use AI more responsibly.

10.2 Problem Framing Script

The reason this topic matters is that AI is already entering daily work, often faster than teams can make clear agreements about it. Some people are experimenting with tools like ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, or Claude. Others are hesitant because they are unsure what is safe, allowed, or useful.

That creates a real problem. Without shared understanding, teams may use AI inconsistently, trust outputs too easily, enter sensitive information into the wrong tools, or avoid useful opportunities because the topic feels too vague or risky.

In this session, we make the topic practical. We will look at what AI is good at, where it can go wrong, and how your team can take a responsible first step.

10.3 Transition to Exercise 1: AI Myth or Reality

You do not need to get this perfect. The goal is to surface what we already believe about AI and test those assumptions together.

Some statements will be clearly wrong. Some will be broadly true. Some will depend on the context. The interesting part is often the discussion, because that shows where teams need shared language.

10.4 Transition to Exercise 2: Useful, Risky, Unsuitable

Now we move from general AI ideas to real work situations.

The question is not only "Can AI do this?" A better question is: "Can we use AI for this responsibly, with the right checks and boundaries?"

You will sort realistic tasks into useful, risky, and unsuitable. If you are unsure, place the task under risky and write down what rule or safeguard would be needed.

10.5 Transition to Exercise 3: Better Prompt, Better Check

Now that we have looked at where AI may or may not belong, we will practice asking better questions.

This is not a prompt engineering course. The point is simple: clearer input usually gives better output, but better prompting does not remove the need for human judgement.

For every AI answer, we should still ask: what needs to be checked?

10.6 Transition to Exercise 4: Team AI Working Agreement

We are not writing a final AI policy today. We are creating a first working agreement for this team.

The agreement should be simple enough to use tomorrow. It should clarify what AI may be used for, what should be avoided, what must always be checked, and who remains responsible for the final output.

If something needs legal, privacy, IT, or management input, we will mark it as a follow-up question.

10.7 Closing Script

The value of this session is not only that we talked about AI. The value is that you now have a shared language, a first overview of useful and risky applications, and a practical starting point for your own team.

Before we close, choose one concrete action you can take in the next week. That could be testing one safe use case, improving one prompt, discussing one risk with your team, or turning today's working agreement into a first internal guideline.

The goal is not to do everything at once. The goal is to take one responsible next step.

11 Outputs and Deliverables

11.1 Participant Output

At the end of the session, participants have:

- a basic shared understanding of what AI can and cannot do
- a clearer view of common risks such as hallucinations, privacy issues, bias, overreliance, and unclear accountability
- a first map of useful, risky, and unsuitable AI use cases for their own work
- one improved prompt example with a defined checking step
- a responsible AI checklist for daily use
- a first team AI working agreement
- one concrete next action they can take within their own team or role

The most important participant output is the first team AI working agreement. The session should not end with awareness only. It should end with a practical artifact that helps the team decide what AI may be used for, what must be checked, what information should not be entered, and who remains responsible for final output.

11.2 Facilitator Output

After the session, I deliver:

Deliverable	Included	Notes
PDF summary	[x]	Short summary of the session, key insights, main risks, and agreed next steps.
Photo or export of board	[x]	Export of sticky notes, online board, use-case map, or shared document.
AI use-case map	[x]	Overview of useful, risky, and unsuitable AI use cases identified by the group.

Deliverable	Included	Notes
Responsible AI checklist	[x]	Clean version of the checklist created or used during the session.
First team AI working agreement	[x]	Main session artifact. Captures allowed uses, risky uses, off-limits uses, checking rules, privacy boundaries, and responsibility.
Action list	[x]	List of concrete follow-up actions agreed during the session.
Resource list	[x]	Curated list of practical AI literacy, responsible-use, and tool resources.
Follow-up advice	[x]	Short advice on what the team should do next, without turning it into open-ended consulting.
Optional implementation offer	[ ]	Only offered if there is a clear follow-up need, such as improving the internal AI agreement, running a workflow scan, or designing deeper training.

12 Remote and Hybrid Design

12.1 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 session needs more structure than a physical session. Instructions should be shorter, exercises should be broken into smaller blocks, and all outputs should be captured in a shared document or online board. The facilitator should check in more often, because quiet participants can disappear more easily online.

For remote delivery, the preferred setup is:

- video call for explanation and discussion
- shared document for the AI-use checklist and final guideline
- optional online board for sorting use cases into useful, risky, and unsuitable categories
- clear links sent before the session
- backup PDF worksheets in case the online board fails

12.2 Hybrid Feasibility

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

Requirement	Needed	Ready
Remote participant check-ins	[x]	[ ]

Hybrid recommendation:

Only with co-facilitator

Reason:

Hybrid is possible, but it is the most fragile format. The main risk is that the physical group becomes dominant while remote participants only watch. For this product to work hybrid, everyone should use the same shared digital board or document, even participants in the physical room. A co-facilitator is strongly recommended to monitor chat, remote participation, technical issues, and whether online participants are still included.

Without good audio, a visible screen, and active remote facilitation, this product should not be sold as hybrid.

13 Pricing and Packaging

13.1 Possible Versions

Version	Duration	Output	Price	Notes
Pilot	2 hours	Mini AI-use checklist and feedback round	€450 excluding VAT	Good for testing the product with a friendly group or first client
Standard	4 hours	Full AI literacy session, use-case map, risk overview, and first team guideline	€950 excluding VAT	Main product and best default offer
Extended	2 times 4 hours	Workshop plus application session, improved guideline, and follow-up advice	€1,750 excluding VAT	Higher value version for teams that want to apply the material to real workflows

13.2 What Is Included

Included:

- intake call of max 30 minutes
- preparation of the session
- session design based on the target group
- live delivery of the training
- reusable worksheets
- practical examples
- AI-use checklist template
- use-case sorting exercise
- basic PDF summary
- follow-up email with resources and next steps

Not included:

- unlimited support
- custom software development
- full AI implementation
- legal compliance audit
- ongoing maintenance
- writing a full internal AI policy
- setting up AI accounts for participants
- technical troubleshooting of participant devices
- extra sessions without agreement
- customization beyond the agreed scope

13.3 Packaging Logic

The pilot version is meant to validate the product quickly. It should be easy to sell, easy to schedule, and useful for collecting testimonials and feedback.

The standard version is the main commercial product. It gives enough time for explanation, exercises, reflection, and a concrete team output without becoming too heavy for the client.

The extended version is for organizations that want more than awareness. The first session builds understanding and a first guideline. The second session applies the ideas to real workflows, improves the team guideline, and identifies practical follow-up actions.

13.4 Pricing Notes

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

Custom work should not be included in the standard training price. If a client wants implementation, internal policy writing, workflow automation, or local AI setup, that should become a separate follow-up offer with its own scope and price.

14 Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Topic too broad	Medium	High	Keep the promise narrow: practical AI literacy, safe use, and first team guideline. Do not cover every AI tool or every possible use case.
Too technical	Medium	High	Use simple examples, plain language, and realistic workplace scenarios. Avoid machine learning theory, model architecture, and complex tooling.
Too generic	Medium	High	Position the product around "Practical AI Literacy for Teams" and practical team-level AI use, not generic prompting or inspiration.
Low market demand	Low	High	Demand appears visible because of AI adoption and AI literacy obligations, but still validate with pilots, search results, and direct conversations.
Too much preparation	Medium	Medium	Use reusable slides, worksheets, use-case cards, risk examples, and a fixed session structure. Limit customization to small examples per audience.
Remote energy drops	Medium	Medium	Use shorter blocks, active exercises, clear online instructions, and frequent check-ins. Avoid long monologues.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Becomes support work	Medium	High	Clearly state that the product is training, not technical support, legal advice, or implementation. Offer follow-up only as a separate scoped product.
Participants expect prompt tricks	Medium	Medium	Explain upfront that this is AI literacy and responsible use training, not a prompt engineering course. Include only a few useful prompt examples.
Client expects legal compliance	Medium	High	Frame the training as support for AI literacy and responsible use, not as a legal audit or compliance certification.
Tool access fails	Low	Medium	Do not make the session dependent on every participant having access to the same AI tool. Use prepared examples and optional demonstrations.
Participants have very different skill levels	High	Medium	Design exercises that work for beginners and allow more advanced participants to go deeper in discussion or examples.
Output stays too vague	Medium	High	End every session with a concrete artifact: AI-use checklist, safe-use map, team guideline, or first action plan.

15 Pilot Plan

15.1 Pilot Audience

Possible pilot groups:

- colleagues at Windesheim
- researchers who are curious about AI but unsure how to use it safely
- lecturers or education teams
- project teams working with documents, reports, or coordination tasks
- SME contacts who want to understand AI before investing in tools
- Value Chain Hackers network
- Social Chicken network
- friendly test group with mixed AI experience

Best first pilot audience:

A small group of 6 to 10 people from education, research, or project work. This group is likely to recognize the topic, ask useful questions, and provide honest feedback without requiring a fully polished commercial version.

15.2 Pilot Goal

The pilot should answer:

Question	Answer
Do people understand the offer?	Test whether the title and explanation are clear without extra verbal explanation.
Do they find it relevant?	Check whether participants recognize the problem of AI confusion, risk, and unclear use.
Is the level right?	Validate whether the session is understandable for beginners but not boring for people who already experimented with AI.
Does the timing work?	Test whether the core activities fit within 2 hours for the pilot and can scale to 4 hours for the standard version.

Question	Answer
Is the output useful?	Check whether the AI-use checklist or first team guideline feels practical enough to use after the session.
Would they recommend it?	Ask whether participants would recommend this to another team, manager, researcher, or SME owner.

15.3 Pilot Feedback Form

Ask:

- What was most useful?
- What was unclear?
- Was the level too easy, right, or too hard?
- Did the session feel practical enough?
- Did the session avoid too much hype or jargon?
- Was the output useful?
- What would you change?
- Would you recommend this to someone else?
- Who do you think this training is best suited for?
- What title would make you click on this workshop?

16 Final Decision

Decision Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Clear market demand	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	AI literacy, responsible AI use, and practical AI training are visible market needs.
Not oversaturated	[ ]	[x]	[ ]	The AI training market is crowded, but the anti-hype and practical team-output positioning creates a clearer niche.
Fits my energy	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The product combines explanation, facilitation, practical examples, and visible participant learning.
Can be delivered in 4 hours	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The scope is manageable if it stays focused on literacy, risks, use cases, and a first team guideline.

Decision Question	Yes	Maybe	No	Notes
Has concrete output	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	Participants leave with an AI-use checklist, use-case map, or first team guideline.
Can be sold clearly online	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	The title and promise are understandable: practical AI literacy without hype.
Should become finalist product	[x]	[ ]	[ ]	This should be one of the first products to pilot.

Final decision:

Move to final shortlist and build a 2-hour pilot version first. After the pilot, refine the title, examples, worksheet, and final output before selling the 4-hour standard version.

17 Research Notes

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

- Strongest positioning: practical AI literacy for teams, not prompt engineering.
- Good alternative titles: Practical AI Literacy for Teams, Practical AI Literacy for Teams, Responsible AI Use in Practice.
- Main output should be simple: AI-use checklist, safe-use map, or first team guideline.
- Avoid legal claims. This supports AI literacy, but is not a compliance audit.
- Avoid becoming IT support. No account setup or tool troubleshooting in the standard version.
- Best first pilot group is likely education, research, or a small project team.
- The product can later connect to deeper offers such as AI for Research Workflows, AI for Reporting, or Local AI for Teams.

AI.nl. 2026. "AI Workshops & Training 2026." 2026. https://www.ai.nl/en/ai-workshops.

European Commission. 2025a. "AI Literacy: Questions and Answers." 2025. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/faqs/ai-literacy-questions-answers.

———. 2025b. "The Netherlands 2025 Digital Decade Country Report." June 18, 2025. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/factpages/netherlands-2025-digital-decade-country-report.

NobleProg. 2026. "Artificial Intelligence Training in The Hague." 2026. https://www.nobleprog.nl/en/artificial-intelligence-ai/training/the-hague.

OECD. 2025. "The Adoption of Artificial Intelligence in Firms." https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/the-adoption-of-artificial-intelligence-in-firms_f9ef33c3-en.html.

OpenMinds Academy. 2026. "AI Act Certification: General AI Literacy." 2026. https://www.openmindsacademy.eu/courses/AI-Act-General-AI-Literacy-English.

Radboud in'to Languages. 2026. "Basic Generative AI Skills." 2026. https://www.ru.nl/en/radboud-into-languages/courses/basic-generative-ai-skills.

Statistics Netherlands. 2025a. "Dutch AI Monitor 2024." June 18, 2025. https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/longread/aanvullende-statistische-diensten/2025/ai-monitor-2024.

———. 2025b. "Use of AI Technology by Dutch Companies." June 18, 2025. https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/longread/aanvullende-statistische-diensten/2025/ai-monitor-2024/2-use-of-ai-technology-by-dutch-companies.

Teamland. 2026. "AI First Corporate AI Training for Amsterdam Teams." 2026. https://www.teamland.com/ai-training/amsterdam.

The Knowledge Academy. 2026. "Generative AI Course in Netherlands." 2026. https://www.theknowledgeacademy.com/nl/courses/artificial-intelligence-tools-training/generative-ai-certification-training-course/.

TheGenAI. 2026. "Generative AI Workshops and 8-Hour MVP Prototyping." 2026. https:

//thegenai.nl/.

Wageningen University & Research. 2026. “Basic Generative AI Skills.” 2026. https://www.wur.nl/en/education/into-languages/generatieve-ai-trainingen/courses/basic-generative-ai-skills.