



Assessing the potential for crowdfunding and other forms of alternative finance to support research and innovation

Final Report

Executive Summary



January – 2017

EUR 2016.7789 EN

Research and
Innovation

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation
Directorate B — Open Innovation and Open Science
Unit B.3 — SMEs, Financial Instruments and State Aid
Contact: Steve Rogers

E-mail: Steve.rogers@ec.europa.eu
RTD-PUBLICATIONS@ec.europa.eu

*European Commission
B-1049 Brussels*

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Assessing the potential for crowdfunding and other forms of alternative finance to support research and innovation

Final Report

Executive Summary

EY

Open Evidence

Politecnico di Milano

European Crowdfunding Network

EUROPEAN COMMISSION

***EUROPE DIRECT is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union***

Freephone number (*):
00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you)

LEGAL NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

More information on the European Union is available on the internet (<http://europa.eu>).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017.

PDF

ISBN 978-92-79-64118-3

doi: 10.2777/02005

KI-07-16-099-EN-N

© European Union, 2017.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Table of Contents

List of acronyms4

Acknowledgements.....5

Abstract.....6

1. Purpose and context of the study7

2. Scope and methodology7

 Methodology7

 Scope of the study.....8

3. Key findings.....8

 The role of alternative finance for R&I8

 Platforms and their business models.....9

 Fundraisers.....9

 Investors.....10

 Ecosystem and future trends11

4. Conclusions and recommendations.....11

Bibliography14

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AF	Alternative Finance
AF RI	Alternative Finance for Research and Innovation
AoN	All or Nothing
BA	Business Angels
COSME	EU programme for Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-sized Enterprises
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
FG	Focus Group
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
MOOC	Massive Open Online Course
P2P	Peer-to-peer
R&D	Research & Development
R&I	Research & Innovation
SMEs	Small and medium-sized enterprises
VCs	Venture Capitalists

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Disclaimer: The information and views set out in this study report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this study. Neither the Commission nor any person acting on the Commission's behalf may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein.

The study was led by Open Evidence together with EY, the European Crowdfunding Network (ECN) and Politecnico di Milano (POLIMI).

Authors

Katarzyna Jakimowicz - Open Evidence

David Osimo - Open Evidence

Claudia Gallo - EY

Giulia Pappalepore - EY

Conny Weber - ECN

Project team:

Enrico Coletta - EY

Claudia Mastrapasqua - EY

Chiara Franzoni - POLIMI

Cristina Rossi - POLIMI

Vincenzo Buttice - POLIMI

Olivier Gajda - ECN

Francisco Lupianez-Villanueva - Open Evidence

Pietro Tornese - Open Evidence

Ilaria Vigo - Open Evidence

Federica Porcu - Open Evidence

Marcello Verona - Open Evidence

Stevan Randjelovic - Open Evidence

Acknowledgements

The study team would like to thank all the stakeholders of the wider crowdfunding ecosystem (investors, platforms, fundraisers, policy makers, national regulators and broader innovation ecosystem players) that have contributed to the research by taking part in surveys, interviews, focus groups and the final European Policy Workshop.

In particular, we would like to express special acknowledgment to the crowdfunding platforms that shared their data for the platform data analysis: Invesdor, CrowdCube, OnePlanetCrowd and Ulule, as well as to the organisers of the Innovative Enterprise, ECN Crowd Camp, Crowd Dialogue and SME instrument Innovators Summit for collaborating in the organisation of the focus groups.

ABSTRACT

This report provides an assessment of whether alternative finance has the potential to help Europe address the problem of access to finance for innovative companies and bridge the gap in terms of access to risk capital, and if EU action is needed to support development of the sector. To this aim, the study produced the following results: 1) an estimation of the size of the alternative market for research and innovation, together with a typology of sectors and of alternative finance funding models suitable for research vs. innovation; 2) an analysis of the European alternative finance landscape for research and innovation; 3) an analysis of the challenges limiting development of the alternative finance, and alternative finance for research and innovation in particular; 4) an assessment of policy options addressing those challenges; 5) a final recommendation of priority action at EU and national level to exploit the opportunities of alternative finance for research and innovation.

1. PURPOSE AND CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Access to finance is one of the main challenges for European companies, in particular those that are smaller, younger and more innovative (European Commission, 2015h).¹ Studies show that the total Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (SME) financing gaps for European countries are three to five times bigger than for the US (Silanes et al., 2015). At the same time, innovative companies face more limited access to business angel (BA) capital (EBAN, 2014) and venture capital than their US counterparts. In this context, alternative finance (AF) can play an important role in helping to fund innovative companies in their early growth and scale-up phase (Filippov and Hofheinz, 2016). Alternative finance in Europe is growing fast, but its size is still small compared to other world regions. The total value of the European AF market was estimated between EUR 4.2 billion (Crowdsurfer-EY, 2015) and EUR 5.4 billion (Cambridge-KPMG, 2016) in 2015 - around one fourth of the US alternative finance market and 18 times the cumulative value of the Asian and Chinese AF market (Cambridge-KPMG, 2016) report. It is growing more slowly than these regions and its pace of growth is slowing down, whilst others are accelerating. The Peer-to-peer (P2P) lending model is the dominant AF model in Europe (72% of the alternative finance EU market in 2015), however, the equity model registers the most rapid growth, and its importance is mostly attributed to innovative companies.

Within the growing phenomenon of AF, it is still unclear how much funding is going to research and innovation (R&I). This study aims to deliver a holistic picture on the potential of alternative finance to improve access to risk finance for research and innovative ventures in the EU, together with the assessment of the need for EU policy action in support of AF for R&I. It is structured along three main objectives that cover a long list of research questions (as included in the Annex):

- 1) To quantify and qualify the potential of alternative finance in Europe with regard to research and innovation;
- 2) To identify key challenges influencing the development of AF, and AF for research and innovation in particular;
- 3) To recommend actions to overcome those challenges and to exploit the opportunities of AF for R&I.

This study is unique in terms of scope, as it concentrates on R&I only, so that the analysis and policy recommendations focus on the specific aspects relevant for R&I funding by default. Nevertheless, in many instances, it touches upon general AF trends, where they are relevant.

2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

Methodology

The study adopted multiple methods with the aim of cross-analysing results from different sources, and reaching out to a variety of stakeholders, in line with the Better Regulation approach. It is important to highlight the innovative nature of the study itself. At the core of the study lies the **platform data analysis**, a unique methodological approach developed by the Politecnico di Milano, based on the computerised content analysis of the project descriptions. In total, the 10 platforms that were analysed² included 263,781 projects that were launched between 2009 to 2016 by fundraisers located in 161 countries and using six languages.

Other methods employed by the study include:

- Desk research - over 260 literature sources have been used in the study; the study team performed an analysis of over 550 AF platforms, in order to create the final database of 232 European AF platforms with an R&I scope;
- Surveys - 55 responses received by a survey of platforms and 45 responses through a survey of users (fundraisers and potential fundraisers);
- Interviews - 60 interviews have been performed with AF stakeholders: investors, policy makers, regulators, fundraisers, AF platforms and eco-system players;
- Case studies - 10 detailed cases were performed (eight on AF projects & two on AF platforms);
- Focus Groups (FG) - four FGs were organised, structured around investors, platforms, fundraisers, and eco-system players;

¹ According to the recent ECB SAFE Survey: October- March 2016, 10% of SMEs declared it as an issue.

² Crowdcube (UK), DavinciCrowd (FR), Futsci (UK), Goteo (ES), Invesdor (FI), Kickstarter (US), OnePlanetCrowd (NL), RocketHub (US), Ulele (FR), Derev (IT)

- Country fiches - 43 country fiches were prepared³, focusing on the snapshot of the AF market, and AF for R&I in particular;
- A website presenting country fiches and a database of AF platforms with an R&I scope was created;
- Extensive online stakeholder engagement was delivered throughout the study, through the website crowdfunding4innovation.eu and social media presence.

Finally, the findings of the study were further validated through the final European Policy Workshop (26 participants).

Scope of the study

The study focused on projects whose main aim is 1) scientific research, 2) initiatives aimed at generating products and services that address new and unsatisfied market needs, and 3) initiatives aimed at satisfying existing market needs by adopting novel combinations of services, methods and technologies, including organisational and social innovation. Thus, the study excluded from the analysis all of the AF initiatives a) directed at artistic or cultural endeavours; b) which do not entail a sufficiently creative or innovation aspect; c) initiatives of personal causes and d) funding whose primary benefit is individual-specific.

For the purpose of the study, the definition of research in accordance with the Frascati Manual (OECD, 2002) was adopted. Research and Development (R&D) is defined as: "*creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications*". With regard to innovation, according to the OECD Oslo Manual (OECD, 2005), innovation is defined as the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organisational method in business practices, workplace organisation or external relations.

The study covers all kinds of AF funding models based on the common taxonomy used by both (Cambridge-EY, 2015) and (Crowdsurfer-EY, 2015) report: Peer-to-peer consumer lending, P2P business lending, equity-based crowdfunding, rewards-based crowdfunding, donation-based crowdfunding, mini-bonds and invoice trading. However, not all methods cover all of these instruments. Platform data analysis has only been applied to instruments that, according to the literature, are most relevant for R&I, such as equity, rewards and donation-based crowdfunding. Mini-bonds and invoice trading have not been included in the data gathering because of their limited potential for R&I, according to the exploratory interviews and literature review.

3. KEY FINDINGS

The role of alternative finance for R&I

The estimated aggregated value of AF investment in R&I in the EU was approximately EUR 755.1 million in 2015, which constitutes between 1/6 and 1/8 of the total value of the European alternative finance market⁴. AF plays a significant role in funding European R&I, especially when compared to the Horizon 2020 budget of approximately EUR 10 billion annually. However, whilst considering the strong difference in size and growth rate of AF between Europe and the rest of the world,⁵ it is clear that European innovators are not benefiting from AF to the same extent as their competitors from other regions of the world. The development of AF is very unbalanced between Member States, and AF for R&I follows the same trend (81% of the volume is represented by the UK and 78.1% of the R&I projects are based in the UK). Moreover, AF for R&I remains mostly domestic (70% of the platforms indicated that the percentage of funding coming from a different country is less than 20%) and less than 10% of cross-border activity happens between EU countries (Crowdsurfer-EY, 2015).

Looking at the different types of R&I, it appears that AF is more suitable for:

³ 28 EU Member State; each country associated with COSME; each country associated with Horizon 2020; Switzerland, Ukraine, US and China.

⁴ Depending on the AF market estimations used.

⁵ While analysing non-EU data is beyond the scope of this project, our platform data analysis report "innovation intensity" rates at global level in line with the EU average, if not slightly superior.

- 1) Later stages of the innovation cycle, when the results are easier to anticipate and evaluate by the “crowd” (according to the study results, there are on average 3 times more innovation-oriented projects than research-oriented projects),
- 2) Innovation related to the improvement of life-conditions (energy, environment, food, health),
- 3) Less capital-intensive initiatives (e.g. not for nanotechnology and research in space).

Moreover, there is a clear distinction between funding models for research vs. innovation. Donation and rewards-based funding models are mostly suitable for basic research, whilst equity and in part lending and reward, are useful for later stages of the innovation cycle, closer to market. Finally, projects funded by equity and lending platforms are bigger than those funded by rewards and donation, thus innovation AF campaigns are bigger than those focused on research. R&I projects (regardless of the platform) raise, on average, more funds than other projects but have lower success rates

Platforms and their business models

The AF market is highly competitive, with a clear advantage for the first-comers. Although the number of active platforms has been growing over the years, the number of platforms founded in a specific year has been steadily decreasing since 2014. The majority of AF R&I platforms are autonomous, profit-oriented companies (73% of surveyed platforms). Yet most of the platforms are relatively small with a turnover below EUR 500 thousand (78% of surveyed platforms) and, in particular, research oriented platforms have a problem in finding a sustainable business model.

An analysis of the database of relevant AF platforms revealed that there are, on average, two times more generic platforms than strictly R&I-oriented platforms. This is not surprising, taking into consideration the basic business model of AF platforms, which is based on the success fees charged to fundraisers and investors as a percentage of the sum gathered or invested (usually 5-10%). Most of the platforms do not charge any fee unless the project is successful. The broader the range of the platform, the stronger the ability to attract more projects and investors. Key success factors of AF platforms include a reliable network of fundraisers and investors, offering different AF models, and offering at least some form of mentorship for fundraisers. Thus, there’s a growing importance of the hybrid funding model (over 20% of all AF R&I platforms) as a way to accommodate the needs of diverse projects. Similarly, the “All-or-nothing” (AoN) funding model dominates (73% of surveyed platforms), being perceived as safer by investors (Oxera, 2015).

Another key success factor mentioned is the national/ international recognition of a platform. The latter is specifically important in the context of cross-border operations, perceived by platforms as a natural way to scale-up. However, regulatory fragmentation at EU level and the existence of different regulatory regimes amongst different countries are named as the main obstacles in cross-border operations. So far, nine countries introduced their own bespoke AF regimes (Austria, Spain, France, UK, Italy, Germany, Portugal, and most recently Finland and Lithuania).

Concerning platforms specialising strictly in R&I, the majority of the AF platforms adopt equity funding models (over 50%) followed by hybrid funding models (24% of platforms). The major distinctive categories of R&I-oriented platforms include: renewable energy and energy efficiency (32.5%); innovation, start-ups and SMEs (32.5%); health & life sciences (12.5%).

Project feasibility and economic impact are the main factors taken into account by platforms when selecting R&I projects. R&I-oriented platforms perform a pre-quality check of projects before listing them (usually through a scientific or advisory board, and according to a set of quality criteria), although there is no standard approach (it differs between platforms, funding models, area and degree of specialisation of AF platforms).

Key challenges of AF platforms

- Platform specific: profitable business model, network for crowd engagement, managing return expectations of investors, transparency around investors, crowd liquidity, gaining the trust of investors.
- Country specific: development of AF platforms is correlated with the maturity of alternative finance market, availability of AF, cultural readiness and the existence of support measures, as well as lack of impediments.
- Cross-border: regulatory fragmentation at EU level and the existence of different regulatory regimes amongst countries.

Fundraisers

Individual innovators and entrepreneurs (around 45-55%) along with SMEs are the main beneficiaries of alternative finance and AF for R&I. The uptake by universities is still very limited in scope. According to interviewees, they are neither aware of AF, nor too eager to experiment with it.

The main drivers for using alternative finance by fundraisers are the same for overall AF and AF for R&I: easier access to finance; validation of the product's market potential; and the use of AF platforms as marketing tools/ communication channels, and as a way to create a network of contacts and partnerships. Other drivers mentioned by fundraisers include personal interests and raising awareness of the project-specific cause.

The key success factors of the AF campaign are attributed to the strength of the communication strategy: depth of project description, frequency of project updates, provision of attractive video material and graphical visuals. For research projects, the credibility of the researchers behind the project is crucial.

The project related factors follow: size of the pledging goal, and duration of funding period. Finally, the choice of the appropriate platform, one with experience and a good reputation, as well as the adequate funding model, are particularly important for fundraisers.

Conversely, a key barrier for fundraisers is the lack of specific skills, such as creation of a business plan, communication experience, lack of know-how on relevant AF models and their suitability for different AF projects, and a lack of resources (time and financial). These factors might be attributed to a general perception that AF is more complex and requires higher level of expertise. Finally, the doubts about the credibility of a platform and the transparency of a platform's operations prevent fundraisers from using alternative finance.

Key barriers for fundraisers

- Fundraiser-related: lack of specific skills (creation of a business plan, development of appealing communication), lack of awareness of AF and its specific models, lack of resources.
- Platform-related: credibility of platforms, transparency of a platform's operations.
- Project-related barriers: complexity of acquiring AF as compared to other financing options, disclosure/ Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues.
- Ecosystem-related: lack of sufficient integration of AF into financing pipeline.

Investors

The role of institutional investors remains limited when it comes to AF for R&I. Institutions were responsible for only 24% of peer-to-peer business lending investments, and only 8% of the investment on equity-based crowdfunding came from institutional investors in 2015 (Cambridge-KPMG, 2016). Similarly, surveyed platforms declared that, on average, 5% of investors are institutional investors and more than half of platforms reported not having institutional investors registered at all. Professional investors use AF platforms to test the market potential of projects (so called "proof of concept") before placing higher investments outside AF platforms in order to avoid platform fees.

Although investments through AF platforms are driven by expected higher financial returns, this is not the only motivation. Factors such as the diversification of an investment portfolio (investing small amounts in a larger number of projects) and risk sharing, due diligence and validation of the project by the market, play an equally important role. Moreover, a distinguishing feature of investments in AF projects is that they are driven by emotion and personal motivations (understood as the personal direct interest in the topic and philanthropic motivations). It is important to note that investors using equity and lending AF models, thus investing in innovations, are more driven by financial motivations. Those investing in rewards and donation-based crowdfunding are more purpose-driven, and are therefore more prone to invest in basic research.

Other than personal motivations and financial returns, investors take into consideration the size and scope of project, R&I stage of the project, team composition and the effectiveness of the platform, whilst deciding to invest in a specific AF project. Moreover, as far as equity and lending AF is concerned, investors prefer investments on local AF platforms, as different alternative finance regimes make investing cross-border riskier in terms of market knowledge, legal costs and complexity of the liability proceedings.

Overall, the transparency of a platform's operations is considered as a priority area for improvement.

Key barriers for investors

- Ecosystem-related risks: reliability of AF as a form of investment and lack of regulation.
- Project-related risks: financial aspects of projects, lack of collaterals, general liquidity of the market.
- Fundraiser-related risks: lack of expertise and management skills.
- Investor-related risk: no real understanding of the potential of the product raising money
- Platform-related risk: asymmetry of information, manipulation of credit scoring, and inappropriate due diligence checks.
- Exogenous factors: new market players, negative condition of the economy, regulatory changes.

Ecosystem and future trends

Alternative finance is perceived as a supplementary, rather than alternative, source to other forms of financing for R&I (about 63% of fundraisers tried to get funding from other sources before or during AF; 50% did so after AF). Investors and platforms mention a leverage effect for AF. Notably, obtaining initial funding through an AF platform attracts further investments from professional investors, business angels and institutions that follow the “crowd”. AF is considered as a way to bridge the equity gap that can be observed at the seed stage. However, it is also seen by some as a way to further promote the development, commercialisation and growth of innovation-oriented projects.

Nowadays, AF platforms with an R&I scope collaborate mainly with accelerators and incubators for project sourcing (48% of surveyed platforms), business angels (30%) and banks (29%). There is a growing consolidation and institutionalisation of the AF sector – 48% of P2P consumer lending platforms, 22% of P2P business lending and equity crowdfunding indicated at least some level of institutional ownership (Cambridge-KPMG, 2016). Indeed, incumbent players, such as banks; venture capitalists (VCs) and business angels channel their investments through AF platforms, either by developing collaborations with existing platforms, or by setting up / acquiring own platforms. Nevertheless, there is a need for the further development of sustainable links between ecosystem players.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Policy options address the challenges of each of the four dimensions: platforms, investors, fundraisers and ecosystem. There are four layers of potential policy actions: 1) EU action in support of alternative finance in general; 2) actions in support of alternative finance for research and innovation (AF RI); 3) actions for AF for innovation only, and 4) actions for AF for research.

To further develop alternative finance for research and innovation, there is the need to address the underlying issues for alternative finance in Europe as a whole. Furthermore, whilst most of the policy measures are equally relevant for both research and innovation, AF for research would benefit more from additional tailor-made support or science-specific measures due to higher barriers and underdevelopment of the alternative finance market in that respect.⁶ Table 1 summarises the final recommended actions.

Table 1 Final policy recommendations

Policy recommendation	Description
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations in support of Alternative Finance in general
Facilitating the clarity of cross-border operations for AF platforms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines / recommendation on AF legislation for all Member States. The EU should come up with minimum standards to be included (e.g. pragmatic investor protection) and aspects to be avoided (such as prospectus requirement for smaller projects). • Guidelines on cross border investments for platforms, and platforms for R&I, to enhance the understanding of different regulatory and legislative regimes.

⁶ Suggested policy measures for innovation: guarantees and EU match funding are innovation specific due to the nature of relevant funding models that are more suitable for financing innovation, rather than due to the need of innovation field itself.

Promoting the standard for transparency of AF operations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitating the creation and promotion of the Code of Conduct for AF platforms. The EU facilitated system of self-regulation could strengthen trust between the stakeholders of the ecosystem. Promoting standardisation in the way results from AF campaigns are reported (Key Performance Indicators) and minimum standard criteria for the selection process of projects by AF platforms.
Creating a European AF information and advisory hub	One-stop shop for AF that provides information services on AF models for fundraisers and investors, and their suitability for specific projects and sectors; organises trainings and events on AF; shares best practice examples with regards to AF, and connects stakeholders on national and regional level, amongst others.
Financial education	Developing Massive Open Online Course (MOOC)-like trainings on AF, facilitating exchanges of good practices between countries, but also between platforms on how to raise awareness and education on AF.
Tax exemptions at national level for investments in AF	Tax deductibility of investments in AF at national level is considered the most effective way to increase the general uptake by investors. There is a crucial role for the EC, on the one hand, to encourage and support the adoption of similar measures at national level, and on the other, to ensure that it does not evolve into additional barriers to cross-border investment.

- Recommendations in support of alternative finance for research and innovation

Quality endorsement of R&I platforms	Open repository of science-related platforms based on the set of specific pre-set criteria, e.g. platforms should be active and have active projects, they should commit to the Code of Conduct and standardised reporting.
Support for AF campaign preparation – micro- grants	European micro-grants to finance preparatory costs of an AF campaign as a quick solution to the lack of fundraiser skills. The sort of costs covered could include the costs of consulting services for the creation of a successful campaign (advisory services of an AF consultant, PR services, video and graphic communication, business plan development).

- Recommendations in support of alternative finance for innovation only

EU Guarantee	Guarantee mechanisms for lending, managed by the platform, are considered a good way for promoting higher risk-taking investment whilst minimising drawbacks at national and regional level.
EU matching funds / co-investment	Platforms specialised in the field would pre-select projects which, after reaching a specific level of funding from the "crowd" / professional investors, would receive the remaining part from EU funds. In practice, that would mean that the EU would commit to contributing a certain percentage of the pledged amount (platforms mention 30% of a total sum pledged) or a certain sum from the start, up to a specific agreed level. Only after reaching this level, the EC would contribute.

- Recommendations in support of alternative finance for research only

EU support to science platforms for sustainable business models	Support for the creation of a scientific-board by 1) opening EC research / science expertise (database of experts) to assess projects; 2) EU using a pre-selection process of projects by the "crowd" for project validation; 3) demanding the involvement of AF in certain calls.
Education of research institutions on AF for R&I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative Finance Service Package for Research Institutions on how to use the potential of alternative finance. It should: include an explanation of suitable alternative financing models for basic research, applied research, innovation; include info on existing R&I platforms as well as training materials for successful AF campaign preparation; promote best practices from the countries and provide a selection of platforms for proven cases. Pilot phase with a couple of research institution in order to promote real case examples.

Whilst there is no strong evidence of market failure justifying hard policy intervention, it is clear that there is lots of room for beneficial soft policy intervention. However, to be effective, this intervention will require careful design and extensive collaboration with stakeholders: alternative finance will require smart, data driven and collaborative policies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aerospace Defence Security Space, SUPPORTING SMES & MID-CAPS - Helping SMEs & Mid-caps invest in growth., pp.1–14.
- AFME, 2015. Bridging the growth gap.
- Agrawal, A., Catalini, C. & Goldfarb, A., 2011. The Geography of Crowdfunding. SSRN Electronic Journal, pp.1–57.
- Agrawal, A., Catalini, C. & Goldfarb, A., 2013. Some simple economics of crowdfunding. NBER Working Paper No. 19133, pp.1–47.
- AK WIEN, 2014. An analysis of 18 platforms in Germany, Switzerland, pp.1–10.
- Allen & Overy, 2015. Funding European business: Harnessing alternatives.
- Amann, S. & Lange, B., 2013. Thematic Programme Capitalisation: Analysis report on Innovation Capacity of SMEs.
- Angel.me, 2015. The battle for entrepreneurial growth.
- Antonenko P.D., Lee B.R., K.A.J., 2014. To Crowdfund Research, Scientists Must Build an Audience for Their Work. PeerJ, (May), pp.1–17.
- Bachmann, A., 2015. Online Peer-to-Peer Lending-A Literature Journal of Internet Banking and Commerce.
- Bain & Company, RESTORING FINANCING AND GROWTH TO EUROPE' S SMEs: Four sets of impediments and how to overcome them,
- Banhatti, R.D., 2016. Crowdfunding of a Social Enterprise: The GloW Project as a Case Study, pp.1–251.
- BBVA Research, 2013. Economic Outlook - United States,
- BBVA Research, 2015. Crowdfunding in 360°: alternative financing for the digital era. , pp.1–26.
- Beaulieu, T.Y., Sarker, S. & Sarker, S., 2015. A conceptual framework for understanding crowdfunding. Communications of the Association for Information Systems, 37, pp.1–31.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T. & Schwienbacher, A., 2013. Individual crowdfunding practices. Venture Capital, 15(4), pp.313–333.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T. & Schwienbacher, A., 2014. Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(5), pp.585–609.
- Belleflamme, P., Omrani, N. & Peitz, M., 2015. The economics of crowdfunding platforms. Information Economics and Policy, 33, pp.11–28.
- Berger, S.C. & Gleisner, F., 2009. Emergence of Financial Intermediaries in Electronic Markets: The Case of Online P2P Lending. BuR - Business Research, 2(1), pp.39–65.
- Bethlendi, A. & Végh, R., Crowdfunding – could it become a viable option for Hungarian small businesses?, pp.100–124.
- BIOCOM AG, 2015. Analysis of Crowd- based Financing in European Life Sciences.
- Branker, K. & Pearce, J.M., Accelerating the Growth of Solar Photovoltaic Deployment with Peer to Peer Financing.
- Brenan, J., 2014. Science by the Masses: Is crowdfunding the future for biotech start-ups? IEEE Pulse, 5(1), pp.59–62.
- Bretschneider, U., Knaub, K. & Wieck, E., 2014. Motivations for crowdfunding: What drives the crowd to invest in start-ups? In ECIS 2014 Proceedings - 22nd European Conference on Information Systems. Association for Information Systems.
- British Business Bank, 2014. Equity Crowdfunding in the UK: Evidence from the Equity Tracker.
- Brüntje Dennis, G.O., 2016. Crowdfunding in Europe - State of the Art in Theory and Practice.
- Bruton, G. et al., 2015. New Financial Alternatives in Seeding Entrepreneurship: Microfinance, Crowdfunding, and Peer-to-Peer Innovations. Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, pp.9–26.
- Burtch, G., Ghose, A. & Wattal, S., 2014a. An experiment in crowdfunding: Assessing the role and impact of transaction-level information controls. In 35th International Conference on Information Systems "Building a Better World Through Information Systems", ICIS 2014. Association for Information Systems.
- Burtch, G., Ghose, A. & Wattal, S., 2014b. The Hidden Cost of Accommodating Crowdfunder Privacy Preferences: A Randomized Field Experiment. Management Science, 61(5), pp.949–962.

- Business France, 2015. Startup funding: A national priority.
- Calders, T., & Verwer, S., 2010. Three naive Bayes approaches for discrimination-free classification. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 21(2), 277-292.
- Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance & University of Cambridge, 2015. Opportunities Within the Diversity of European Crowdfunding.
- Cambridge-KPMG 2016, The 2nd European Alternative Finance Industry Report, Sustaining Momentum, Cambridge Centre for Alternative Finance & University of Cambridge.
- Canada Media Fund, 2012. Crowdfunding in a Canadian Context -Exploring the Potential of Crowdfunding in the Creative Content Industries.
- Carlton Mansfield, 2015. Research on Crowdfunding in China 2015.
- Chen, D., Lai, F. & Lin, Z., 2014. A trust model for online peer-to-peer lending: a lender's perspective. *Information Technology and Management*, 15(4), pp.239–254.
- Chuene, D. & Mtsweni, J., 2015. The adoption of crowdsourcing platforms in South Africa. 2015 IST-Africa Conference, IST-Africa 2015, pp.1–9.
- Colombo, M.G., Franzoni, C. & Rossi-Lamastra, C., 2015a. Internal social capital and the attraction of early contributions in crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, pp.75–100.
- Colombo, M.G., Franzoni, C. & Rossi-Lamastra, C., 2015b. Cash from the crowd. *Science (New York, NY)*, 348(6240), p.1201.
- Cordova, A., Dolci, J. & Gianfrate, G., 2015. The Determinants of Crowdfunding Success: Evidence from Technology Projects. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 181, pp.115–124.
- CrowdfundingHub, 2016. Crowdfunding Crossing Borders. An Overview of Liability Risks Associated with Cross Border Crowdfunding Investments
- CrowdfundingHub, 2016a. The Current State of Crowdfunding in Europe.
- Crowdsourcing.org, 2012. Crowdfunding industry report - market trends, composition and
- Crowdsurfer-EY, 2015, Crowdfunding: Mapping EU markets and events study, European Commission crowdfunding platforms. Research report. pp.1–30.
- Crucial Crowdfunding Capital, 2016. CROWDFUNDING FOR ENTERPRISE (an examination of the crowdfunding landscape in Europe).
- CSES, 2015. Assessing the Potential for EU Investment in Venture Capital and Other Risk Capital Fund of Funds.
- Cullina, E., Morgan, D.L. & Conboy, D.K., 2014. The Development of a Public / Private Model for the Crowd- funding and Crowdsourcing of Scientific Research Projects Motivation for Research.
- Cumming, D.J., Leboeuf, G. and Schwienbacher, A., 2014. Crowdfunding Models: Keep-it-All vs. All-or-Nothing. Paris December 2014 Finance Meeting EUROFIDAI-AFFI Paper.
- Danmayr, F., Archetypes of Crowdfunding Platforms: A Multidimensional Comparison.
- Desai, R.M. & Kharas, H., 2013. The wisdom of crowd-funders what motivates cross-border private development aid?
- Dietrich, A. & Amrein, S., 2015. Crowdfunding Monitoring Switzerland 2015., pp.1–24.
- Dragojlovic, N. & Lynd, L.D., 2014. Crowdfunding drug development: The state of play in oncology and rare diseases. *Drug Discovery Today*, 19(11), pp.1775–1780.
- Duda, R. O., & Hart, P. E. , 1973. Pattern classification and scene analysis (Vol. 3). New York: Wiley.
- Dufour, Y. & Steane, P., 2006. Competitive paradigms on strategic change: mapping the field and further research development. *Strategic Change*, 15(3), p.129.
- Dushnitsky, G., Guerini, M., Piva, E., & Rossi-Lamastra, C., 2016. Crowdfunding in Europe. *California Management Review*, 58(2), 44-71.
- EBAN, 2014. Statistics Compendium, The European Trade Association for Business Angels, Seed Funds, and Other Early Stage Market Players.
- E. K. Byrnes, J. et al., 2014. To crowdfund research, scientists must build an audience for their work.
- Elkuch, A., Brunner, C. & Marxt, C., 2013. Reciprocal crowdfunding as means to enable student and graduate entrepreneurship in Africa - a case study of Rwanda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 19(4), p.498.
- Emekter, R. et al., 2015. Evaluating credit risk and loan performance in online Peer-to-Peer (P2P) lending. *Applied Economics*, 47(1), pp.54–70.

ESMA European Securities and Markets, 2014. Opinion Investment-based crowdfunding,

European Commission, 2013. Dynamic financial constraints and innovation: Evidence from the UK Innovation Surveys.

Eurofi, 2014. Providing appropriate financing tools for EU SMEs and midcaps., pp.2012–2014.

EuroFinuse Position, 2013. EuroFinUse Response to the European Commission Consultation "Crowdfunding in the EU – Exploring the added value of potential EU action."

European Banking Authority, 2013. EBA response to the European Commission's Consultation Paper on Crowdfunding.

European Banking Authority, 2015. Opinion of the European Banking Authority on lending-based crowdfunding., 1(1093), pp.1–40.

European Commission, 2000. DIRECTIVE 2004/39/EC OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 21 April 2004 on markets in financial instruments amending Council Directives 85/611/EEC and 93/6/EEC and Directive 2000/12/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council and repealing

European Commission, 2001. Consultation document - Crowdfunding in the EU - Exploring the added value of potential EU action.

European Commission, 2010. Communication From the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, COM(2010) 546 final.

European Commission, 2010a. Turning Europe into a true Innovation Union, MEMO/10/473 06/10/2010, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_MEMO-10-473_en.htm?locale=en

European Commission, 2011. Action plan to improve access to finance for SMEs, COM(2011) 870 final.

European Commission, 2012. A framework for European Crowdfunding.

European Commission, 2013a. ENTREPRENEURSHIP 2020 ACTION PLAN Reigniting the entrepreneurial spirit in Europe, COM(2012) 795 final.

European Commission, 2013b. Financial instrument facilities supporting access to risk finance for research and innovation in Horizon 2020.

European Commission, 2013c. Innovation Union A pocket guide on a Europe 2020 initiative.

European Commission, 2014a. COM(2014) 172 final, Unleashing the potential of Crowdfunding in the European Union, COM(2014) 172 final.

European Commission, 2014b. GREEN PAPER LONG-TERM FINANCING OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMY {COM(2013) 150 final}.

European Commission, 2014c. Crowdfunding and the Role of Managers in Ensuring the Sustainability of Crowdfunding Platforms.

European Commission, 2014d. Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EU, EURATOM) No 966/2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union EN.

European Commission, 2014e. Crowdfunding innovative ventures in Europe - The financial ecosystem and regulatory landscape.

European Commission, 2014f. REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EU, EURATOM) No 966/2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union, COM(2014) 358 final.

European Commission, 2015. Funding Research, Innovation and Culture in a New Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges for European Crowdfunding Champions European, workshop held in Brussels on 9 July 2015.

European Commission, 2015a. Crowdfunding: Mapping EU markets and events study Executive Summary.

European Commission, 2015b. Crowdfunding in Europe - state of play and next steps.

European Commission, 2015c. Green Paper - Building a Capital Market Union.

European Commission, 2015d. GREEN PAPER Building a Capital Markets Union, COM(2015) 63 final.

European Commission, 2015e. HORIZON 2020 WORK PROGRAMME 2014 – 2015 6. Access to Risk Finance Revised.

European Commission, 2015f. INVESTMENT AND COMPANY REPORTING Economic analysis and evaluation Head of unit, p.22991111.

European Commission, 2015g. Understanding Crowdfunding and its Regulations How can Crowdfunding help ICT Innovation?

European Commission, 2015h. Access to finance: still a barrier for EU companies' growth, published on: 12/11/2014, last update: 19/06/2015; http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/AF/itemdetail.Afm?item_id=7893

European Commission, 2016. Commission staff working document - Report on Crowdfunding in the EU Capital Markets Union.

European Crowdfunding Network, 2013. Review of Crowdfunding Regulation - Interpretations of existing regulation concerning crowdfunding in Europe, North America and Israel

European Foundation Centre & Transnational Giving Europe, Netherlands, 38, pp.1-7.

European Investment Bank, 2013. Supporting access to finance for SMEs and midcaps.

Falch, M. & Henten, A., 2008. Investment dimensions in a universal service perspective: next generation networks, alternative funding mechanisms and public-private partnerships. *Info*, 10(5/6), pp.33-45.

Fang, Z., Zhang, J. & Zhiyuan, F., 2014. Study on P2P E-finance platform system: A case in China. *Proceedings - 11th IEEE International Conference on E-Business Engineering, ICEBE 2014 - Including 10th Workshop on Service-Oriented Applications, Integration and Collaboration, SOAIC 2014 and 1st Workshop on E-Commerce Engineering, ECE 2014*, pp.331-337.

Fatoki, O., 2014. The Financing Options for New Small and Medium Enterprises in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(20), pp.748-755.

Feldmann, N. et al., 2014. Idea assessment via enterprise crowdfunding: An empirical analysis of decision-making styles. In *ECIS 2014 Proceedings - 22nd European Conference on Information Systems*. Association for Information Systems.

Fillippov S., Hofheinz P., 2016. From Startup to Scale-Up: Growing Europe's Digital Economy.

Financement Participatif France, 2014. Baromètre de l'année 2014 - Crowdfunding France.

Financial Conduct Authority, 2013. The FCA's regulatory approach to crowdfunding (and similar activities).

Financial Conduct Authority, 2015. A review of the regulatory regime for crowdfunding and the promotion of non-readily realisable securities by other media. Financial Conduct Authority.

For, O. & In, I., 2011. How can we improve access to risk finance in Europe? *Innovation*, pp.1-5.

Friedman, P.J., 2002. The impact of conflict of interest on trust in science. *Science and engineering ethics*, 8(3), pp.413-420.

Friedman, S & Jin, Z.G., 2014. The Information Value of Online Social Networks: Lessons from Peer-to-Peer Lending, NBER Working Paper No. 19820

Fumagalli, D.C. & Gouw, A.M., 2015. Crowdfunding for Personalized Medicine., 88, pp.413-414.

Funk, A.S., 2016. Institutions Influencing the Evolution of Crowdfunding in China: A Review of the World Bank Report on Crowdfunding's Potential for the Developing World., pp.1-251.

G., G., 2016. Equity crowdfunding of an entrepreneurial activity., 32, pp.415-425.

Gajda, O. & Mason, N., 2013. Crowdfunding for impact in Europe and the USA.

Gerber, E.M. & Hui, J., 2013. Crowdfunding: Motivations and Deterrents for Participation. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 20(6), p.32.

Gierczak, M.M. et al., 2016. Crowdfunding: Outlining the New Era of Fundraising., pp.1-251.

Gierczak, M.M., Bretschneider, U. & Leimeister, J.M., 2014. Is all that Glitters Gold? Exploring The Effects of Perceived Risk on Backing Behavior in Reward-based Crowdfunding. *International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)*, (2014), pp.1-13.

Giudici, G. et al., 2012. Crowdfunding: The New Frontier for Financing Entrepreneurship?, pp.1-13.

Gleasure, R., 2015. Resistance to crowdfunding among entrepreneurs: An impression management perspective. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 24(4), pp.219-233.

Global Solution Network, 2015. CROWDFUNDING A Roadmap for Global Solution Networks.

Goldfarb, A.A.& C.C.& A., 2015. Crowdfunding: Geography, Social Networks , and the Timing of Investment Decisions. , 24(2), pp.253-274.

Gossel, B.M., Bruntje, D. & Will, A., 2016. Crowd and Society: Outlining a Research Programme on the Societal Relevance and the Potential of Crowdfunding. , pp.1-251.

- Grüner, H.P. & Siemroth, C., 2015. Cutting out the Middleman: Crowdfunding, Efficiency, and Inequality, pp.3–5.
- Guerzoni, M. et al., 2016. The Emerging Crowdfunding Market in Italy: Are “the Crowd” Friends of Mine?, pp.1–251.
- Guo, Y. et al., 2016. Instance-based credit risk assessment for investment decisions in P2P lending. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 249(2), pp.417–426.
- Haas, P., Blohm, I. & Leimeister, J.M., 2014. An Empirical Taxonomy of Crowdfunding Intermediaries. *International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS)*, pp.1–18.
- Hagedorn, A. & Pinkwart, A., 2016. The Financing Process of Equity-Based Crowdfunding: An Empirical Analysis. , pp.1–251.
- Hardy, W., 2013. How to perfectly discriminate in a crowd? A theoretical model of crowdfunding. *University of Warsaw Faculty of Economic Sciences Working Papers*, 16(101), pp.1–28.
- Hemer, J., 2011. A snapshot on crowdfunding. *Enconstor*, p.39.
- Hornuf, L. & Schwienbacher, A., 2015. Funding Dynamics in Crowdfunding,
- Hornuf, Lars & Schwienbacher, A., 2014. The Emergence of Crowdfunding in Europe.
- Huffman, W.E. & Just, R.E., 1999. Agricultural Research: Benefits and Beneficiaries of Alternative Funding Mechanisms. *Review of Agricultural Economics*, 21(1), pp.2–18.
- Ingram, C. & Teigland, R., 2013. Crowdfunding Among IT Entrepreneurs in Sweden: A Qualitative Study of the Funding Ecosystem and ICT Entrepreneurs’ Adoption of Crowdfunding,
- Ingram, C. & Teigland, R., Is crowdfunding doomed in sweden? When institutional logics and affordances collide, (Re-)design matters. , pp.1–12.
- Ingram, C., Teigland, R. & Vaast, E., 2014. Solving the puzzle of crowdfunding: Where technology affordances and institutional entrepreneurship collide. *Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, pp.4556–4567.
- Instruments, F., 2014. Horizon 2020 Kick off meeting - SMEs: the New tools / opportunities for access to finance introduced by Horizon 2020 (i . e . Horizon 2020 Financial Instruments).
- IPA Institute of Public Accounts, 2015. Crowd Funding, A policy response submission on crowd funding.
- Iyer, R., 2009. Screening in New Credit Markets: Can Individual Lenders Infer Borrower Creditworthiness in Peer-to-Peer Lending? *Harvard Kennedy School Faculty Research Working Papers Series*,
- Iyer, R. et al., 2014. Screening peers softly: inferring the quality of small borrowers. *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series*, (15242), pp.1–65.
- Janke Dittmer, J.A.M. and E.P.M.V., 2014. The Balance between Exploration and Exploitation in the “New” Venture Capital Cycle: Opportunities and Challenges. In *Exploration and Exploitation in Early Stage Ventures and SMEs*, pp.15–37.
- Jegelevičiūtė, S. & Valančienė, L., 2015. Comparative Analysis of the Ways Crowdfunding is Promoted. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 213, pp.268–274.
- Johannsson, M. et al., 2015. Space and Open Innovation: Potential, limitations and conditions of success. *Acta Astronautica*, 115, pp.173–184.
- K., S., 2014. Wisdom of Crowds. *Inside Reference Data*, 9(4), pp.10–11.
- Kadra Branker, Emily Shackles, and J.M.P., 2013. Peer-to-peer financing mechanisms to accelerate renewable energy deployment. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), pp.1689–1699.
- Kim, J. et al., 2015. An Empirical Analysis of a Crowdfunding Platform. , Working paper, p.27.
- Kirby, A.E. & Worner, S., 2014. Crowd-funding: An Infant Industry Growing Fast. , pp.1–62.
- Kirilova, P.K., 2016. Impact of Debt Crowdfunding for Civic Projects on the Optimal Portfolio of a Socially Responsible Investor. , pp.1–251.
- Koeck, D.F.& A.J.B.& T.K.& B., 2014. Exploring entrepreneurial legitimacy in reward-based crowdfunding. *Venture Capital*, 16(3), pp.247–269.
- Kraus, D., 2007. Does borrowers’ impatience disclose their hidden information about default risk?
- Kshetri, N., 2015. Success of Crowd-based Online Technology in Fundraising: An Institutional Perspective. *Journal of International Management*, 21(2), pp.100–116.

- Kuo, D.C.L. et al., 2014. Investigating the effects of project scales on the patterns and performance of successfully funded, technology-oriented innovative crowdfunding projects. *Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management (IEEM)*, 2014 IEEE International Conference on, 184(188), pp.9–12.
- Kuti, M. & Madarász, G., 2014. *Crowdfunding.*, pp.355–366.
- Langley, P., Iba, W., & Thompson, K., 1992. An analysis of Bayesian classifiers. In *Aaai* (Vol. 90, pp. 223-228).
- Lam, P.T.I. & Law, A.O.K., 2016. Crowdfunding for renewable and sustainable energy projects: An exploratory case study approach. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 60, pp.11–20.
- Larrimore, L. et al., 2011. Peer to Peer Lending: The Relationship Between Language Features, Trustworthiness, and Persuasion Success. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 39(1), pp.19–37.
- Lasrado, L.A. & Lugmayr, A., 2013. Crowdfunding in Finland – A New Alternative Disruptive Funding Instrument for Businesses. *AcademicMindTrek '13*, pp.194–201.
- Ledford, H., 2012. Alternative funding: Sponsor my science. *Nature*, 481, pp.254–5.
- Lee, C.H., Zhao, J.L. & Hassna, G., 2016. Government-incentivized crowdfunding for one-belt, one-road enterprises: design and research issues. *Financial Innovation*, 2(1), p.2.
- Lee, N., Sameen, H. & Cowling, M., 2014. Access to finance for innovative SMEs since the financial crisis. *Conference Paper - DRUID Society Conference 2014, CBS, Copenhagen*.
- Lehner, O.M., 2013. Crowdfunding social ventures: a model and research agenda. *Venture Capital*, 15(4), pp.289–311.
- Lehner, O.M., Grabmann, E. & Ennsgraber, C., 2015. Entrepreneurial implications of Crowdfunding as alternative funding source for innovations. *Venture Capital*, 1066, pp.1–19.
- Leonard, I.P.O.D., 2015. Crowdfunding for Hardware Things to consider before launching that Kickstarter campaign. , pp.22–23.
- Li, F.-W. & Pryer, K.M., 2014. Crowdfunding the Azolla fern genome project: a grassroots approach. *GigaScience*, 3(1), p.16.
- Li, Z. & Duan, J.A., 2014. Dynamic strategies for successful online crowdfunding. *24th Workshop on Information Technology and Systems*.
- Liao, C., Zhu, Y. & Liao, X., 2015. The role of internal and external social capital in crowdfunding: Evidence from China. *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala*, 49(JUNE), pp.187–204.
- Lin, M., Prabhala, N.R. & Viswanathan, S., 2009. Judging borrowers by the company they keep: social networks and adverse selection in online peer-to-peer lending.
- Loi, R. et al., 2015. Can microfinance crowdfunding reduce financial exclusion? Regulatory issues. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 30 No, pp.645–658.
- Lucia, P.M., 2015. Crowdfunding: among Suitability and Appropriateness Rules and its Applicability to Capital Increase Operations. , pp.287–332.
- Marelli, A. & Ordanini, A., 2016. What Makes Crowdfunding Projects Successful “Before” and “During” the Campaign? , pp.1–251.
- Marlett, D., 2015. Crowdfunding Art, Science and Technology A Quick Survey of the Burgeoning New Landscape. *Leonardo*, 48(1), pp.104–105.
- Marshall, J., 2013. Kickstart your research. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(13), pp.4857–4859.
- Mäschle, O., 2012. Rationing of excessive demand on crowdfunding-platforms.
- Mäschle, O., 2012. Which information should entrepreneurs on German crowdfunding-platforms disclose? *Thünen-Series of Applied Economic Theory*, (127), p.30.
- Massolution, 2015AF *The Crowdfunding Industry Report*.
- Mazzucato, M., 2013. Financing innovation: Creative destruction vs. destructive creation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 22(4), pp.851–867.
- Meyskens, M. & Bird, L., 2015. Crowdfunding and Value Creation. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(2), pp.155–166.
- Milne, A. & Parboteeah, P., 2016. The Business Models and Economics of Peer-to-Peer Lending.
- Mina, A., Lahr, H. & Hughesy, A., 2013. The demand and supply of external finance for innovative firms. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 22(4), pp.869–901.

- Mollick, E., 2014. The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), pp.1–16. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2013.06.005>.
- Mollick, E., & Nanda, R., 2015. Wisdom or madness? Comparing crowds with expert evaluation in funding the arts. *Management Science*.
- Moncada, J., 2015. Crowdfunding - Crowdfunding for social impact.
- Moritz, A. et al., 2014. Investor Communication in Crowdfunding: A Qualitative-Empirical Study. SSRN Working Paper No 2462282, pp.1–43.
- Moritz, A. & Block, J.H., 2016. Crowdfunding: A Literature Review and Research Directions., pp.1–251.
- Motylska-Kuzma, A., 2015. Cost of Crowdfunding as a Source of Capital for the Small Company. 18th International Academic Conference, pp.461–473.
- Muller, M. et al., 2013. Crowdfunding inside the enterprise. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '13*, p.503.
- MyMicroInvest, 2014. My MicroInvest - Invest alongside professionals in startups.
- Nabarro & altfiDATA, 2015. Where are they now? A report into the status of companies that have raised finance using Equity Crowdfunding in the UK.
- Naroditskiy, V. et al., 2014. Referral Incentives in Crowdfunding. IZA Discussion Paper Series, 7995(Hcomp), pp.1–18.
- Nasrabadi, A.G., 2016. Equity Crowdfunding: Beyond Financial Innovation. pp.1–251.
- Nesta, 2008. AN INTRODUCTION TO CROWDFUNDING.
- Nesta & University of Cambridge, 2014 (Cambridge-Nesta, 2014). Understanding Alternative Finance - The UK Alternative Finance Industry Report 2014.
- O'Toole, C.M., Lawless, M. & Lambert, D., 2015. Non-bank financing in Ireland: A comparative perspective. *Economic and Social Review*, 46(1), pp.133–161.
- Ossendorf, V. & Jekl, A., 2010. Regulation of Alternative Funds in the Czech Republic in the Context of the Debate on their Potential Regulation in the European, pp.120–129.
- Osimo, D., Pujol, L. & Porcu, F., 2015. Analysis of Alternative Funding Mechanisms for Scientific Research. In R. Vuorikari & Y. Punie, eds. *Analysis of Emerging Reputation and Funding Mechanisms in the Context of Open Science 2.0*. JRC IPTS.
- Otero, P., 2015. Crowdfunding. A new option for funding health projects. *Archivos argentinos de pediatría*, 113(2), pp.154–157.
- Ozdemir, V., Faris, J. & Srivastava, S., 2015. Crowdfunding 2.0: the next-generation philanthropy: A new approach for philanthropists and citizens to co-fund disruptive innovation in global health. *EMBO reports*, 16(3), pp.267–271.
- OECD, 2002. Frascati Manual: Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, 6th edition, available at: <http://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascaticmanualproposedstandardpracticeforsurveysonresearchandexperimentaldevelopment6thedition.htm>
- OECD, 2005. Oslo Manual: Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data, 3rd Edition, available at: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/science-and-technology/oslo-manual_9789264013100-en
- Oxera, 2015. Crowdfunding from an investor perspective. Final report prepared for the European Commission Financial Services User Group, 17 July 2015.
- Parker, S.C., 2014. Crowdfunding, cascades and informed investors. *Economics Letters*, 125(3), pp.432–435.
- Partner, F. et al., 2015. Event Report. pp.1–5.
- Pazowski, P. & Czudec, W., 2014. Economic Prospects and Conditions of Crowdfunding. *Human Capital without Borders: Knowledge and Learning for Quality of Life*, pp.1079–1088.
- Pensco, 2015. 2015 PENSICO Crowdfunding Report.
- Pelizzon L., Riedel M., Tasca P., 2016. Classification of Crowdfunding in the Financial System, Banking Beyond Banks and Money. A Guide to Banking Services in the Twenty-First Century, Axel Springer.
- Perlstein, E.O., 2013. Anatomy of the Crowd4Discovery crowdfunding campaign. *SpringerPlus*, 2(1), pp.1–3.
- Pitschner, S. & Pitschner-Finn, S., 2014. Non-profit differentials in crowd-based financing: Evidence from 50,000 campaigns. *Economics Letters*, 123(3), pp.391–394.

- Posegga, O., Zylka, M.P. & Fischbach, K., 2015. Collective dynamics of crowdfunding networks. *Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2015-March*, pp.3258–3267.
- Profatilov, D.A., Bykova, O.N. & Olkhovskaya, M.O., 2015. Crowdfunding: Online charity or a modern tool for innovative projects implementation? *Asian Social Science*, 11(3), pp.146–151.
- Pur, Sabine; Huesig, Stefan; Mann, Hans-Georg; Schmidhammer, C., 2014. How to analyze the disruptive potential of business model innovation in two-sided markets? The case of peer to peer lending marketplaces in Germany. 2014 Portland International Center for Management of Engineering and Technology, PICMET 2014, pp.693–709.
- Rajput N.K., Singh V., B.A., 2015. Resources, challenges and way forward in rare mitochondrial diseases research. *F1000Research*, 4, p.70.
- Ramos, J., 2014. Crowdfunding and the Role of Managers in Ensuring the Sustainability of Crowdfunding Platforms.
- Ramos, J. & Gonza, B., 2016. Crowdfunding and Employment: An Analysis of the Employment Effects of Crowdfunding in Spain., pp.1–251.
- Rao, H. et al., 2014. Emerging dynamics in crowdfunding campaigns. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 8393 LNCS, pp.333–340.
- Regner, P.C.& T., 2012. Crowdfunding: Determinants of success and funding dynamics.
- Ren, K., 2015. Peer-to-Peer Lending. pp.2–4.
- Riedl, J., 2013. Crowdfunding technology innovation. *Computer*, 46(3), pp.100–103.
- Risterucci, F., 2016. The Ten Commandments of Crowdfunding, pp.1–251.
- Robobank, 2015. Annual Report 2015.
- Roig Hernando, J. & Soriano Llobera, J., 2015. Crowdfunding de préstamos para PyMEs en España: Un análisis empírico. *Estudios de economía aplicada*, 33(1), pp.301–318.
- Roosevelt Institute, 2013. Will Crowdfunding Kickstart an Investment Revolution? Policy and Political Implications of Peer-to-Peer Financing. , pp.1–6.
- Rubinton, B.J., 2013. Crowdfunding: disintermediated investment banking, (47061).
- Rupeika-Apoga, R., 2014. Alternative Financing of SMEs in the Baltic States: Myth or Reality? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 156(April), pp.513–517.
- Ryu, S. & Kim, Y.-G., 2016. A typology of crowdfunding sponsors: Birds of a feather flock together? *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 16, pp.43–54.
- Safner, R., 2013. Essays on the Institutional Analysis of Copyright and Its Alternatives. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), pp.1689–1699.
- Sahami, M., Dumais, S., Heckerman, D., & Horvitz, E., 2015. A Bayesian approach to filtering junk e-mail. In *Learning for Text Categorization: Papers from the 1998 workshop (Vol. 62, pp. 98-105)*.
- Salomon, V., 2014. Emergent models of financial intermediation for innovative companies: from venture capital to crowdinvesting platforms in Switzerland.
- Sannajust, A., Roux, F. & Chaibi, A., 2014. Crowdfunding In France: A New Revolution?
- Santander, 2014. Corporate Social Responsibility Report.
- Schäfer S. M., Metag J., Feustle J. and Herzog L.; Selling science 2.0: What scientific projects receive crowdfunding online? *Public Understanding of Science*, 1–19, 2016.
- Scholz, N., 2015. The relevance of crowdfunding: The impact on the innovation process of small entrepreneurial firms. PhD Proposal, 1.
- Schwienbacher, A., 2010. Crowdfunding of Small Entrepreneurial Ventures.
- Schwienbacher, L.H. and A., 2014. Should Securities Regulation Promote Crowdinvesting?
- Sharma, A., Khan, J. & Devereaux, P.J., 2015. Is crowdfunding a viable source of clinical trial research funding? *The Lancet*, 386(9991), p.338.
- Sifferlin, B.Y.A., 2015. Paying to play. As U.S. spending on medical research lags, a new crowdfunding model emerges.
- Silanes L., McCahery F. J., Schoenmaker D., and Stanisc D., 2015. The European Capital Markets Study: The Estimation of the Financing Gap of SMEs, *Duisenberg School of Finance, Amsterdam*
- Singh H., Gopal R., L.X., Risk and Return of Investments in Online Peer-to-Peer Lending., pp.1–6.

- Siva, N., 2014. Crowdfunding for medical research picks up pace. *The Lancet*, 384(9948), pp.1085–1086.
- Smith, R.J. & Merchant, R.M., 2015. Harnessing the crowd to accelerate molecular medicine research. *Trends in Molecular Medicine*, 21(7), pp.403–405.
- Startup Europe Crowdfunding Network, 2014. Support services to foster the crowdfunding environment in Europe focused on web entrepreneurs.
- Strausz, R., 2015. Crowdfunding, demand uncertainty, and moral hazard - a mechanism design approach.
- Tech City News, 2008. *The Future of Crowdfunding.*, p.2008.
- Thaker, D. et al., 2015. A Conceptual Paper on Crowdfunding with Reference to Entrepreneurs and Investors in India. , 5(1041).
- The Crowd Data Centre, 2014. Mapping - The State of the Crowdfunding Nation Documenting The Global Rise of eFinance & the eFunding Escalator,
- The World Bank, 2013. Crowdfunding' s Potential for the Developing World.
- Tobergte, D.R. & Curtis, S., 2013. SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 17TH MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITIES COMMITTEE.
- Tomczak, A. & Brem, A., 2013. A conceptualized investment model of crowdfunding. *Venture Capital*, 15(January 2015), pp.1–25.
- Torjesen, I., 2015. Crowdfunding sought for study that will provide first images of human brain on LSD. *Bmj*, 350(mar05 4), pp.h1215–h1215.
- Torkanovskiy, E., 2016. Non-equity Crowdfunding as a National Phenomenon in a Global Industry: The Case of Russia. , pp.1–251.
- Turan, S.S., 2015a. Financial Innovation - Crowdfunding: Friend or Foe? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, pp.353–362.
- Turan, S.S., 2015b. Stakeholders in equity-based crowdfunding: Respective risks over the equity crowdfunding lifecycle. *Journal of Financial Innovation*, 1(2), pp.141–151.
- Turner, A. et al., 2010. The future of finance - The Socialisation of Finance. ... the Future of Finance, p.294.
- Twintangibles, 2013. Crowdfunding: The Scottish Perspective.
- University of Cambridge; Ernst&Young, (Cambridge-EY, 2015), 2015. Moving Mainstream - The European Alternative Finance Benchmarking Report.
- Valančienė, L. & Jegelevičiūtė, S., 2014. Crowdfunding for Creating Value: Stakeholder Approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 156(April), pp.599–604.
- Vasileiadou, E., Huijben, J.C.C.M. & Raven, R.P.J.M., 2014. Crowdfunding niches? Exploring the potential of crowdfunding for financing renewable energy niches in the Netherlands, pp.1–24.
- Views, D., 2014. Crowdfunding for Sustainability at SMEs Crowdfunding for Sustainability at SMEs.
- W. Joenssen, D. & Mullerleile, T., 2016. Limitless Crowdfunding? The Effect of Scarcity Management, pp.1–251.
- Wang, H. et al., 2015. A process model on P2P lending. *Financial Innovation*, 1(1), p.3.
- Wang, P. et al., 2015. Exploring the critical factors influencing online lending intentions. *Financial Innovation*, 1(1), p.8.
- Wang, Hui; Greiner, Martina; Aronson, J.E., 2014. Peer-to-peer lending to small businesses. Finance and Economics Discussion Series, Division of Research & Statistics and Monetary Affairs, Federal Reserve Board, pp.1–26.
- Wardrop, R., 2015. Crowdfunding: Opportunity & Challenges for Venture Capital. EAFS, 25th March 2015, Brussels.
- Webb, C. O., Ackerly, D. D., & Kembel, S. W., 2008. Phylocom: software for the analysis of phylogenetic community structure and trait evolution. *Bioinformatics*, 24(18), 2098–2100.
- Weigmann, K., 2013. Tapping the crowds for research funding. *EMBO Reports*, 14(12), pp.1043–1046.
- Wells, N., 2013. The Risks of Crowdfunding. *Risk Management*, (March), pp.26–29.
- Wenzlaff, K. & Rohler, D., 2011. Crowdfunding schemes in europe. European Expert Network on Culture, pp.2–59.

- Wessel, M. et al., 2015. A Lie Never Lives to be Old: The Effects of Fake Social Information on Consumer Decision-Making in Crowdfunding. *European Conference on Information Systems*, pp.1-16.
- Wheat, R.E. et al., 2013. Raising money for scientific research through crowdfunding. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 28(2), pp.71-72.
- Wieck, Enrico; Bretschneider, Ulrich; Leimeister, J.M., 2013. Funding From the Crowd: an Internet-Based Crowdfunding Platform To Support Business Set-Ups From Universities. *International Journal of Cooperative Information Systems*, 22(03), p.1340007.
- Willfort, R. & Weber, C., 2016. The Crowdpower 2.0 Concept: An Integrated Approach to Innovation That Goes Beyond Crowdfunding., pp.1-251.
- Wilson, K.E. & Testoni, M., 2014. Improving the role of equity crowdfunding in europe's capital markets. *Breugel Policy Contribution*, (9), pp.1-14.
- Witt, T., 2015. Crowdfunding for science, research and science communication.
- Xu, Yejun; Enrique Ribeiro-Soriano, D.; Gonzalez-Garcia, J., 2015. Crowdsourcing, innovation and firm performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 30 No, pp.pp. 645-658.
- Xu, A. et al., 2014. Show Me the Money! An Analysis of Project Updates during Crowdfunding Campaigns. *Proceedings of the 32nd annual ACM conference on Human factors in computing systems*. ACM, 2014., pp.591-600.
- Yan, J., Yu, W. & Zhao, J.L., 2015. How signaling and search costs affect information asymmetry in P2P lending: the economics of big data. *Financial Innovation*, 2014(2015), pp.1-11.
- Yang, L. & Siu-king, V., 2012. Performance as a Signal To Information Asymmetry Problem in Online Peer-To-Peer.
- Zablitzsch, I. & Development, W.B., 2015. "Funding Research, Innovation and Culture in a New Digital Age: Challenges and Opportunities for European Crowdfunding Platforms".
- Zhang, B., & Srihari, S. N., 2004. Fast k-nearest neighbor classification using cluster-based trees. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 26(4), 525-528.
- Zhang, T. et al., 2014. Trust Building in Online Peer-to-Peer Lending. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management*, pp.250-266.
- Zhang, Z., 2014. Credit Risk Preference in E-finance: An Empirical Analysis of P2P Lending. *Association for Information Systems AIS Electronic Library (AISel)*.
- Zheng, Haichao, Jui-Long, Hung Zihao Qi, B.X., 1999. The role of trust management in reward-based crowdfunding. *Int J Logistics Management*.
- Zilber S.N., Silveira F., de Carvalho L.F., I. a. G., Crowd funding as an alternative for new ventures funding in emerging countries.

How to obtain EU publications

Free publications:

- one copy:
via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);
- more than one copy or posters/maps:
from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or
calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

The study assesses if alternative finance has the potential to help Europe address the problem of access to finance for innovative companies and bridge the gap in terms of access to risk capital, and if EU action is needed to support development of the sector. The study is structured around three main objectives 1) quantifying and qualifying the size of the alternative market for research and innovation; 2) analysing the challenges limiting development of the AF, and AF for research and innovation in particular; 3) providing final recommendation of EU actions to address those challenges and to exploit the opportunities of alternative finance for research and innovation.

Studies and reports



Publications Office