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Evenzo is a service which claims to ease the hassle of venue acquisition for people who are having events. This is not a new service, as there are larger organizations dedicated to this such as Peerspace, EVENTup, and Venuefinder. They claim to offer a 10-15 minute time from search until a confirmed booking. In addition, they claim to offer a 30% discount for bookings. 24/7 support is also promised.

If their claims are all true, their service would certainly add convenience to the process of obtaining a venue. Their negotiated 30% discount assists the customer in cost reduction, and their promised support reduces risk.

The problem that they are presenting is fairly simple. They suggest that finding venues is difficult and time consuming. In order to remedy this, their service connects people to venues. This is not problem of incredible importance, but it is a valid concern for people who are event planning. However, the most detracting issue is that it is not an original service and does not necessarily offer value that the other services do not. In their value proposition, they don’t mention competing platforms and therefore can’t show why they are a better choice. In addition, they don’t mention how they will be profiting from their service and it is not immediately inferable.

SecurityAct is a product offered to people seeking better way to secure an area from photographs and video recording, as an alternative to confiscating cell phones. As opposed to tackling this through software means, the product is a sticker placed over the device’s cameras with circuitry which will alert a central authority if it is removed.

This reduces the risk in secure areas of photographs being taken and information leaked. In addition, it enhances the convenience of maintaining security by not confiscating cell phones, reducing the risk of them going missing or dissuading people from attending.

SecurityAct has a clear potential market and presents their product as a solution to an existing problem, for which there aren’t any real alternatives.

Federov aims to attach their equipment to containers of food to improve the tracking of freshness. This is intended to allow better food distribution and enhance the lives of consumers.

While this will increase the costs of packaging for food, it could aid in the reduction of risks and costs from food spoilage.

While their sales trailer addresses the position of the consumer, this is a technology that would be implemented from the supplier’s side. They claim that it could be connected to smart refrigerators and smartphones. Unfortunately, they don’t go into much detail the specific problem that they are trying to solve. They present several problems. These include forgetting to add food to the shopping list, food spoilage, containers being nearly empty when making a shopping list, and the hassle of grocery shopping.

They also make the assertion that their technology could detect a true expiration date of foods, rather than forcing people to trust or distrust the printed date. Problematic is the fact that they do not go into detail about how the technology could work and how it will be connected to other devices, creating the impression that they are plugging an idea for a technology rather than the technology itself.

Blazing Shield is a service which doesn’t seem very focused. It claims to be a security service and also a web hosting service with a substantial Distributed Denial of Service (DDOS) filter. This appears to be a direct competitor to services such as Cloudflare. This is interesting because Blazing Shield claims to have the largest DDOS mitigation capacity in Europe at 2. 5TB/s while Cloudflare claims their network can handle 10TB/s. Either Blazing Shield is unaware of their competition’s abilities, or they are overstating their own.

This service doesn’t necessarily offer any advantages over its competition, although an additional service in the market will work to drive prices down for everyone.

Their sales trailer does not explain why they are superior to other options, and only gives a very small amount of information about the product. It could use a lot of improvement.

Security4Things aims to facilitate people to protect their property using low-power transceivers with the ability to track property as an alternative to using cell networks and GPS. The use of electronics with a much lower power requirement has the benefit of vastly increased battery life.

The increase in the battery life of the object tracker greatly increases convenience and peace of mind for the user. In addition, not using GPS and cell networks decreases the cost to the end user.

They present the benefit of this technology with a hypothetical example of a bicycle being stolen. Their presentation has a few obvious flaws. First, their device can only work in “ protected areas” equipped with technology compatible with theirs. This is not very helpful in the case of a bicycle, as for most people the only “ protected area” might be where they live. Lastly, they present a way to recover the bicycle. Their suggestion is that you would mark your bicycle as being stolen, and the community would work to find it. Crowdsourcing security is a concerning idea, and would warrant an analysis of how well it would work rather than assuming people would work hard to find numbers of stolen bicycles.