TiLE 2004
Maastricht Exhibition and Congress Centre
Tuesday 15th to Thursday 17th June

Session: Innovation v Cookie Cutter
Theme Manager: Axel Hüttinger
Deputy: Malcolm Lewis

0. Introduction: [5 min]

In the attraction industry, we are witnessing an increase in "cookie cutter" projects that seek to mimic other projects. Many clients and developers ask for the new Eden Project, the new Disney park, the new Guggenheim or the new Exploratorium. The driving force of this trend is the economic situation of the leisure industry - "cookie cutter" projects are thought to reduce the risk. Is it possible to copy a working model and implement successfully in a different location? Is the risk really decreased and is there real financial benefit? Above all, will the visitor accept a homogenised product, with uniformities of style, content, interpretation and business model across the world-wide leisure market?

1. Presentation: [15 min]
The innovation train…who drives Innovation?
Do we drive innovation or does it drive us?
Speaker: Mrs Yael Coifman Associate Director, ERA, London
Yael.Coifman@econres.com

I propose to take look at major innovations in the leisure industry, (those that truly revolutionised) and the context in which they were developed. (Economic situation, demographic changes, politics, etc) to see if there is a pattern that emerges regarding the driving factors. The important aspect would be to look at the planning period not the opening of the concept. I would examine 5 examples. Case studies to be reviewed could include the following:

- Disneyland
- Branded themed restaurant chains (and then the overexpansion of the concept in boom times)
- Cirque de Soleil
- First Vegas casino to incorporate the 'give-away' entertainment aspect - Treasure Island?
- First incorporation of entertainment into retail - West Edmonton Mall
- Development of the purpose built multiplex
- The all-inclusive entertainment programmed resort - Club Med and Butlins
- Purpose Built Corporate Attractions - World of Coke and Chocolate World

The most recent attempt? Technology driven failures of Segaworld and Gameworks - why? Was the timing off, the context wrong for innovation?
For each I will review the driving factors that shaped the time for the innovation, the result and the impact on leisure development to see if a pattern emerges. Then finish with the current setting we are all in and question what's next and can we tell when the next major innovation will come? Do we drive innovation? Or does it drive us?

2. Presentation: [15 min]

With respect to interactive science centers:
Is it possible to copy a working model and implement it in a different location?

Speaker: Joseph G. Ansel, Principal of Ansel Associates, Inc.
ja@anselinc.com

Absolutely. With respect to interactive science centers this has already happened with some excellent results, and with some problems. If we copy: 1) Is the risk really decreased and 2) is there a real financial benefit?

The risk of failed exhibits is decreased with copies providing that:

1. The people doing the exhibit design and/or fabrication really understand what the original exhibit did and how it was originally built. This is often not the case.
2. Overall exhibition design criteria allow for exhibit copies to be built without so many changes as to make the copy completely different than the original. For example, a freestanding table mounted piece may be hard to replicate as a wall mounted unit in a forced circulation, heavily themed, environment.
3. Those who are doing the design and fabrication have operational experience with the exhibits in a science center setting.
4. Communication between the designers, fabricators and ultimate client is open and continuous.

The financial benefits are simple:

1. Tried and true exhibits will work more often and with less problems than completely new concepts.
2. Some tried and true exhibits can be a simple "buy-out."
3. Total capital project and ongoing operating costs should be lower than a completely new exhibition concept, and
4. Costs can be known relatively early on in the project cycle for exhibits which exist. Budgeting is easier.

Does the audience accept a homogenized product?
This question has arisen time and time again since the development of the "Exploratorium" model and, while there are some caveats, the answer is: YES because:

1. In completely new markets the old model is new. Only we professionals know that the exhibits exist elsewhere, only we professionals care about this! Most often our audience neither knows, nor cares—just ask the kid spinning wildly on the Momentum Machine if he cares there is a version of this same exhibit in San Francisco!
2. Most fundamental interactive science exhibits are, or can be made, culturally neutral. Spinning around like an ice skater is just as much fun for Koreans as for the British.
3. The phenomena based interactive experience is like chocolate; it's just good and people like throughout their lifetimes. We all have "favorite" exhibits we visit time and time again.

The reason this question arises is because some mover's and shakers in our industry are at times too insecure, or vain, simply to deliver a great product to the public. They want to change things so they can say they have advanced the

field or done something completely new. But while we should advance the field and do new things, it's also essential to recognize the value of existing concepts. If all we do is copy, how will we be creative?
One can do non creative things—copy—and still be creative within a given profession or field. Each new painting is a new work—although the paint and canvass remain common. Writers can be immensely creative using the common words of our language. However inventing a completely new field or area of inquiry is a higher level of creativity and precious few of us are likely to do this. Once you compare yourself, in a fundamental way, to others, you then define yourself. This is a first and major step away from creating a new field of work or inquiry. Comparison can be either positive ("We are a third generation science center…") or negative ("We're primarily an old school natural history museum…") but in either case, you dramatically reduce the potential for radically new methods or paradigms to arise.
At the early Exploratorium we were not a science museum or a technical museum or an art center or any other such thing. We worked at the Exploratorium and even we—in the beginning—didn't know how to define the place, nor predict what it would become. Oppenheimer did this because labels limit.
Note the truly creative do not know they are so. They work in their own world to their own standards. By definition, the very new has no direct precedent.

3. Presentation: [15 min]

The Cologne Science Center

Speaker: Armin Frey, Project Manager, Research Institute for Applied Knowledge Processing (FAW)
frey@faw.uni-ulm.de

In Cologne, a Science museum of a special type is being built. The Cologne Science Centre's theme is 'Life and knowledge, Knowledge and Life'. It sets itself the task of conveying knowledge, to continue one's education it will have a lot of interesting things to offer for young and old in terms of recreational value. As regards content, the Science Centre will deal with questions of the future as well as with the diversity of daily life. The CSC will, at the same time, be an attractive venue for picking out the most important social questions about the future and challenges as its central theme. The big problems of the world and the contributions of science in important current subject areas in terms of possible solutions will be made the subject of discussion.
After a long search, the Cologne Science Centre found its final location on the former CFK premises. Here, on the right-hand bank of the River Rhine a new recreational area and multifunctional site near the town is being built, into which will be integrated the attractive building of the Cologne Science Centre in terms of town planning.

Content of the attraction:

I. Questions of orientation and epistemic aspects
I.1 The "superorganism mankind": The world at the end of the 20th century
I.2 Where does knowledge come from? / Epistemology
I.3 Sustainable development in the 21st century: Social effects of human activities in the future

II. Life
II.1 Information as the basis of life
II.2 The biological evolution
II.3 Nervous systems and brains

III. Technical Information Processing
III.1 Computer / Technical Information Processing
III.2 Telecommunications and Internet
III.3 Intelligent machinery / Robotics

IV. Life and survive?
IV.1 Food and water
IV.2 Health: The modern scientific medicine
IV.3 Health: The other medicine
IV.4 Genetic engineering and biotechnology in agriculture
IV.5 Genetic engineering in medicine / Healing with genes

4. Discussion: [20 min]