

Evaluation Sheet as part of Round no. ... Poland Prize by Accelpoint

Project details

Project name	
Applicant name	
Path	
Application date	

Formal criteria Part 1

Expert evaluating the formal part	
Evaluation date	
Result	*positive *negative

Item	Criterion	
1	The Project fits the needs of the Business Partner	
2	The Project fails to fit the needs of the Business Partner but may be interesting	

Formal criteria Part 2

Expert organisation name	
Expert evaluating the formal part	
Evaluation date	
Result	*positive *negative

Item	Criterion	Yes / No

1	The entity has operated for no more than 5 years	
2	The entity is a micro- or small enterprise	
3	The entity is unlisted	
4	The entity has not distributed (paid out) profit	
5	The entity was not established as a result of a merger	
6	The entity has no capital or personal links with the Accelerator or the Business Partner and does not remain in a legal or actual relation with them	
7	The entity holds exclusive rights to the product/service submitted for the program	
8	The entity faces no economic difficulty	
9	At least 50% + 1 share of the Entity and at least 1 post in the Entity's Management Board are held by foreign natural persons	
Results of the formal evaluation (positive/negative)		

Instruction for the formal evaluation:

The formal evaluation is carried out in two stages of evaluation and performed by the Accelpoint experts.

Part 1. of the formal evaluation

As part of Part 1. of the formal evaluation the evaluator verifies whether the project fits the demand defined by the Business Partner.

If the evaluator finds that the project fits the defined needs of the Business Partner, he/she refers the project for the content-related evaluation.

If the evaluator finds that the project fails to fit the defined needs of the Business Partner but may be interesting, he/she refers the project for the content-related evaluation and notifies the Business Partner, indicating the potential of the project.

If the evaluator finds that the project fails to fit the defined needs of the Business Partner, he/she rejects the project and notifies the startup on the evaluation result.



Rzeczpospolita
Polska



Unia Europejska
Europejski Fundusz
Rozwoju Regionalnego



Part 2. of the formal evaluation

The application may be evaluated positively at the final stage of the formal evaluation provided that each criterion of the formal evaluation is met. Part 2. is carried out prior to execution of the grant agreement. The formal criteria of Part 2. must remain up-to-date and satisfied also on the date of execution of the grant agreement.

Fulfilling each criterion will be confirmed on the basis of documents presented, including appended to the agreement, prior to execution of acceleration agreements with selected projects.

Part 2 of the formal evaluation may end with a positive result only if each criterion is positively verified.

In the case of natural persons declaring formation of a company, criteria 1, 3 and 5 of Part 2. of the formal evaluation are deemed satisfied, while criteria 2 and 9 of Part 2. of the formal evaluation are evaluated on the basis of presented ownership and Management Board structure.

Content-related criteria

Project name	
Path	
Application date	
Expert evaluating the content-related part	
Expert organisation	

Item	Criterion	Score scale	Awarded scores
1	Fits the defined needs of the TR/Investor	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means that the project satisfies the requirements of the Business Partner to a minimum extent, and 5 – it fits the need and strategy, has the potential for implementation.			
2	Maturity of the solution (MVP or a commercialised product)	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>lack of MVP or lack of data</i> , and 5 – a commercialised product with financial traction.			
3	Sector-related experience of the team	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means lack of experience or data, and 5 – a majority of the key personnel has sector-related/technological experience in the field of the implemented project			
4	The problem the product/service solves was properly defined	1-5	
Evaluation covers the extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>lack of data or poorly</i> , and 5 – perfectly.			

5	Competition on the Polish market	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>huge competition</i> , and 5 – no competition			
6	Presentation/Pitchdeck addresses the defined needs of the TR/Investor	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>no reference</i> , and 5 – perfectly – an exemplary solution adjusted to a specific need/context of the TR/Investor was provided.			
7	The product is user-friendly	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>no data</i> , and 5 – perfect			
8	The product is scalable (locally, regionally, globally)	1-5	
Evaluation covers extent to which a criterion is satisfied ranging from 1 to 5, whereby 1 means <i>no potential</i> , and 5 – perfect – globally.			
Total score in the content-related evaluation			

Evaluation date	
Total score in the content-related evaluation	

Manual for the content-related evaluation:

The content-related evaluation is carried out by 2 Accelpoint Experts and 2 Experts assigned by the Technology Recipient/Investor (per project).

All Experts fill in the card in the scope of content-related evaluation using tools provided by the Accelerator. Upon completion of the evaluation for the relevant Acceleration Round, the Expert fills in and approves the Application summary evaluation card in all criteria evaluated thereby in the form required by the Accelerator.



Rzeczpospolita
Polska



Unia Europejska
Europejski Fundusz
Rozwoju Regionalnego



The Experts' score is averaged, and the score given to teams provide the basis for a team ranking, creating a project ranking list. For a pitch session a list of 25% highest scored projects is recommended, which are later evaluated by the Evaluation Committee during the pitch session. In the case of equal scores, all teams which are ranked among 25% highest scored projects are invited to the pitch session. The score granted in the content-related evaluation is designed to select projects for a pitch session, and the number of given scores does not determine the decision of the Evaluation Committee.

Projects ranked among top 25% which were not accepted by the Evaluation Committee are included in the reserve list.

The Evaluation Committee decides how many projects within a given round will launch acceleration and selects projects on the basis of a majority voting after the pitch session. The Evaluation Committee takes decision on the basis of the pitch session and is not bound by the scoring granted during the content-related evaluation.