2017 NearUS Application
Evaluation Process
Match&Pitch – category Research Organization

1. Eligibility Check

- Part of the target group ☐ Yes ☐ No
    1. Representatives of a Research Organization looking for market opportunities and funding for a limited portfolio of "hot" R&D projects.

- Based in EU Member States or H2020 Associated Countries ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (B2B2C)Industry focused in ICT and/or ICT convergence, with B2C or B2B2C applications for the technologies presented ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Be able to demonstrate a working prototype or V1 ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Have registered Intellectual Property or are registering IPs ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Able to write in English ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Word count is respected ☐ Yes ☐ No

- Pitch deck uploaded ☐ Yes ☐ No

Application eligible if <u>ALL</u> 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
The applicant has: - 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		The applicant has: - Understood the service offered - Articulated some needs and objectives, but not specifically - Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed		The applicant has: - Poorly understood the service offered - Not articulated clear needs and objectives

b. **Technology and knowledge of the US opportunities** (question 2)

Readiness of the technologies (data, working prototype, data, adaptability of the technology) and opportunities perceived in the US (target market) for his/her projects/members.

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated how his/her technologies are ready to be presented - Clearly articulated the IP approach for each of them - Clearly defined the US target market(s) or niche market(s) - Clearly understood the needs in the US and defined the opportunities		The applicant has: - Clearly explained the technologies but they are partially ready to be presented - Identified market needs, target market and end US customers but not all - Planned the IP approach or implemented some support for his/her scientists		The applicant has: - Technologies not ready to be presented - Not articulated a clear market for the innovations - No IP plan or cannot protect or license the innovation

c. **Motivation** (question 3)

Evaluation of the motivation of the candidate to pursue the long-term success for his/her researchers in the US? Is he/she the right representative for the US market.

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated his/her motivation - Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right profile to pitch the technologies. - The control / power to support the projects in the long term		The applicant has: - Articulated some of his/her motivation - Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed - Some control / power to influence the projects or his/her organization in the short to mid-term		The applicant has: - Poorly showed his/her motivation or articulated enthusiasm or ability to pitch - No control / power to influence the projects or his/her organization in the short to mid-term

d. **Overall** (after review of the 3 answers <u>AND</u> the pitch deck)

What is your overall impression of the organization, its 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
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated needs - A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs - Strong technical competitive edges - Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists		The applicant has: - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US		The applicant: - Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

3. Pitch Deck Review

a. Overall

What is your overall impression of the organization, its 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
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated needs - A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs - Strong technical competitive edges - Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists		The applicant has: - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US		The applicant: - Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

b. Technology

Is the organization representing and supporting truly innovative projects with technologies that have been implemented in a demonstrable, replicable setting (prototype or V1 ready)?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 – Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
The participant has: - 2 examples of innovations based on breakthrough technology that are in the process to be protected, licensed and/or scalable		The participant has: - 1 example of innovation based on breakthrough technology that are in the process to be protected, licensed and/or scalable		The participant has: - Difficulty to present innovations with potential interest for the US market

c. **Commercial Potential**

Are the target markets clearly defined with a (being) proven business model? Does the applicant have a clearly defined market need and a good understanding of who will be the target customers for the innovation he/she represents? Have the technologies generated some revenues or pre-sales?

5 - Exceptional	4 - Above Average	3 - Good	2 - Fair	1 - Poor
The applicant has: - Clearly identified market needs and end users for the technologies in the US - Relevant target markets - Clearly articulated the competitive advantages of the products for customer interaction - As some revenues, pre-sales or signed sales partners or license agreements		The applicant has: - Identified a market need, target market and end customers but not all for the 2 technologies presented - A valid competitive advantage statement for both, at least for the European market - As some pre-sales, sales partners, license agreements or strong leads		The applicant has: - Poorly identified or not identified the proper target markets, market needs or potential end customers - Not articulated a clear competitive advantages for customer buy-in - No potential partners or revenues

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
The organization has: - International access to capital and expertise - A sound team and mentors/advisory board - An international network		The organization: - Access to capital expertise - Has some experts/mentors in global markets - Some contacts / partners internationally		The organization: - is understaffed or with very limited budget and connectivity

Top 20 applicants are selected (innovators, B2B and research organizations)

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
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated his/her technologies in English - Clearly demonstrated his/her interest to support their expansion in 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		The applicant has: - 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		The applicant has: - Poorly presenter his/her scientists 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
The applicant has: - Clearly presented his/her organization, ecosystem and international network - Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right innovations / projects for the US market		The applicant has: - A strong local and national ecosystem - Demonstrated that his/her technologies may have some potential in the US		The applicant has: - Poorly showed the impact of his/her organization in the community - Could do present technologies with a prototype or V1 ready

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
The applicant has: - A complete applicationthat 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		The applicant has: - Has demonstrated thoughts and commitment towards future international collaboration - Some next steps planned for his/her scientists to share his/her experience and contacts		The applicant did not complete multiple sections of the application - 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 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
The applicant has: - Clearly articulated needs - A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs - Strong technical competitive edges - Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists		The applicant has: - The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs - May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US		The applicant: - Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs - May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS

Top 10 applicants are selected (innovators, B2B and research organizations)