

ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES - SUPPORT TO COMPANY BUILDER FOCUSED ON BIOTECHNOLOGY

Basic guidelines for the assessment of Projects are presented below. For each item and sub-item, a series of guiding questions are presented for conducting the assessment. Even though these questions constitute the basis of the assessment, this does not exclude that the qualification of each item or sub-item incorporates or relies on other aspects that the evaluator considers relevant, and these must be made explicit in each case. Likewise, it may not always be possible to answer all of the guiding questions in every case.

1. EXECUTIVE TEAM

Profile and skills of the executive team are assessed. In particular, their background in generating new ventures with a focus on biotechnology, their profiles and trajectory, the proposal in terms of team structure, and their dedication to the project.

(Weighting 20%)

1.1 – Profile and skills of the Executive Team (100%)

- Will the executive team be based in Uruguay?
- Is the executive team capable of carrying out the project? Are the capabilities and the division of roles complementary?
- Do their different members have prior backgrounds in managing company building processes and/or specific knowledge about company building programs and/or private investment?
- Do they have specific experience and knowledge linked to the national and regional research ecosystem focusing on biotechnology?
- Is the declared commitment adequate for the project's development?
- Is the in-person participation of representatives from the central organization considered in the company building process?
- Do they have alliances with third parties or internal resources that ensure access to: legal services, intellectual property advice, communication, administrative, and technical support?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

2. BACKGROUND AND SUCCESS CASES IN COMPANY BUILDING PROCESSES

The background of the applicant organization is assessed. Specifically, the history of supporting the creation of biotechnology-focused ventures, as well as their establishment and subsequent growth; the financial, managerial, and technical capacity to follow up on ventures under these conditions, as well as the existence of demonstrable success cases associated with company building processes.

In the case of a proposal submitted in the form of a consortium of two or more organizations, the complementarity of capabilities that enhance the value proposition will also be assessed. Previous experience of collaborative work will be valued.

(Weighting 20%)

2.1 - Background and success cases(100%)

- Is the proposed organizational structure suitable for the success and impact of the project?
- Do they have experience in generating new ventures with a focus on biotechnology?
- Do they have relevant success cases associated with company building programs?
- In the case of a consortium application, is there complementarity in capabilities that enhance the value proposition? Do the involved organizations have previous experience of collaborative work?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

3. SUPPORT METHODOLOGY AND NETWORK OF MENTORS

The methodology for the recruitment, support and follow-up of applicants, its differential characteristics, its component services, conditions for potential ventures to go through the stages of the process and their outcomes are assessed. The organization's possible specializations and the skills to meet them are also assessed.

(Weighting 20%)

3.1 – Recruitment methodology, selection, support and follow-up (50%)

- Are the methodologies used to attract and select applicants in the national academic sector appropriate?
- Will they achieve the proposed number of new ventures by implementing the scheduled activities?
- Are the activities, mentorship, and training suitable for supporting the applicants? By implementing the proposed services, will the applicants achieve the expected results after going through the company building program?

4. LINKAGE WITHIN THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ECOSYSTEM AND SPILLOVER TO THE NATIONAL ECOSYSTEM

The links that the applicant organization has and/or proposes in Uruguay and the world are assessed, seeking to improve its value proposition and generate opportunities and benefits for the supported ventures.

Likewise, the level of spillover to the national ecosystem is assessed through activities and other linkage actions, with the objective of generating a significant impact on the national entrepreneurial ecosystem.

(Weighting 15%)

4.1 – Quality of international linkages (50%)

- Are there linkage networks and/or alliances within the international ecosystem (innovation, entrepreneurship, investment, academic) that can add value to the supported ventures?
- Does the proposal consider linkages that add value to Uruguay's ecosystem? Are the proposed linkages of the expected quality for the ecosystem?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

4.2 – Quality of national linkages (30%)

- Are there linkage networks and/or alliances within the national ecosystem (innovation, entrepreneurship, investment, academic) that can add value to the supported ventures?
- Are the proposed linkages of the expected quality to add value to the company building proposal?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

4.3 – Spillover activities to the ecosystem (20%)

- Is there a proposal of a schedule of linkage activities with the national entrepreneurship ecosystem?
- Is their quantity and frequency sufficient?
- Do the proposed activities have the potential to add value to the ecosystem through new knowledge, access to experts, exposure or other features?
- Does the proposal demonstrate significant impact on the national entrepreneurial ecosystem?
- Is there a clear commitment reflected in the activities, resources, compatibility of institutional strategies, to perceive that the linkages will contribute to the proposal?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

5. BUSINESS MODEL AND FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY
 The proposed business model is assessed, considering the revenue generation model and the financial sustainability of the organization.
 (Weighting 5%)

5.1 – Business Model (70%)

- Are the organization's income and expense items properly identified?
- Is the projection consistent with the organization's sustainability strategy after the end of the support?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

5.2 – Financial Sustainability Strategy (30%)

- Are sources of income diversified and working towards long-term financial sustainability?
- Is the proposed business model consistent with a strategy for financial sustainability after program support ends?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

6. INDICATORS AND OBJECTIVES PLAN
The alignment of the indicators and objectives of the proposal with the general objectives of the instrument is assessed. Likewise, the work plan and budget presented to enable the achievement of the indicators and objectives set forth are assessed.

(Weighting 5%)

6.1 – General objective and specific objectives (25%)

- Are the general objective and specific objectives correctly defined for the scope of the proposal?
-

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
6.2 – Indicators Plan (25%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ¿Existe una alineación de los indicadores propuestos con el apoyo a emprendimientos con foco en biotecnología? • ¿Son desafiantes los resultados a alcanzar? • ¿Existe coherencia entre los objetivos propuestos y los indicadores que se pretenden alcanzar? 					
SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)
6.3 – Work plan and milestones (25%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do the activities have a chronological sequence and reasonable expected times? • Do the milestones allow the assessment of results and the achievement of objectives throughout the project? As defined, do they represent significant events that are expected to occur throughout the project? • Does the work plan include a schedule of activities that will contribute to the spillover to the national venture ecosystem? 					
SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

6.4 – Budget (25%)

- Are the budgeted expenses consistent with the activities to be carried out and the indicator plan presented?
- Are the expenses eligible for project financing?
- Is there a commitment to obtain the expected results? Is this commitment reflected in the contributions to the project?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

7. PRIVATE INVESTMENT COMMITMENTS

The capacity of the applicant organization to invest in selected ventures after their passage through the support program is assessed, allowing the co-investment with the UIH to be carried out. This may be in the form of cash contributions from its own funds or commitments to contribute funds from third parties.

(Weighting 15%)

7.1 – Quality of the private investment commitments (100%)

- Does the organization demonstrate the ability to co-invest in selected ventures after their passage through the company building program?
- Does the organization have its own liquid funds and/or commitments to provide liquid funds from third parties? Is the quality of the commitments as expected?
- Does the organization or its board members have a history of making investments? Do they have relevant success stories?
- Is the proposed investment instrument in line with the objectives of this instrument?
- Are the proposed investment conditions appropriate?
- Is there a detail of the criteria for selecting the projects to be invested in? Are the criteria in line with the objectives of the program?

SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)

8. OVERALL ASSESSMENT					
8.1 – Overall Assessment					
SCORE	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)