



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 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"> <li>- Clearly understood the service offered</li> <li>- Clearly articulated his/her needs and objectives</li> <li>- Clearly demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Understood the service offered</li> <li>- Articulated some needs and objectives, but not specifically</li> <li>- Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly understood the service offered</li> <li>- Not articulated clear needs and objectives</li> </ul>

### 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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated how his/her technologies are ready to be presented</li> <li>- Clearly articulated the IP approach for each of them</li> <li>- Clearly defined the US target market(s) or niche market(s)</li> <li>- Clearly understood the needs in the US and defined the opportunities</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly explained the technologies but they are partially ready to be presented</li> <li>- Identified market needs, target market and end US customers but not all</li> <li>- Planned the IP approach or implemented some support for his/her scientists</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technologies not ready to be presented</li> <li>- Not articulated a clear market for the innovations</li> <li>- No IP plan or cannot protect or license the innovation</li> </ul>

**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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated his/her motivation</li> <li>- Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right profile to pitch the technologies.</li> <li>- The control / power to support the projects in the long term</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Articulated some of his/her motivation</li> <li>- Demonstrated that his/her needs will be met by the service proposed</li> <li>- Some control / power to influence the projects or his/her organization in the short to mid-term</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly showed his/her motivation or articulated enthusiasm or ability to pitch</li> <li>- No control / power to influence the projects or his/her organization in the short to mid-term</li> </ul>

**d. Overall (after review of the 3 answers AND 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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated needs</li> <li>- A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs</li> <li>- Strong technical competitive edges</li> <li>- Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs</li> <li>- May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs</li> <li>- May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS</li> </ul>

### 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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated needs</li> <li>- A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs</li> <li>- Strong technical competitive edges</li> <li>- Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs</li> <li>- May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs</li> <li>- May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS</li> </ul>

#### 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
<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 examples of innovations based on breakthrough technology that are in the process to be protected, licensed and/or scalable</li> </ul>		<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 example of innovation based on breakthrough technology that are in the process to be protected, licensed and/or scalable</li> </ul>		<p>The participant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficulty to present innovations with potential interest for the US market</li> </ul>

**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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly identified market needs and end users for the technologies in the US</li> <li>- Relevant target markets</li> <li>- Clearly articulated the competitive advantages of the products for customer interaction</li> <li>- As some revenues, pre-sales or signed sales partners or license agreements</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identified a market need, target market and end customers but not all for the 2 technologies presented</li> <li>- A valid competitive advantage statement for both, at least for the European market</li> <li>- As some pre-sales, sales partners, license agreements or strong leads</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly identified or not identified the proper target markets, market needs or potential end customers</li> <li>- Not articulated a clear competitive advantages for customer buy-in</li> <li>- No potential partners or revenues</li> </ul>

**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"> <li>- International access to capital and expertise</li> <li>- A sound team and mentors/advisory board</li> <li>- An international network</li> </ul>		<p>The organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to capital expertise</li> <li>- Has some experts/mentors in global markets</li> <li>- Some contacts / partners internationally</li> </ul>		<p>The organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- is understaffed or with very limited budget and connectivity</li> </ul>

**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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated his/her technologies in English</li> <li>- Clearly demonstrated his/her interest to support their expansion in the US market</li> <li>- Respected the 15 min presentation, and was clear, to the point in his/her answers to the questions/comments</li> <li>- A clear Slide Deck, easy to follow</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Articulated most of the points in the slide deck</li> <li>- Respected the 15 min presentation, and was able to answers the questions/comments</li> <li>- Only minor changes /improvement in the slide deck will be needed</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly presenter his/her scientists or articulated enthusiasm</li> <li>- Has to redo his/her slide deck</li> <li>- Could not respect a 15 min presentation or does not have the English level required</li> </ul>

##### 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"> <li>- Clearly presented his/her organization, ecosystem and international network</li> <li>- Clearly demonstrated that he/she has the right innovations / projects for the US market</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A strong local and national ecosystem</li> <li>- Demonstrated that his/her technologies may have some potential in the US</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly showed the impact of his/her organization in the community</li> <li>- Could do present technologies with a prototype or V1 ready</li> </ul>

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

**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
<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clearly articulated needs</li> <li>- A well thought out technical solutions (prototype or V1) and business strategies to address that needs</li> <li>- Strong technical competitive edges</li> <li>- Presented the needs of a presence in the US and needs NearUS resources to support his/her scientists</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The potential to have successful transatlantic ventures, but has to better identify their needs</li> <li>- May not have projects with prototypes or V1 ready to present in the US</li> </ul>		<p>The applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not have a clear grasp of his scientists needs</li> <li>- May not be able to support transatlantic collaboration or utilize NearUS</li> </ul>

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