GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE VENTURE ACCELERATION PROGRAM

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. **TRACK RECORD AND ACCELERATION PROCESS SUCCESS STORIES**

**The track record of the applicant is assessed. In particular, a track record of having supported ventures in growth and acceleration stages, and its financial, managerial and technical capacity to follow up on ventures in these conditions, as well as the existence of demonstrable success stories associated with venture acceleration processes.****In the case of an application 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 working together will be positively assessed.****(Weighting 20%)** |
| **1.1 - Track record and success stories (100%)** |
| * Is the proposed organizational structure adequate for the success and impact of the project?
* Does the applicant have experience in venture acceleration processes?
* Does the applicant have relevant success stories associated with acceleration programs?
* Are the resources allocated by the organization for the implementation of the project (human, financial, physical, etc.) adequate to achieve the proposed objectives?
* In the case of an application in the form of a consortium, is there a complementarity of capabilities that enhances the value proposition? Do the organizations involved have previous experience working together?
 |
| **SCORE** | **Poor (1)** | **Fair (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **EXECUTIVE TEAM**

**Profile and skills of the executive team are assessed. In particular, track record of having accompanied ventures in growth and acceleration stages, their profiles and background, the proposal in terms of team structure and their dedication to the project.****(Weighting 20%)** |
| **2.1 – 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 its different members have previous background in the management of venture acceleration processes and/or specific knowledge about acceleration programs and/or private investment?
* Does it have specific experience and knowledge related to the national entrepreneurship ecosystem?
* Is the declared dedication adequate for the development of the project?
* Is the in-person participation of representatives of the central organization in the acceleration stages planned?
 |
| SCORE | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **3. SUPPORT METHODOLOGY AND NETWORK OF MENTORS****The methodology for the recruitment, acceleration and follow-up of ventures, its differential characteristics, its component services, the conditions of the ventures to go through the stages of the process and its results are assessed. The organization's possible specializations and the skills to meet them are also assessed.** **(Weighting 20%)** |
| **3.1 – Recruitment methodology, selection, acceleration and follow-up (50%)** |
| * Are the methodologies used to capture and select ventures in growth and acceleration stages adequate?
* Will the execution of the programmed activities achieve the proposed coverage and number of ventures?
* Are the activities, mentoring and training adequate to accompany the ventures? By implementing the proposed services, will these ventures achieve the expected results after their passage through the acceleration program?
* Do they have the capacity to execute the different methodological elements at the level required by the projects? Is the methodological approach robust and well supported?
* Are the specialization or focus areas specified in the proposal? Are they in line with UIH’s prioritized areas?
* Do they value the impact of ventures?
 |
| **SCORE** | **Poor (1)** | **Fair (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  **3.2 – Quality of the network of ventures (50%)** |
| * Is there a network of recognized mentors, made up of experts from different verticals, that can add value to the supported ventures?
* Is the quality of the mentoring network as expected for the ecosystem?
* Is the time dedicated by the mentors to accompany the supported ventures as expected? Are the mentoring instances sufficient?
* Is there consistency between the proposed activities and the value that mentors can add?
 |
| **SCORE** | **Poor (1)** | **Fair (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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 (60%)** |
| * 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?
* Is there consistency between the proposed activities and the value that linkages can add?
* 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **4.2 – Quality of national linkages (20%)** |
| * 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 acceleration proposal?
* 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **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?
 |
| SCORE | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **5. PRIVATE INVESTMENT COMMITMENTS****The capacity of the proposing organization to invest in selected ventures after their passage through the acceleration 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%)** |
| **5.1 – Quality of the private investment commitments (100%)** |
| * Does the organization demonstrate the ability to co-invest in selected ventures after their passage through the acceleration 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?
* 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) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **6. 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%)** |
|  **6.1 – 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?
 |
| **6.2 – 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **7. PLAN OF INDICATORS AND OBJECTIVES****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%)** |
| **7.1 – 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **7.2 – Plan of indicators (25%)** |
| * Is there an alignment of the proposed indicators with the support to dynamic ventures in growth and acceleration stages?
* Are the results to be achieved challenging?
* Is there consistency between the proposed objectives and the indicators to be achieved?
 |
| SCORE | Poor (1) | Fair (2) | Good (3) | Very Good (4) | Excellent (5) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **7.3 – Work plan and milestones (25%)** |
| * 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **7.4 – 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)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| **8. OVERALL ASSESSMENT** |
| **8.1 – Overall Assessment** |
| **SCORE** | **Poor (1)** | **Fair (2)** | **Good (3)** | **Very Good (4)** | **Excellent (5)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |