

The Concept of Business Model Scalability

Morten Lund¹ and Christian Nielsen¹

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the article is to define what scalable business models are. Central to the contemporary understanding of business models is the value proposition towards the customer and the hypotheses generated about delivering value to the customer which become a good foundation for a long-term profitable business. However, the main message of this article is that while providing a good value proposition may help the firm 'get by', the really successful businesses of today are those able to reach the sweet-spot of business model scalability.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The article is based on a five-year longitudinal action research project of over 90 companies that participated in the International Center for Innovation project aimed at building 10 global network-based business models.

Findings: This article introduces and discusses the term scalability from a company-level perspective. It illustrates how managers should be using this term for the benefit of their business by focusing on business models capable of achieving *exponentially increasing returns to scale*, thus fulfilling the objective of making it applicable for business decisions and not merely an abstract economical concept. The article finds five patterns of business model scalability that all companies, regardless of industrial affiliation, can use to their advantage. Especially the role of stakeholders in the business model is highlighted in achieving scalability.

Research limitations/implications: Limitations relating to qualitative research confine the generalisation of the findings. The implication of this research is that achieving scalability is not solely a matter of digitalizing business models. Rather, there are a number of specific business model configurations that support scalability and the mechanisms to do this are not merely characterized as digital.

Practical implications: This article provides managers with a concrete roadmap for how to work towards business model scalability including suggested managerial processes and how to facilitate these.

Originality/Value: The power of business models lies in their ability to visualize and clarify how firms' may configure their value creation processes. Among the key aspects of business model thinking are a focus on what the customer values, how this value is best delivered to the customer and how strategic partners are leveraged in this value creation, delivery and realization exercise. This paper couples these advantages with a structure for identifying scalability, and hence stronger business models.

Keywords: Business models, scalability, growth, flexibility, business model configurations, strategic partners

Please cite this paper as: Lund, M. and Nielsen, C. (2018), The Concept of Business Model Scalability, Journal of Business Models, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 1-18

¹ Aalborg University

² Aalborg University and Norway Inland University of Applied Sciences

Introduction

It is the prime responsibility of any company director to optimize the competitiveness of his/her business. Understanding how best to configure the company is a prime mechanism in creating profits in the short term and in the long term, in due course also creating jobs and thereby wealth in society. Many basic textbooks in economics, business, management and marketing introduce students to the concepts of scale and scope. Whereas economies of scale for a firm primarily refers to reductions in the average cost per unit associated with increasing the scale of production for a single product type, economies of scope refer to lowering the average cost for a firm via product diversification, i.e. producing two or more products.

In applying these two concepts to the study of American industrial history, Chandler *et al.* (1990) argue for ways of positioning an organization in relation to the market offering. It seems natural to align these ideas to how a company proposes to make money and such thoughts are not alien to the present debate in the field of business models and the related action of business model innovation. When the word scalability is used in the context of running a company, it implies that the underlying business model offers the potential for economic growth within the company.

In relating the concept of scalability to business models in this manner, a couple of interesting questions arise: Are there degrees of scalability evident in contemporary business model configurations? Under which circumstances is the relationship between scale and scope of particular importance? Hence, it is the objective of this paper to analyze the concept of scalability in relation to growing a company and relate this notion to the specific business model configurations being employed by businesses. In this setting scalability is applied in a slightly different manner than in Chandler *et al.*'s (1990) conceptualization of competitive focus. This paper discusses the dimensions of scalability in the context of business models and creates a roadmap for understanding and analyzing scalability. In turn, it provides input to contemporary understandings of business model patterns, archetypes and configurations as well as practical insights for managers and owners of SMEs and newly created ventures.

The concept of scalability

The adjective 'scalable' means "Able to be changed in size or scale" (Oxford Dictionaries), hence we use the term scalability to denote a state where change in size is achievable. In the context of IT infrastructure, Bondi (2000) argues that, "Scalability is ability of a system, network, or process to handle a growing amount of work in a capable manner or its ability to be enlarged to accommodate that growth". Here scalability refers to the capability of a system to increase its total output under an increased load when resources (typically hardware) are added. This is directly transferable to the context of scaling businesses.

Linking the notion of scalability to business models provides a meaningful framework for discussing and estimating business potential. Business potential is important to many stakeholders in business. From a social and community level, business potential is related to societal wealth creation through the creation of jobs and thereby also tax money for sustaining welfare. From an investor perspective business potential is the backbone of valuation techniques like the Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) model and the bets that many investors make regardless of holding a few stocks on their private account, active Business Angel investors or large institutional investors. From the perspective of stakeholders directly involved in a business and its ecosystem, like for example employees, customers, suppliers and other types of business partners, business potential is important for lowering risk perceptions such as loss of a job, loss of receivables, and loss of money. We might accrue scalability and business potential to the related topic of *growth*.

From Bondi's (2000) description it can be deduced that in addition to growth, addressed above in conjunction with business potentials, the flexibility of a system, structure or business, likewise is an important characteristic of scalability. Flexibility is related to having a certain organizational agility (Christopher and Towill, 2001; Boden, 2004) that allows for changes instigated by external events such as new competition, regulation or macro-economic pressures, or internal events such as R&D, loss or gain of core competences, financial resources etc. Flexibility might induce a certain agility in the offering of value to customers or be conceived as the ability to innovate the business.

Finally, the effects of scalability are also important to consider. In entrepreneurship, there is talk of the entrepreneur's dilemma (Wasserman 2006), which relates to the problem of when to sell a venture to a more capital abundant owner, but also the problems entrepreneurs face when having to decentralize decision-making or hire a professional administrator or CEO to run the company for them. In the organization literature, there is an abundance of growth models and development phase models for organizations (see for example Greiner, 1972; Mintzberg, 1983) depicting the organizational, financial and managerial challenges of a growing, or declining, company.

The key lies in unlocking exponentially increasing returns to scale

Going back to the notions of scale and scope from an economics perspective, three different variations of returns are given (Basu 2008, Gelles and Mitchell 1996), namely increasing, constant and declining returns to scale. In addition to this can be added the dimension of a linear relationship versus an exponential relationship. In table 1, this provides an overview of the possibilities according to these two dimensions. Obviously, in situations of declining returns to scale, the question is merely how quick to leave the business. In the case of linear relationships there might be a case for selling out tactically so as to destroy as little value as possible. In a situation with constant returns to scale, the business needs to be innovated or investments of excess capital should be done elsewhere, and finally in the increasing returns to scale column, the business models become more attractive from a scalability perspective.

Table 1 illustrates the importance of understanding that scalability can take several forms. For the manager

of a company, it should be unsatisfactory to expect an increase in returns of 10% if the capital employment to reach that goal also is 10%. This is the case of constant returns to scale. And employing an increase in staff of 10% to receive a positive net-result of 5% would be an example of declining returns to scale.

Take the example of a small but stable design company. There are four partners that create a profit of USD 80.000 in year one to be split among them. In year two they hire in a 5th partner, resulting in a profit of USD 100.000, but splitting into five parts results in constant returns to scale. This is a situation seen in many small consultancy companies and scalability achieved merely by selling more hours of service is seldom an activity with increasing returns to scale. It might be the case that some administrative costs, over time, can be spread out across a greater revenue base to achieve some form of synergy effect, but this cannot be termed a scalable business model.

The point being made here is that the objectives of scaling a business should not just be the ability to employ 10% more employees, 10% more capital or resources and get 10% more output. Even despite the fact that synergies might provide the case for linear increasing returns to scale. For a business model to be truly scalable, it ought to hold the promise of exponential increasing returns to scale. While achieving scalability in the context of linear increasing returns to scale is concerned with finding synergies, the promise of exponential returns to scale are found in cases where the applied resources, competences and value propositions of a business models in combination with one another evolve to completely new properties, by Nielsen and Dane-Nielsen (2010) denoted emergent properties. The synthesis of these arguments can be summarized in figure 1 below.


 Declining RtS	Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes	Sell out sensibly	Innovate or invest elsewhere
Exponential Attributes	Leave as soon as possible	Synergies make this a good place to be
		The sweet-spot

Table 1: Analyzing business model scalability

Methodology

The empirical inputs for this paper is based on a longitudinal action research project from 2007 to 2013. It reports the research focusing specifically on the innovation of the 10 network-based business models being studied. The Danish research program “International Center for Innovation” (ICI) was initiated in 2007, ending in March 2013. The project aimed to inspire and assist participants in a development process of innovating new network-based global business models and in providing a solid base for relevant qualitative data, parallel to a business and industry ambition of creating sustainable business models for the companies involved. The collaborating companies were structured into networks consisting of at least 5 companies. Each network was followed for a period of at least two years. ICI has since 2007 followed and documented the development of 10 network-cases including a total of 92 companies that were in the process of understanding their business model with the ambition to innovate their existing business models to become new global network-based business models.

We applied longitudinal interventionist type methods (Lukka, 2005) to the facilitation and study of business model innovation processes. These were combined with a series of non-interventionist type semi-structured interviews (Yin 2013). The research group followed the companies involved in the 10 networks through workshops, company meetings, board meetings and observations. During the research project, there were numerous meetings, workshops, reports

and semi-structured interviews, which were recorded and/or documented with minutes, pictures or video. The terminology of business models was introduced to all participants during workshops, and especially the use of the Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder & Pigneur 2010), and narratives exemplifying existing, successful business models (Lund 2014) were mobilized to the business model innovation project.

Where are scalability attributes located in business models?

Business model scalability can be defined as: “A business model that is agile and which provides exponentially increasing returns to scale in terms of growth from additional resources applied”. Hence, in the search for such attributes we would be looking for business models flexible enough to cope with internal and external forces and demands, and where business potential is not constrained by physical or material assets, such as number of man hours, machine time, cash liquidity, storage, and other forms of capacity. The search for business models that are able to juggle the characteristics of having few or no capacity constraints while simultaneously providing unique and hard to copy value propositions to customers seems to be the name of the game.

Interestingly, the hype of business models at the turn of the Millennium was concerned with precisely the notions of scalability attributes, namely in the context of E-business models. Unfortunately, many of the early




Figure 1: Hitting the scalability Sweet Spot

E-business companies forgot to calculate realistic business cases and many therefore ended up bankrupt at the hands of the dot.com bubble crash in 2001. The E-business hype took advantage of the Internet as a new global channel to reach customers and users. Technology made it possible for companies to multiply their market potential. By combining Internet-based marketing and ordering mechanisms with traditional physical distribution channels, many E-businesses were able to outcompete the (then) traditional bricks and mortar stores, for example in retailing. A very notable example of this is the case of Dell, described in detail by Kraemer *et al.* (2000), who succeeded in disintermediating the existing retail value chain of the PC industry. We highlight the past tense of *then*, because today, not a respectable retail store exists without an Internet platform of some sort.

But is it necessarily “a unique business model” to have an online marketing channel (incidentally like everybody else) whereby an order made in the webshop can be delivered by postal services? This is definitely questionable. However, if it was possible to add a new distribution channel that, in addition to satisfying a new group of customers, provided additional value to the customers using the existing distribution channels, then that would be defined as “a unique business model”. The aspect of scalability could then be judged by the notions of the returns to scale and if these were increasing, we would have a sweet-spot situation of business model scalability.

In a related article, Nielsen and Lund (2018) provide evidence of five patterns relating to the link with exponential increasing returns to scale. Below we describe these five patterns:

Pattern 1 – Scalability achieved through new distribution channels

According to Nielsen and Lund (2018), the notion of selling through multiple distribution channels cannot

be deemed *novel* in any sense it is important to consider the returns to scale attributes. If the implementation of a new distribution channel cannibalizes on existing channels the returns to scale would be declining, a worry that many retailers face. Linear increasing returns to scale could potentially be obtained through the sharing of corporate overhead and savings related to higher production outputs, which would be the normal economic argument for adding new channels to the business. However, creating a *sweet-spot scalable business model* would be achieved in cases where adding a new distribution channel provides additional value to existing channels and the customers using them. Coca-Cola addresses this by delivering content to consumers through as many channels as possible, while Zara takes the integrator approach of being in command of the bulk of the steps in a value-adding process by controlling all resources and capabilities in terms of value creation. This is illustrated in Tabel 2.

An example of achieving scalability through new distributions channels simultaneously with a higher value proposition to existing channels was found in a case study of the Danish supplier of fresh fish, Copenhagen Seafood. The company added a new channel for private consumers of fresh fish and as a result achieved being able to sell higher quality fish to their restaurant segment at a lower price. Mixing the channels meant that the private consumers of fresh fish also were made aware of which restaurants they shared suppliers with and this rise in awareness increased the business of the involved restaurants. This is an example of the type of complementary fit identified by Zott and Amit (2013) which occurs when activities are mutually reinforcing. According to Milgrom and Roberts (1990, 1995), activities are complements when the marginal value of one activity increases as the other activity is increased.

	Declining RtS	Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes	Channels might cannibalize each other	Channel might give access to new market segment	Sharing of overhead costs and production costs between channels
Exponential Attributes	Cannibalization and loss of brand value		Channels create value for each other's customer segments

Table 2: New channel scalability

Pattern 2 – Scalability through release from traditional capacity constraints

From the field of managerial accounting comes the lessons of investing at points of constraint in the production process. However, Nielsen and Lund (2018) argue that when viewing this from the perspective of business model innovation, companies should be asking themselves how to innovate in order to avoid such constraints altogether. In this sense companies should be asking themselves whether they are in the business of selling consulting or service hours, products, data or reports. Each of the above has different characteristics relating to capacity constraints. In the private banking sector this release from capacity constraints is sought by focusing on the customer relationship activities and outsourcing infrastructure management and product innovation activities. A notable example applying this business model configuration is the Swiss network operator TelcoMobile International.

In our case study of the Nordic engineering consulting company, COWI, involved in a technology-based joint venture, several possibilities were at hand. Embedded in the corporate culture of this company, strongly influenced by industry tradition, was the notion of the ‘coverage ratio’ – the percentage of hours billed to customers. This generally gives R&D activities in the industry a hard time and tends to lead to a focus on specific types of customers, namely large government organizations best acquainted with reimbursing activity on an hourly basis. Table 3 reports the characteristics of the different patterns lending themselves to this capacity constraint problem. The example illustrates that for COWI to move into the sweet-spot this would mean focusing on a new customer segment, selling a different product and essentially a showdown with the longstanding corporate culture of invoicing hours.

	Declining RtS	Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes	Developing new report types for each specific customer	Selling commented and further analyzed but standard data-reports	Selling and cross-selling the system as a product with an annual software license
Exponential Attributes			Selling standard data reports to smaller customers. Selling data about customers

Table 3: Capacity constraint scalability

Pattern 3 – Scalability through the outsourcing of investments

‘If money grew on trees’ is a popular expression typically leading to some sort of ranking and choice of options in a company. The ability to optimize the cash liquidity constraints, cash flow and working capital attributes of one’s business model would take the worries from many a CFO. However, since cash is almost never in abundance, or free for that matter, business models that are able to push capital requirements over to strategic partners are most often welcome and Nielsen and Lund (2018) argue that this is an important mechanism for building scalable business models. Thoughts aligned to business model configurations (Taran *et al.*

2016) applying these mechanisms are similar to Henry Chesbrough’s open innovation mindset. Procter & Gamble is a notable example here because they routinely utilize external sources to fuel the business model and allow unused ideas to flow outside to other companies.

One of our cases, SkyWatch, a company that has developed and produces a drone, a business model with fewer financial and other resource constraints, than those of the closest competitors, was developed. SkyWatch stuck to developing their core platform and let other companies develop the software and hardware technologies the drone could carry and operate. Much like the business model of Apple, where software

developers create content for the iTunes platform and pay to have it presented there, SkyWatch's partners created software and hardware for checking oil tanks, mapping minefields, search and rescue operations, just to name a few. Table 4 reports these characteristics.


			
Declining RtS		Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes			Partners create technologies that help market the drone
Exponential Attributes	Own R&D of applications and technologies for the drone		Partners create Technologies that provide content to data-reports SkyWatch can re-sell

Table 4: Scalability throughout outsourcing financial constraints

Pattern 4 - Scalability through the leveraging of partners working for free

Nielsen and Lund (2018) describe how this pattern of business model scalability is concerned with understanding the value perspective of the stakeholders around the company and how to optimize the value proposition of your product/service offering to them. We might briefly return to Apple and congratulate them on receiving 30% of revenues from the partners that ensure the lock-in of Apple's paying customers to - yes you guessed it - Apple. Business models here are concerned with leveraging resources and partners

in more intelligent manners. Tupperware applies such attributes to attaining a free sales force, and in the era of social media, Groupon and similar companies have taken this leveraging of customers as key marketing partners to a whole new level of business. Table 5 illustrates how these attributes relate to notions of scalability. Here we have used the notions of marketing partners, but such strategic partners could be leveraged for distribution, creating customer loyalty, giving access to resources and performing other activities according to the value configuration of the business model.


			
Declining RtS		Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes		Customers see what other customers with similar interests purchased	Sales force works for free and receives revenue-based percentages
Exponential Attributes			Marketing of offers is taken over by the potential customer giving unique access to relevant segments

Table 5: Scalability through the leveraging of partners

Pattern 5 – Scalability through the implementation of platform models

Achieving scalability through the implementation of platform models is somewhat related to example D above concerning leveraging partners and Nielsen and Lund (2018) characterise this as the fifth mechanism of business model scalability. However, in this case the implementation typically creates slightly more radical form of business model innovation. Platform-based business models have collaboration as their central element. Examples of companies here are value chain coordinators like PrintConnect.com, collaboration platforms like Podio and multisided platform models like VISA. When looking at business model innovation from this platform-based perspective, an important question to ask is, “How do we make our competitors into our partners or even main customers?” Some

companies will be able to leverage constant returns to scale, maybe even linear increasing returns to scale by cooperating with competitors on distribution services, inbound logistics, even service center and administrative center constructions.

An example of a hidden champion doing just this is an organizer of professional networks, The Relationship Factory, that during our research with them developed a dedicated software platform that their competitors were willing to pay to get access to. In doing so, they were released from the constraints of selling hours and products and moved into selling ease of use attributes and benchmark data. Table 6 illustrates that the sweet-spot entails becoming the chosen partner of the competition

	Declining RtS	Constant RtS	Increasing RtS
Linear Attributes		Service and administration collaboration	Cooperation of distribution and logistics
Exponential Attributes			Competitors become customers and strengthen the position of the firm. Selling access to existing customer base

Table 6: Scalability through the implementation of platform models

Business model scalability patterns

The five patterns presented above illustrate how a number of companies studied have been able to innovate and concurrently re-design their business model attributes. While these attributes would commonly have led to declining, constant or at best linear increasing returns to scale, novel ways of configuring business models have the potential of leading to the attributes of the sweet-spot, i.e. exponentially increasing returns to scale. Our data on business model scalability illustrates that the novel attributes identified here fall into

four dimensions capable of leveraging exponentially increasing returns to scale:

1. Features/components that enrich the existing value proposition (for free)
2. Features/components that free the business model of existing capacity constraints
3. Features/components that change the business model to a platform for other businesses
4. Features/components that change the role of existing stakeholders and utilize them in simultaneous roles in the business model

Table 7 below illustrates how the four dimensions of achieving business model scalability interact with the key attributes identified in the five patterns above. It illustrates how the five patterns (horizontal) cross the four (vertical) dimensions. A general insight is that companies that only search for cost-cutting alternatives typically will find their way to declining, constant and at

best linear increasing returns to scale. However, achieving exponentially increasing returns to scale is achieved by thinking in terms of value propositions between and among the stakeholders and partners involved in the immediate business-ecosystem of the company.

Enriching Value Propositions	Removing Capacity Constraints	Creating a Platform	Change the role of Stakeholders
New channel enriches the value proposition to existing customers			
Selling data instead of selling man-hours			
Strategic partners create lock-in for customers			
		Customers do marketing or become salespeople	
		Competitors become customers	

Table 7: Dimensions of achieving business model scalability

Business model configurations with scalability characteristics

The five patterns illustrate the configuration of ‘exponentially increasing returns to scale’ business models. They also show that it is possible to find novel ways of configuring the business models of companies in even very traditional industries. The identified dimensions in table 1 also highlight how to distinguish between the synergetic offerings of the linear increasing returns to scale and the emergent properties of the exponentially increasing returns to scale characteristics.

Leaning on the examples discussed above, this next phase in the paper looks for generalizations capable of capturing the identified characteristics of sweet-spot business models. There are various levels of abstraction available for the modeling of the value creation of businesses. For example, Osterwalder *et al.* (2004) distinguish between meta-models of business models, taxonomies of business model types, modeled instances of business models and real-life companies. Lambert (2015) and Groth and Nielsen (2015) also survey the usefulness of taking ones point of departure in specific levels of abstraction. While Lambert’s (2015) goal is to set the scene for a stronger theory-building

practice within the field of business models, Groth and Nielsen’s (2015) objectives are concerned with illustrating that the level of business model taxonomies is the most advantageous point of departure for developing statistically reliable models of different ways of doing business.




Figure 2: Different levels of business model abstraction (inspired by Massa and Tucci 2013)

In another recent contribution, Massa and Tucci (2013), distinguish between six levels of abstraction (see Figure 2).

For the purpose of the following analysis and identifying and describing the characteristic features of business models and their value creation processes, we choose the level of business model configurations as our point of focus here. In this phase of the study, we considered the configurations suggested by Linder and Cantrell (2000), Osterwalder and Pigneur (2010),

Gassmann *et al.* (2014) and finally Taran *et al.* (2016). Coupled with the four attributes of business model scalability derived from figure 2, table 7 below reports the desk survey of the sources quoted above. The objective here has been to identify already recognized and classified business model configurations capable of containing the four scalability characteristics. This in turn is expected to lead to a sounder understanding of how to generalize the five patterns and provide a possible framework for further investigation.

Enriching value propositions	
Virtual community	
Named by	Weill & Vitale, 2001
Description	Facilitate and create loyalty to an online community of people with a common interest enabling interaction and service provision. Members (customers or partners) add information into a basic environment and thereby create value for one another
Real life examples	Trust Pilot, YouTube
Related labels	Community model (Rappa, 2001), Crowdsourcing (Johnson, 2010), Open source (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
e-shop/shop	
Named by	Timmers, 1998
Description	Customers will pay premium prices for convenience such as: broad selection, ubiquitous access and fast delivery
Real life examples	ASOS.com
Related labels	Merchant model (Rappa, 2001); One stop, convenient shopping (Linder and Cantrell, 2000); Supermarket (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014), Shop in shop (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014), linked to E-commerce (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
e-mall/mall	
Named by	Timmers, 1998
Description	A collection of shops or e-shops, usually enhanced by a common umbrella
Real life examples	eBay
Related labels	Merchant model (Rappa, 2001), one stop low price shopping (Linder and Cantrell, 2000), Shop in shop (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014), linked to E-commerce (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
Removing capacity constraints	
Channel maximization	
Named by	Linder and Cantrell, 2000
Description	Content is delivered through as many channels as possible
Real life examples	Coca Cola
Related labels	
Integrator	
Named by	Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014
Description	Be in command of the bulk of the steps in a value-adding process by controlling all resources and capabilities in terms of value creation
Real life examples	Zara
Related labels	Bundling business models (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010)

Disintermediation	
Named by	Johnson, 2010
Description	Deliver directly to the customer a product or a service that has traditionally gone through an intermediary
Real life examples	Dell
Related labels	Manufacture (direct model) (Rappa, 2001), Direct to consumer (Weill and Vitale, 2001), Direct selling (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
Customer focused	
Named by	Taran <i>et al.</i> 2015
Description	Focus on the customer relationships activity and outsource the infrastructure management and the product innovation activities
Real life examples	Mobile Telco, Private banking
Related labels	Unbundling business models (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010), linked to From push to pull (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014), linked to Orchestrator (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
Trade show	
Named by	Taran <i>et al.</i> 2015
Description	Leave marketing or other value chain functions (payment, logistics, ordering) to a 3rd party with a well-known brand name e.g. licensing, outsourcing
Real life examples	Alibaba.com, Exhibition fair
Related labels	Third-party marketplace (Timmers, 1998)
Changing the role of stakeholders	
Round up buyers	
Named by	Taran <i>et al.</i> 2015
Description	Buyers are rounded up to gain purchase discounts and thereby offer attractive prices
Real life examples	Costco, Groupon
Related labels	Buying club (Linder and Cantrell, 2000)
Content creator	
Named by	Taran <i>et al.</i> 2015
Description	Provide content (e.g. information, digital products and services) via intermediaries
Real life examples	Bloomberg L.P.
Related labels	Content provider (Weill & Vitale, 2001), Digitalization (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
Creating Platform-Based Value	
Free for advertising	
Named by	Linder and Cantrell, 2000
Description	Offer free products and services through a platform and make revenues from selling advertising space
Real life examples	Facebook, GOOGLE
Related labels	Advertising model (Rappa, 2001), Free advertising (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010), Market aggregation (Linder and Cantrell, 2000), Hidden revenue (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)
Integrated	
Named by	Chesbrough, 2006
Description	Routinely utilize external sources to fuel the business model and unused ideas are allowed to flow outside to others' business models. The company becomes a system integrator of internal and external technologies
Real life examples	Procter & Gamble
Related labels	Open Business Model (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014)

Table 8: Business model configuration with business model scalability attributes (continued)

Adaptive	
Named by	Chesbrough, 2006
Description	Create an “ecosystem” by establishing its technologies as the basis for a platform of innovation for the value chain and benefit from the investments of other in the platform
Real life examples	Apple Iphone
Related labels	
Value chain service provider	
Named by	Timmers, 1998
Description	Specialize on a specific function for the value chain, such as electronic payments or logistics, with the intention to make that into their distinct competitive advantage.
Real life examples	Shipping- and freight companies
Related labels	Layer player (Gassmann <i>et al.</i> , 2014); Reliable commodity operations (Linder and Cantrell, 2000), Service-wrapped commodity (Linder and Cantrell, 2000)
Value chain coordinator	
Named by	Taran <i>et al.</i> 2015
Description	Provide transaction coordination services and optimization of the communicational and organizational workflows for all parties involved in the same value chain
Real life examples	Celarix, PrintConnect.com
Related labels	Value net integrator (Weill & Vitale, 2001), Value chain integrators (Timmers, 1998), Transaction service and exchange intermediation (Linder and Cantrell, 2000)
Collaboration platforms	
Named by	Timmers, 1998
Description	Provide a platform (a tool kit and an information environment) for collaboration between enterprises
Real life examples	Podio
Related labels	Shared IT infrastructure (Weill and Vitale, 2001)
Brokerage	
Named by	Johnson, 2010
Description	Bring together buyers and sellers and facilitate transactions
Real life examples	Saxo Bank, stock exchanges
Related labels	Information brokerage, trust and other services (Timmers, 1998), Intermediary (Weill and Vitale, 2001), Affiliate model (Rappa, 2001); Brokerage model (Rappa, 2001), Open market making (Linder and Cantrell, 2000), Exclusive market making (Linder and Cantrell, 2000)
Infomediary	
Named by	Rappa, 2001
Description	Collect or/and produce information for other in regards to market information, products, producers and consumers
Real life examples	Edmund
Related labels	
Multi-sided platforms	
Named by	Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010
Description	Multi-sided platforms create value by facilitating interactions between two or more distinct but interdependent groups of customers
Real life examples	Nintendo, GOOGLE, VISA

Table 8: Business model configuration with business model scalability attributes (continued)
(inspired by Taran *et al.* 2016)

The analysis of the configurations in patterns one to five led to a set of common attributes that could be mobilized in relation to attaining exponentially increasing returns to scale. Using the language provided by the Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010), the business model configurations presented here have a tendency to concentrate around the building blocks on the left-hand side of the Business Model Canvas, also denoted the back-end of the business model (Günzel and Holm 2013) or the value configuration (Osterwalder *et al.* 2004). These building blocks relate to Strategic Partners, Activities, Resources, Cost Structure and are connected to the Value Proposition.

This analysis of already recognized configurations in the present business model literature illustrates that while the notions of creating platform-based business models with exponentially increasing returns to scale is quite widespread, there is much more scarcity according to the three other proposed dimensions. These listed configurations offer to the reader the possibility of finding inspiration. However, in order to come to terms with analysing the business models of their own companies, managers might need an additional framework from which to start their analysis. This is provided in the roadmap below.

A roadmap for achieving business model scalability

The five scalability patterns above illustrate how companies have been able to innovate and concurrently re-model their business model attributes. While these attributes would commonly have led to declining, constant or at best linear increasing returns to scale, in the instances described in this manuscript, novel ways of configuring the business model led to exponentially increasing returns to scale. It is evident that achieving exponentially increasing returns to scale requires thinking in terms of value propositions between and among the stakeholders and partners involved in the immediate business ecosystem of the company, also denoted the focal firm. This is because aligning and leveraging the competences and motivations of strategic partners has primary effects relating to smoother cooperation, but also important secondary effects relating to greater trust, higher loyalty and lock-in of such relationships.

Using the language provided by the Business Model Canvas (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010), the five patterns presented above clearly focus on rejuvenating the building blocks relating to the value configuration part of the canvas (Osterwalder *et al.* 2004). These building blocks relate to engaging strategic partners, identifying relevant activities and necessary resources, observing cost structure mechanisms and the value proposition towards customers. Instead of stomping down the habitual road of analyzing cost structures, product segment profitability and market-segment growth, managers should follow the roadmap below which outlines three steps towards achieving business model scalability.

Our suggestion is that the company to go through these three stages in three management meetings with 1-2 weeks in between. The meetings need not be longer than 90 minutes each to foster brainstorming and discussion on identifying whether there are novel ways to tweak the existing business model.

STEP 1: Identify potential strategic partners

Scalability typically connects strategic partners to the value proposition being offered either through activity-sharing or resource-sharing. Remembering that achieving scalability requires thinking beyond the scope of merely sharing costs, executives need to ask their management team the following questions:

1. Are there potential strategic partners that could perform activities in our business model cheaper while providing a higher value proposition to our customers at the same price?
2. Are there potential strategic partners that could provide resources in our business model at a cheaper price while providing a higher value proposition to our customers at the same price?

Take one question at a time. First, give the individuals time to contemplate by themselves, typically 4-6 minutes, before pairing them. In pairs, ask them to create a top-3 list of the most potent ideas they have generated between them. This should take 6-10 minutes. These ideas are then shared with the whole team on a whiteboard or flipover, being presented in 30-60 seconds by the person who did not bring it to the table. Repeat this scenario for question two. The answers to these two

questions provide indications of which aspects of the business model that are prone to innovation. Finish off by prioritizing all of the suggestions, for example through a dotmocracy vote (see Osterwalder *et al.* 2014) if it is difficult to reach agreement. This may be advanced by making a vote “with the brain” and a vote “with the heart” to make sure the radical ideas also receive attention.

STEP 2: Questions that unlock scalability

This second step is designed to induce greater detail about how to reconfigure the business model of the firm at hand. This can be achieved by asking a series of questions listed below. We suggest to have the management team prepare thoughts about the questions in advance. Divide the questions among teams of 2-3 and ask each group to come up with minimum two ideas per question. Each idea should be presented in 1-2 minutes, for example according to the following structure, containable within one PowerPoint slide that can be printed in A3 in advance:

- The title and basic catch-phrase of the idea
- How does it challenge our existing way of thinking business?
- What would we need to do differently?
- Who (which other company) excels at this?
- What is the key connection(s) in this business model?
- Explain how it achieves scalability

Unlocking-scalability questions:

1. Are there potential strategic partners that can offer features that enrich the existing value proposition to our customers (for free), while receiving value back themselves?
2. Are there alternative ways of generating revenue?

3. Are there alternative configurations that free the business model of existing capacity constraints?
4. Is it possible to change the business model to a platform for other businesses to buy in to?
5. Is it possible to change the role of existing stakeholders and utilize them in simultaneous roles in the business model?
6. Who would pay for either access to our customer-base or knowledge about our customers and their characteristics?
7. How strong are the “hard to copy” and “time to copy” attributes of our current value proposition towards customers?
8. Which mechanisms are in place to create lock-in of our customers?
9. How agile is our company towards threats from new entrants or new technologies and quickly would we be able to readjust?

When all of the ideas have been presented, it is important to create an overview of them, for example by hanging the printed A3's on the wall, and facilitate a discussion that helps to identify ambitious and realistic possibilities for example by prioritizing them. It may also be necessary to divide out follow-up assignments relating to further reality checks, before the most applicable options are taken into the next step.

STEP 3: Analyze the scalability attributes

Finally, step 3 of this roadmap to scalability is to analyze the attributes of each of the possibilities the company has identified and prioritized in steps 1 and 2 according to the table below. Start by placing the option in the quadrant it is most likely to be situated. Discuss then how to configure this option so that it gains in exponentiality on the one hand, and on the other how it can be configured to increase the returns to scale in its application.

Concluding remarks

Following Osterwalder and Pigneur's (2010) Business Model Canvas, business models can be based on many different value propositions towards customers. While some business models allow for economies of scale, others are based on economies of scope and differentiation. Hence, in returning to the concept of scalability in the context of business models this article illustrates that scalability comes in varying degrees. Achieving sweet-spot business models is typically connected with the ability of leveraging exponentially increasing returns to scale. The many examples applied in this study illustrate the difference between ordinary and novel implementations. The point here is that the devil lies in the detail and in choosing the most intelligent manner of configuring the business model.

Despite the study identifying several business model configurations in table 7 holding promise for sweet-spot business models, and identifying a number of novel business models, from which four dimensions of exponential returns to scale were identifiable, our research indicates that this does not constitute an explicit enough process for managers to follow. Accordingly, a roadmap to be used to structure the managers' business model innovation process was suggested.

To conclude this article, scalable business models have the following characteristics:

- The business potential is characterized by exponentially increasing returns to scale
- They remove themselves from otherwise typical capacity constraints of that type of business
- Partners enrich the value proposition without hurting profits
- Stakeholders take multiple roles and create value for one another
- The business model becomes a platform that attracts new partners, including competitors

Furthermore, the discussion led to the identification of the two criteria:

- Agile and flexible businesses both in growth and decline
- Hard to copy value propositions or ones that take a long time to replicate

Working with this roadmap for business model scalability is relevant for entrepreneurs who are in the process of starting up companies and developing business models from scratch as well as business managers concerned with innovating, rejuvenating and re-modelling their businesses. The ideas put forth here are also important for potential investors to understand when analysing businesses. Finally, these aspects are highly relevant for policy-makers because they relate to the support mechanisms for entrepreneurial activities and support activities for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) both on national and supra-national levels.

While a lot of the recent research relating to business model innovation tends to focus on the alignment of value propositions and customer needs (cf. Osterwalder *et al.* 2014) or the organizational effects of business model innovation (Foss and Saebi 2015), we found the topic of business model scalability to be more concerned with achieving configuration alignment between the value proposition and strategic partners. In this analysis costs were found to be either associated with activities or resources. As such, this research indicates that the notions of cost structures were actually irrelevant as a stand-alone building block in the business model. This would imply that future discussions about the financial aspects of business models are focused on *revenue models* and not profit models, as for example suggested by Zott *et al.* (2011).

Looking towards future perspectives, three of the dimensions identified as gateways to scalable business models (enriching value propositions, removing capacity constraints and changing the role of stakeholders) were found to a lesser extent in the literature on business model configurations. Hence, research ought to focus on uncovering new configurations with these characteristics. Using the approach generated in this paper might be difficult for managers. This can be overcome by introducing better guidance, for example through the use of analogies, metaphors or storytelling. Finally, this article suggests that the notion of scalability would be an important dimension of a yet to see sound business model archetypes scheme (Massa and Tucci, 2013; Taran *et al.*, 2016).

References

- Basu, S. (2008). Returns to scale measurement, *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition.
- Boden, T. (2004). The grid enterprise—structuring the agile business of the future. *BT technology journal*, 22(1), 107-117.
- Bondi, André B. (2000). "Proceedings of the second international workshop on Software and performance - WOSP '00". p. 195. doi:10.1145/350391.350432
- Chandler, A. D., Hikino, T., & Chandler, A. D. (2009). *Scale and scope: The dynamics of industrial capitalism*. Harvard University Press.
- Chesbrough, H. (2006). *Open business models. How to thrive in the new innovation landscape*, Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Christopher, M., & Towill, D. (2001). An integrated model for the design of agile supply chains. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 31(4), 235-246.
- Foss, N.J. and T. Saebi (2015). *Business Model Innovation: The Organizational Dimension*. Oxford University Press.
- Gassmann, H., Frankenberger, K., and Csik, M. (2014). *The Business Model Navigator: 55 Models That Will Revolutionise Your Business*. FT Press.
- Gelles, G.M.; Mitchell, D.W. (1996). "Returns to scale and economies of scale: Further observations". *Journal of Economic Education*, 27 (3): 259-261.
- Greiner, L. E. (1972), reprinted in 1997. Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. 1972. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(3), 55-60.
- Groth, P. & C. Nielsen (2015), Business Model Taxonomies: Using statistical tools to generate valid and reliable business model taxonomies, *Journal of Business Models*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 4-21.
- Günzel, F., & Holm, A. B. (2013). One Size Does Not Fit All—Understanding The Front-End And Back-End Of Business Model Innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 17(01).
- Johnson, M.W. (2010). *Seizing the white space: Business model innovation for growth and renewal*, Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Lambert, C. (2015). The importance of classification to business model research, *Journal of Business Models*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 49-61.
- Linder, J. and Cantrell, S. (2000). Changing business models: Surfing the landscape, Accenture Institute for Strategic Change, Canada.
- Lukka, K. (2005). Approaches to case research in management accounting: the nature of empirical intervention and theory linkage. *Accounting in Scandinavia—The Northern Lights*, Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press, Kristianstad, SW, 375-99.

- Lund, M. (2014). *Capturing the business model narrative: Designing business models with narratives*, Ph.D. dissertation, Aalborg University.
- Massa, L and Tucci, C.L. (2014). Business model innovation. In M. Dodgson, D.M. Gann, and N. Phillips (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of innovation management*, Oxford University Press, UK.
- Milgrom, P. and Roberts, J. (1990). The Economics of Modern Manufacturing Technology, Strategy, and Organization, *American Economic Review*, 80(3): 511-28.
- Milgrom, P. R. and Roberts, J. (1995). Complementarities and Fit: Strategy, Structure, and Organizational Change in Manufacturing, *Journal of Accounting & Economics*, 19: 179-208.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Nielsen, C. & M. Lund (2018), Building Scalable Business Models, Accepted and forthcoming in *Sloan Management Review*
- Nielsen, C., & Dane-Nielsen, H. (2010). The emergent properties of intellectual capital: a conceptual offering. *Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting*, 14(1), 6-27.
- Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., and Tucci, L.C. (2004). Clarifying business models: Origins, present, and future of the concept, *Communications of AIS*, 6, 1-25.
- Osterwalder, A., and Pigneur, Y. (2010). *Business model generation. A handbook for visionaries, game changers and challengers*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons.
- Osterwalder, A., Y. Pigneur, G. Bernarda & A. Smith. (2014). *Value Proposition Design*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Rappa, M. (2001). Managing the digital enterprise - business models on the web, North Carolina State University. <http://digitalenterprise.org/models/models.html> [accessed June 2004].
- Taran, Y., Nielsen, C., Thomsen, P., Montemari, M. and Paolone, F. (2015). Business Model Configurations: A Tool to Map Out Potential Innovation Routes. Working paper, Aalborg University.
- Timmers, P. (1998). Business models for electronic markets, *Journal on Electronic Markets*, 8(2), 3-8.
- Wasserman, N. (2006). Rich Versus King: The Entrepreneur's Dilemma. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2006, No. 1, pp. 001-006). Academy of Management.
- Weill, P. and Vitale, M.R. (2001). *Place to Space*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage publications.
- Zott, C., R. Amit and L. Massa (2011) The Business Model: Recent Development and Future Research, *Journal of Management* 37, 4, pp. 1019-1042.
- Zott, C., & Amit, R. (2013). The business model: A theoretically anchored robust construct for strategic analysis. *Strategic Organization*, 11(4), 403-411.

About the Authors

Morten Lund is Associate Professor and Center Director at Business Model Design Center. Morten is an experienced entrepreneur and executive manager, who founded, consulted and invested in multiple ventures with disruptive business models. Morten co-founded the Business Design Center with Christian Nielsen. He has a combined academic, pragmatic, and creative profile, leveraging the link between research and industry. His educational background is an MSc. in Business Economics, with specialization in organization and business strategy. Further, he holds a Ph.D. degree in Business models from the Technical Faculty at Aalborg University, Denmark.



Christian Nielsen, PhD, is Professor at Aalborg University in Denmark. He is the Head of the Department Business and Management at Aalborg University. Christian has previously worked as an equity strategist and macro economist focusing specially on integrating Intellectual Capital and ESG factors into business model valuations. His PhD dissertation from 2005 won the Emerald/EFMD Annual Outstanding Doctoral Research Award, and in 2011 he received the Emerald Literati Network Outstanding Reviewer Award. Christian Nielsen has a substantial number of international publications to his record and his research interests concern analyzing, evaluating and measuring the performance of business models. Public profile available on <http://www.linkedin.com/in/christianhnielsen> and <http://personprofil.aau.dk/profil/115869#>

