

Innovation and Entrepreneurship Basics AY 2019/2020

Guidelines for the Case Study Presentation

When: the week of the exam call. Register on Esse3 and book your slot here!

Duration: 15 minutes (10 minutes presentation + 5 minutes questions)

Format: oral presentation (supported by powerpoint slides)

Logistics guidelines:

- Your presentation should be based on any of the cases below. Alternatively, you can propose your own topic, but they require approval from the teaching team. Topics below are pre-approved.
- If you choose a pre-approved topic, you don't need to inform us about your choice. If you want to propose your own case study please contact us via email and give us up to two *working* days for approval.
- If you are proposing your own topic, contact us well before the deadline; don't wait until the last second! Should your proposal be rejected, you can submit another case study, but we will take up to two more days again to review.
- **If you submitted your own case study, please wait for a notification of approval by the teaching team before starting to work on it!**
- Appropriately reference sources you use to develop your presentation. Suitable sources can be class material, but especially scientific articles, authoritative web sources, practitioner articles...
- The presentation is graded on a scale from 0 to 20 points, with the following evaluation criteria:
 - a. Correctness and completeness of the provided information (e.g., ability to connect to other relevant concepts and relevant social/economic facts)
 - b. Exposition (i.e., overall presentation performance and flow; reasonable use of the slides medium and decent English; soundness of the case)
 - c. Argumentation (i.e., Capacity to express critical thinking, outlining critical issues, challenges and relevant reflections about the case studies and answering precisely to questions)
- Don't make too many slides! A good ballpark is to use a maximum of 10 slides.
- **Send the slides to i-and-e-team@list.disi.unitn.it by 7pm of the day before your exam.** Name file as: *yourName_yourSurname.pdf*. If you're using a different format, please make sure to also send at least a PDF version in order to avoid problems on the day of the presentation.
- **We invite you not to choose the same topic you did your battle on.** As an example, if you did the Trust battle, we suggest that you don't do the Trust individual assignment. But still, you can try to convince us that you have a good reason or angle in mind about your battle...

Content guidelines:

- The presentation is a moment of reflection and critical thinking about key themes in Innovation and Entrepreneurship. The topics we propose here start from the worlds you created during the battles. In the battles, we explored future alternative scenarios that could be used to draw reflections about how, where, and why we want to go as a society. Decisions that we take everyday participate in shaping the future, and innovators are the ones that try to look ahead and imagine a different future.
- The cases proposed here start from some aspects of the battles that we believe have not been thoroughly explored in the class. They usually start from the side that won the battle in class, and continue the critique of their viewpoint, reinforcing the idea that even though they won the debate, there is more.
- If you do not like the perspectives which we are proposing, but would still like to explore one of these cases in more depth, feel free to briefly detail it and submit it to us.
- We will write a case study for each battle as the class progresses. Should you feel in a hurry, you're always free to email us with your own topic proposal.

Case Study 1: Privacy vs Transparency

While we framed the battle as one of dystopias, both terms — privacy and transparency — are nowadays seen as drivers of change exclusively with a positive connotation. Indeed, many reforms, class actions and public debates are done in the name of transparency and privacy, both in the public and private sectors. Sometimes, however, these needs clash and trigger deeper reflections. From video surveillance, to access to information stored in personal electronics, the examples are many. **Explore cases of clash between the need of extra transparency and of extra privacy, and dig deeper into the key ethical tradeoffs implied by this clash.** What was the key reason that caused the clash? In what sense was more privacy/transparency needed? What were the main possible alternatives, and what was the final decision? Who benefitted from the decision? What possible future scenarios could this decision impact? What possible “slippery slopes” could appear in the future stemming from these decision? (for example, nobody thought about software copyrights when copyright duration was extended after Disney...).

Case Study 2: Type 1 Civilisation Humanity — Ecologists vs Engineers

Since the dawn of Science Fiction, many technologies have moved from fantasy to reality, sometimes with uncanny accuracy. From modern submarines in “20.000 Leagues Under The Sea” to the tablets in “2001: A Space Odyssey”, the examples are many. In this case study, we ask you to do a similar process. **Take a technology from a recent work of sci-fi (a book, movie, tv series, videogame, comic, podcast... released in the last 15 years) and think about how it might become a reality in our near future.** What shape could it take in our world? Roughly, how far in the future is it? What

type of organisation could lead its development and deployment (a corporate; a startup; a consortium of universities; etc)? What are the main impacts that this technology would have on the economy and society? What critical concerns would it raise?

Case Study 3: Trust the Man vs Trust the Machine

In the battle we only had the chance to investigate a very small amount of cases around the broad topic of trust (whether assigned to people or to machines), and teams have both argued for why it was good that trust should be assigned to one of the two actors. There have been in our history, however, many cases where trust was misplaced, and we trusted people when we would have better trusted machines, or vice versa. **Take a case of misplaced trust, and explore it with some depth finding data and impacts (both philosophical, in law, and practical). Then, try to imagine and present an alternative “happy ending” in which things went well, potentially by changing on who the trust is placed.** What is the background of this case, and when did it happen? Why was trust misplaced? Would technology and society have been mature to trust a person (in case they were trusting a machine) or trusting a machine (in case they were trusting a person)? What impacts does your “happy ending” have? Is it just a case when things would have run smoothly, or would there have been lessons learned from the “near miss” situation?

Case Study 4: Smart City vs Smart Countryside

When our society first moved from an agriculture-based economy to an industry-based one, a key driver was that we reached a “cap” on the development of pre-industrial technologies. Metal-making, fiber weaving, chemical processes, transportation, harvesting, building materials... All these processes and more needed the industrial revolution to reach new potentials in their development. When mechanisation became widespread, previous techniques became obsolete, and new techniques took their places, and the same happened even for some post-industrial technologies. More than 200 years later, however, some obsolete technologies could be refreshed using new insights, and could achieve potentials which are unreachable even for contemporary solutions. **Take an obsolete technology (examples: sailing; fire-based heating; wood construction...) and show how it could be reasonably adapted to the contemporary world.** Why was this technology abandoned, and with what was it replaced? What are the key technological advancements that would enable this technology to be reborn? What key societal challenges could it help solving? What could be the key problems or ethical criticisms that it could raise? When it would become market-ready, how big could its market be?

Case Study 5: Cyborgisation vs Genetic Enhancement

We spoke of cyborgisation and genetic enhancement as future scenarios, something which is still not in our lives. When taking things literally, that’s surely true, but we already have in our world many technologies, digital or not, that “enhance” us as humans. For example, internet-connected smartphones allow us to share visuals and sounds almost instantly, and some medications can push our bodies’ capabilities

further than it would normally be. All these technology share the feature of being (almost) transparent or widely accepted in our society, and enhance what humans are able to do. **Take an already-existing “human-enhancing technology”, trace back its history, and then present some possible future scenarios for it.** What type of technology is it, and in what stage of maturity is it (you can use Gartner’s Hype Cycle if it helps you)? What new possibilities would the development of that technology open for human beings? What directions could it take if it were developed further? Does it have any ethical concerns that maybe we have silently accepted but we should reopen a debate about?