



2017 NearUS Application
Evaluation Process
Innovation Tour – category Multipliers

1. Eligibility Check

- Part of the target group Yes No
 1. Representatives of a research organization looking for market opportunities for a specific portfolio of R&D projects;
 2. Representatives of research ecosystems looking for market opportunities for a specific portfolio of R&D projects; including cluster managers, research lab managers, tech transfer office managers, etc.

- Based in EU Member States or Associated Countries Yes No

- Industry focused in ICT and/or ICT convergence, such as Smart Home, Smart City, Autonomous Vehicles, Manufacturing, Drones, R/AR/360/Simulation, and Security Yes No

- Able to write in English Yes No
- Word count is respected Yes No
- Pitch deck uploaded Yes No

Application eligible if ALL criteria are met.



2. Application Review

a. Expectation (question 1)

Are the expectations in line with NearUS mission statement? Are the objectives clearly defined?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly understood the service offered - Clearly articulated his/her needs and objectives - Clearly demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understood the service offered - Articulated some needs and objectives, but not specifically - Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly understood the service offered - Not articulated clear needs and objectives

b. Knowledge of the US market and its opportunities (question 2)

Opportunities perceived in the US for his/her projects/members

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly understood the needs of his/her projects the US and defined the opportunities for them - Clearly articulated how the technologies could be or have been competitive and scalable for the US market (present or past examples) 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified a market need for his/her technologies / members/ scientists - Example (s) of technologies that succeeded in the US or that have potential advantage 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly identified or not Identified his/her US target market for his/her technologies / members / scientists - Not articulated a clear competitive advantage for US customer buy-in

c. Motivation (question 3)

Evaluation of the motivation of the candidate to pursue the long-term success for his/her companies / projects / researchers in the US? Can he/she use what he/she will have learnt?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulated his/her motivation - Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right profile to learn then share what he/she has learnt. - The control / power to support the projects in the long term 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Articulated some of his/her motivation - Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed - Some control / power to support the projects in the short to mid-term 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly showed his/her motivation or articulated enthusiasm - No control / power to support the projects in the short to mid-term

d. Overall (after review of the 3 questions AND the pitch deck)

What is your overall impression of the organization, its members/technologies/scientists and ability to turn them into successful transatlantic companies? How well does this applicant align with NearUS goals and/or can utilize the NearUS program? Is the pitch deck ready to be presented?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulated the needs of his/her projects - A well thought out process to address those needs - Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to succeed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with immediate opportunities in the US 		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not have a clear grasp of his/her members / companies / scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

3. Pitch Deck Review

a. Overall (after review of the 3 answers AND the pitch deck)

What is your overall impression of the organization, its members/technologies/scientists and ability to turn them into successful transatlantic companies? How well does this applicant align with NearUS goals and/or can utilize the NearUS program? Is the pitch deck ready to be presented?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly presented his/her organization - Clearly presented the transatlantic needs of his/her members / companies / scientists - Needs a presence in the US and NearUS resources to succeed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with immediate opportunities in the US 		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not have a clear grasp of his/her members / companies / scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

b. Ideas/Technologies

Is the organization representing and supporting truly innovative projects?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Example(s) of innovation(s) based on breakthrough technology that have been or could be protected, licensed and scalable 		<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Example(s) of innovation(s) based on technology that have been protected, licensed or scalable 		<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulty to present innovations with potential interest for the US market

c. Commercial Potential

Are the target market(s) clearly defined for the innovation(s) represented? Does the applicant have a clearly defined market need and a good understanding of who will be the target customers for the innovation(s) he/she is representing?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly identified a market need and end users of the product in the US for his/her innovations - Clearly articulated the competitive advantages of his/her members / companies / scientists 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified a market need, target market and end customers but not all for his/her innovations - Valid competitive advantage statements, at least for the European market 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly identified or not identified the proper target market, market need or potential end customers for his/her innovations - Not articulated a clear competitive advantage or his/her projects

d. International Expertise and Access to capital

Is the team appropriate to help its innovations to go overseas? Does the organization have proper mentors/advisory board established to support its innovations to get funding, locally and internationally?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The organization has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International access to capital and expertise - A sound team and mentors/advisory board - An international network 		<p>The organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to capital expertise - Has some experts/mentors in global markets - Some contacts / partners internationally 		<p>The organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is understaffed or with very limited budget and connectivity

Top 20 applicants are selected (multipliers and innovators)

4. Interview

a. Marketing / Presentation

Evaluation of the “look” of the slide deck, and of the ability to present of the candidate. Is he/she the right representative of the technologies for the US market.

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly articulated his/her project in English - Clearly demonstrated his/her interest to learn about the US market - Respected the 15 min presentation, and was clear, to the point in his/her answers to the questions/comments - A clear Slide Deck, easy to follow 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Articulated most of the points in the slide deck - Respected the 15 min presentation, and was able to answers the questions/comments - Only minor changes /improvement in the slide deck will be needed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly presenter his/her technology or articulated enthusiasm - Has to redo his/her slide deck - Could not respect a 15 min presentation or does not have the English level required

b. Pipeline / Network / Technologies

Did the participant clearly present his/her organizations and pipeline of innovative projects that could interest US investments?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly presented his/her organization, ecosystem and international network - Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right innovations / projects for the US market 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A strong local and national ecosystem - Demonstrated that his/her projects may have some potential in the US 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poorly showed the impact of his/her organization in the community - Could do share success stories

c. Commitment and Resources

Has the participant/team already initiated relationships for the projects advancement overseas? Did the participant show a clear effort in the input quality and thorough completion of the application? Are the next steps and budget to support transatlantic ventures well defined (next trip to the US with a delegation, invitation of US experts to country of origin, ...)

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A complete application that contains appropriate detailed descriptions and strategies - A defined international roadmap that can be met with resources proposed - The process to share and follow up with the contacts met and what he/she has learnt 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has demonstrated thoughts and commitment towards future international collaboration - Some next steps planned for his/her members / entrepreneurs / scientists to share his/her experience and contacts 		<p>The applicant did not complete multiple sections of the application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not have a good idea of his/her next transatlantic event - Does not have a structured plan to share his/her experience / contacts met in the US

d. Overall

What is your overall impression of the organization, its members/technologies/scientists and ability to turn them into successful transatlantic companies? How well does this applicant align with NearUS goals and/or can utilize the NearUS program? Is the pitch deck ready to be presented?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly presented his/her organization - Clearly presented the transatlantic needs of his/her members / companies / scientists - Needs a presence in the US and NearUS resources to succeed 		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with immediate opportunities in the US 		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not have a clear grasp of his/her members / companies / scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

Top 10 applicants are selected (multipliers and innovators)