



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

Office of the
Chief Economist



Accelerating Commercialisation Grant Recipient Case Studies

WWW.INDUSTRY.GOV.AU/OCE



Australian Government
Department of Industry,
Innovation and Science

Office of the Chief Economist

For further information on this research paper please contact:

Evaluation Unit
Department of Industry, Innovation and Science
Email: Evaluation.Unit@industry.gov.au

Evaluators: Claire Welsh and Claire Bramwell

This evaluation project was led by Claire Welsh with supervision from Claire Bramwell in the Evaluation Unit during 2017, and drew upon interviews with businesses conducted by ORIMA consultants. Thank you to all who contributed to this evaluative case studies report.

Disclaimer

This report represents the findings of the evaluators and does not necessarily reflect those the views of the Australian Government.

© Commonwealth of Australia 2019.

This work is copyright. Apart from use under Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced or altered by any process without prior written permission from the Australian Government. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to chiefeconomist@industry.gov.au. For more information on Office of the Chief Economist research papers please access the Department's website at: www.industry.gov.au/OCE



Creative Commons Licence

With the exception of the Coat of Arms, this publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia Licence.

Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia Licence is a standard form license agreement that allows you to copy, distribute, transmit and adapt this publication provided that you attribute the work. A summary of the licence terms is available from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/deed.en>. The full licence terms are available from <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/legalcode>.

The Commonwealth's preference is that you attribute this publication (and any material sourced from it) using the following wording:

Source: Licensed from the Commonwealth of Australia under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Australia Licence. The Commonwealth of Australia does not necessarily endorse the content of this publication.

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Case studies project	5
1.3 Report Structure	5
2. Methodology	6
2.1 Case study sites	6
2.2 Limitations	6
Case study findings	8
3. What were businesses' experiences of application and delivery processes?	9
3.1 Expression of interest and application process	9
3.2 Reporting	11
3.3 Expert Network	12
3.4 Commercialisation Adviser	13
4. What outcomes occurred for the business as a result of participation in the program?	14
4.2 Ability to attract investment	15
4.3 Networks	15
4.4 Ability to commercialise and gain new skills/knowledge	16
4.5 Commercialising novel products, process and services	16
4.6 Change in the number of employees	17
5. To what extent can business outcomes be linked to participation in AC?	18
5.1 Attribution	18
5.2 Likely outcome without AC	19
5.3 Participants value the program	19
Appendix A	20

Executive Summary

Accelerating Commercialisation (AC) is part of the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science's (DIIS) Entrepreneurs' Programme (EP).¹ It aims to encourage and assist small and medium businesses, entrepreneurs and researchers to commercialise novel products, processes and services.

DIIS has developed evaluative case studies on eight AC grant recipients. The case studies form part of a broader monitoring evaluation of EP. The project commenced in June 2017 as an extension to the EP Customer Satisfaction Survey. ORIMA consultants were engaged to interview businesses and the department's Evaluation Unit completed the analysis and write up.

The population for the case studies was drawn from the first cohort of grant recipients who had been out of the program for 12 months. The businesses were removed from the customer satisfaction sample and all 11 businesses in the identified group were invited to participate in the project. Eight businesses agreed to be involved.

Business outcomes were assessed across case studies and aggregated to allow comparison. Businesses have been frank and open in their responses. Responses have been aggregated and de-identified to provide anonymity. The project findings are:

1. The application process was considered onerous and took significant time to complete. However, seven out of eight businesses felt the benefits of the grant outweighed the challenges of the application process.
2. Quarterly reporting expectations for AC were reasonable. The expectations and timeframes for reporting were well communicated by the department.
3. Commercialisation Advisers were considered professional, knowledgeable and helpful. Businesses benefited from their advisers in terms of introductions to contacts and investors, advice and general mentorship. Six businesses have maintained informal relationships with the Commercialisation Advisers beyond the end of their project.
4. The grant helped put all businesses on the path to commercialisation and helped five businesses complete the development of their product, process or service. Other businesses were able to secure patents for their technology and/or assess whether there was a market opportunity for their product overseas.
5. The grant improved businesses' ability to attract private investment and the majority of businesses gained new skills and knowledge.
6. The attribution of the business outcomes to AC has been complex. For some case studies the grant supported the whole business. For other case studies, the grant funded a specific project within the business that sat alongside other projects and activities which can be expected to have contributed to the outcomes.
7. Nevertheless, the majority of businesses would recommend AC to others and were very satisfied with the program overall. The perceived value of the program was most influenced by the quality of advice and support from advisers, alignment between adviser background and applicant business and the grant amount.

¹ EP is the government's flagship initiative for business competitiveness and productivity at the firm level. Other parts of EP are Business Management, Innovation Connections and Incubator Support.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The Accelerating Commercialisation (AC) program was introduced in November 2014 as part of the Government's Entrepreneurs' Programme (EP). AC is one of the four elements delivered under EP.² It aims to encourage and assist small and medium businesses, entrepreneurs and researchers to commercialise novel products, processes and services.

AC shares many features with the former Commercialisation Australia (CA) program which ran from 2009 to 2013 to support the commercialisation of Australian research and intellectual property. CA was delivered through four different types of grants and provided case manager advice and access to an expert network.

The AC grant provides matched funding to businesses of up to \$1 million to help lower the costs and risks of early stage (pre-revenue) commercialisation. Applicants must demonstrate a 'need for funding' by showing that they have exhausted other funding avenues. The maximum project period is two years. In addition to the funding, it provides grant recipients with access to independent Commercialisation Advisers who:

- Assess and validate participant commercialisation opportunities and needs.
- Provide guidance on business planning, investment attraction, market development, intellectual property protection and value proposition.
- Help leverage additional private sector investment.

Since AC commenced, a total of 264 grants have been offered to businesses at a value of \$133.6 million (as at 30 September 2017). Grants have been made to 168 businesses across the five Growth Sectors.³

1.2 Case studies project

The Evaluation Unit in the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science has developed case studies on eight grant recipient businesses. They provide insight on businesses' outcomes and their experiences of service offerings and delivery. They are intended to complement quantitative information from program data and provide insight into how the program works in practice. The case studies will form part of the evidence base for the two year EP monitoring evaluation scheduled for 2017–2019.

1.3 Report Structure

This report has been structured around three questions:

1. What were businesses' experiences of application and delivery processes?
2. What outcomes occurred for the business as a result of participation in the program?
3. To what extent can business outcomes be linked to participation in AC?

² The three other elements of EP are: Business Management, Incubator Support and Innovation Connections.

³ Information on Growth Sectors is available in Appendix C of the AC Customer Information Guide available on: <https://www.business.gov.au/assistance/accelerating-commercialisation>

2. Methodology

The case studies were developed as an extension of the ORIMA customer satisfaction survey which was completed in June 2017. ORIMA consultants conducted one hour face-to-face interviews with the CEO/director/founder from each of the eight businesses in July/August 2017.

Interview questions were drafted by the department and supplemented by additional questions from the ORIMA customer satisfaction survey.⁴ The business responses were fed back into the customer satisfaction survey results which were presented to the department in August 2017 by ORIMA. Interview transcripts, recordings and notes were shared with the Evaluation Unit for coding and analysis.

Business outcomes were assessed across case studies and aggregated to allow comparison. Businesses have been frank and open in their responses. Comments made about Commercialisation Advisers and the application/reporting process have been aggregated and de-identified to provide anonymity.

2.1 Case study sites

The population for the case studies was drawn from the first cohort of grant recipients who had been out of the program for 12 months. The businesses were removed from the customer satisfaction sample and all 11 businesses in the identified group were invited to participate in the project. Eight businesses agreed to be involved.

The case study 'sites' represent a range of business types, industries, experiences and project aims. Future evaluators should consider alternative sampling methodologies and may select cases according to the project aims, adviser experience, grant amounts and industry sectors.

2.2 Limitations

Limitations to the AC case studies project are:

- Data has been collected through one round of one hour interviews with one business representative. They only provided insight into that business's experiences and to some extent relied on the interviewees' recollection.
- As recipients of grants, businesses' outcome reporting may be positively skewed. However, one business was unhappy with their Commercialisation Adviser. This may result in the business underestimating the contribution of AC to their reported outcomes.
- The studies do not provide data on turnover, revenue or capital. They were limited by the type of information businesses were able to provide in one hour. Some interviewees were uncomfortable estimating

⁴ Interview questions are included in Appendix A

the percentage of total funding/investment AC represented, and a couple paused the interview to search for data. The case studies show that not all grant recipients were experienced business owners and as the businesses have grown, individuals' roles in the business change. For example, one business used the grant to employ an experienced executive and at this point the founders' role 'transferred from being the boss to being a director and a subordinate employee – executive director'. The founder was not necessarily able to provide detailed, accurate information on changes in revenue and capital over a three year period in a one hour interview without reference materials. Alternative data collection methodologies should be prioritised to collect accurate pre, during and post grant data.

- Due to resourcing and time constraints, it has not been possible to conduct second interviews with businesses to probe or clarify their responses.

Case study findings

- The AC application process was considered onerous and took significant time to complete. However, seven out of eight businesses felt the benefits of the grant outweighed the challenges of the application process.
- Quarterly reporting expectations for AC were reasonable. The expectations and timeframes for reporting were well communicated by the department.
- Commercialisation Advisers were considered professional, knowledgeable and helpful. Businesses benefited from their advisers in terms of introductions to contacts and investors, advice and general mentorship. Six businesses have maintained informal relationships with the advisers after the end of their project.
- AC funded projects set and achieved different aims. Of the eight businesses, two hired experienced executives; four made their first sales; and one proved the commercial viability of their product.
- The grant helped put all businesses on the path to commercialisation and helped five businesses complete development of the product, process or service. Other businesses were able to secure patents for their technology and/or assess whether there was a market opportunity for their product overseas.
- The grant improved businesses' ability to attract private investment and the majority of businesses gained new skills and knowledge.
- Attribution of the business outcomes to AC is difficult. For some case studies the grant supported the whole business, while for others, the grant funded a specific project within the business that sat alongside other projects and activities which can be expected to have contributed to the outcomes.
- Nevertheless, the majority of businesses would recommend AC to others and were very satisfied overall. The perceived value of the program was most influenced by the quality of advice and support from the Commercialisation Advisers, alignment between adviser background and applicant business, and the grant amount.

3. What were businesses' experiences of application and delivery processes?

3.1 Expression of interest and application process

Businesses unanimously agreed that the expression of interest process was straightforward and easy.⁵ However, seven out of eight businesses described the application process as 'onerous' or 'hard work'. There were four main factors that contributed to businesses' assessment of the application process: the time it took to complete, the format, the level of guidance about how to complete the application form, and the businesses' experience with government grants.

Time

The length of time businesses spent on the application form was a recurring theme across the case studies. Business estimates varied from two days to three months, with four businesses reporting it took them over 80 hours to complete the application.

It was a significantly onerous path that took me out of the business for six weeks straight and that was damaging for a team of four. Losing about 25% of business resources is difficult.

Two businesses did not provide any indication of time, but both felt that it had been a time-consuming process.

There is an awful lot of heavy lifting for the application form.

Businesses also suggested the format and lack of guidance contributed to the length of time it took them to complete the application. Two business commented that they felt they needed a consultant to write the submission if they wanted to give their application the best chance of success, while a third business acknowledged the cost of a consultant was prohibitive for resource-poor businesses.

⁵ The expression of interest is the first step in the two-step application process. Businesses who lodge an expression of interest (EOI) with the department may receive: feedback on their eligibility for the grant; referral to other Federal, State and Territory Government programs; referral to other Entrepreneurs' Programme services (such as Business Management or Innovation Connections); guidance and feedback on their commercialisation activities; guidance on the application process for AC.

Format

Businesses provided the following feedback on the format of the application:

The application form itself was quite hard work... There were limitations on what you can actually do with the forms that made it hard to pull in external things that we already have.

The Excel file was very unwieldy...the calculator template was clunky and did not work well.

One business suggested that the application form had a heavy focus on text and described the process as 'like writing essays'. The business also suggested that the format was traditional and 'did not align with the way business plans are delivered today'.

Business plans are usually delivered as a discussion around a PowerPoint. I'm not saying that [writing] shouldn't have been there, but...it's kind of a burden.

Guidance

Another business suggested they could have completed the paperwork in two-thirds of the time if the application form/instructions had been clearer. Businesses expressed uncertainty around:

- The information requirements (in terms of both the nature and extent of information required)
- The steps in the application process
- The timing of committee meetings to assess submissions⁶
- The degree to which the business would be accountable for achieving their listed milestones if the project evolved in a different way.

Support from Commercialisation Advisers and the department

Some businesses received assistance from their advisers at the application stage. Three businesses had existing relationships with their adviser through previous grants or recent introductions. One business mentioned the support from their AusIndustry customer service manager:

[Our customer service manager] could relate to our business's problems, but also knew the government side. They would say, "Well, I think the best way to – what you're after describing in business language, here's the way to put into grant language". [They were] a good translator in the middle. They were just encouraging and provided affirmation to get the thing done.

⁶ Businesses were unsure of deadlines for submitting their application forms. One business noted that they had missed a committee meeting deadline for submissions by one week and had to wait eight weeks before their signed off documentation could go to the committee for review and approval.

Businesses suggested:

- Moving the application online to make it more efficient
- Developing a checklist for the application process
- Developing more guidance to accompany the application forms/ templates
- Providing a calendar of committee meetings to assess submissions
- Providing more explicit guidance on the expected time investment needed for the full application process

Business's experiences

Two businesses acknowledged that their difficulties with the application process were partly due to inexperience and unfamiliarity with government grants. For example, one business acknowledged that they had struggled with the language in the grant application and felt that it had taken them a significant amount of time to complete as they had to learn the 'jargon of business'. A second business acknowledged that they struggled to present their project 'the right way'.

We naturally pitch it to people like ourselves, but it's being looked at from an Australian government perspective in terms of what sort of benefits would be derived from it. So it's often hard for us to keep that in mind when we're thinking about commercial and technological benefits we would be achieving rather than high-level governmental benefits.

Two businesses reflected that although they thought the application process was onerous, in hindsight, compared to other government grants they had received, the process was also reasonable.

Now that I've gone through it and been involved in other programs, the application relative to other programs isn't that bad.

3.2 Reporting

Financial milestone reporting for AC occurred on a quarterly basis. All eight businesses appreciated that it was a necessary requirement and felt it was a reasonable expectation. The majority of businesses found the reporting straightforward. In contrast to the application process, one business noted that the reporting requirements and expectations were made clear by the department who 'did a great job of telling [them]: this is what we need, these are the dates we need it by...the form you fill out, this is the way you do it'.

Four businesses discussed the challenges with the Excel document. Two businesses suggested the reporting framework was rigid and inefficient.

The spreadsheet macros did not work and was not intuitive to complete...the Excel template was not user friendly.

Another business discussed the challenge of retrospectively fitting their accounting data into the reporting template. They noted there were times when

the accounts did not match up correctly and they were not able to correct the templates.

Two business commented that the reporting was challenging because of the distinction between the project expenditure and the businesses' expenditure as a whole. One business provided an example to illustrate the gap between the AC project and the whole of business data.

Once we set up the accounting in Xero, every time we put in a new thing, you have to answer not just where it is in the company accounting system, but where is it in AC's view of the accounting system. How is it categorised? Basically categorises it in two different ways – what's the AC categorisation versus the standard business accounting one?

Businesses suggested:

- Developing guidance on how best to manage grant vs non-grant expenditure during the project.
- Providing advice on how to configure Xero and other accounting software to efficiently manage project reporting and expenditure.

3.3 Expert Network⁷

Six of the businesses mentioned the Expert Network in their feedback. Two noted that they appreciated being part of the network and had found a long-term mentor through the network who they continued to catch up with on a regular basis.

The Expert Network was helpful in making introductions to potential business partners.

The remaining four businesses were more ambivalent about the benefit and/or format of the network.

It was unclear what the purpose of the network was.

It was interesting on a personal level to learn about other people's projects and entrepreneurship in Australia but it was difficult for our business to get any use out of the network.

Three of the businesses wanted more formalised peer mentoring through the network and suggested more regular events. As far as one business was aware, there had only been one event in the last 12 months.

⁷ The Expert Network is intended to provide a group of experienced people who assist businesses to make connections and create capital raising and market entry opportunities. Members of the Expert Network include successful entrepreneurs, domain experts, professional investors and strategic corporations. They have extensive experience in management, commercialisation, capital markets and business development. Members offer knowledge, skills, insights and links to help bring novel product, process or service to market. The network is designed to complement the Commercialisation Advisers support and provide a growing resource to help businesses access assistance/people more quickly.

3.4 Commercialisation Adviser⁸

The majority of businesses provided positive feedback about their advisers and described them as knowledgeable, hardworking and helpful. Only one business was very dissatisfied with their adviser and felt they had been disadvantaged as a result.⁹

As previously discussed, some advisers provided assistance at the application phase. One business acknowledged that their adviser support increased after the grant was awarded.

I think we had a couple of rounds of feedback through the application process and the adviser was very specific and very helpful with suggesting changes...Once we got the grant we met with our adviser more frequently and it was very regular.

Businesses appreciated the hands-on approach of their advisers and most maintained regular contact. One business did not feel as though they needed a lot of support from their adviser:

I think we've probably caught up twice maybe over the next year. I think [the adviser] wanted to maybe catch up a little bit more but we didn't really need it. He was obviously busy as well, but we caught up a couple of times.

Despite the different models of support, all eight businesses (including the dissatisfied business) reported having benefited from their adviser. Advisers contributed to business outcomes by introducing businesses to useful contacts or investors.

Access to our Commercialisation Adviser's capital-raising network and other general advice on business strategy has greatly assisted the business. We are currently in the final stages of a major capital raise and this was initially based on an introduction through our Commercialisation Adviser.

Advisers also provided advice and ongoing mentorship to the majority of businesses. Six businesses have maintained ongoing, informal relationships with their advisers since the end of their grant and one business has stayed in touch with their AusIndustry customer service manager.

Three of the businesses had different advisers over the course of their projects (either through multiple grants, other businesses they were involved in or due to adviser turnover). These businesses were able to compare their advisers and agreed that they were most useful when their skills and experience aligned with the business.

Our second adviser had worked in our sector so knew our domain much, much better...they reinforced the same viewpoints and helped focus our project.

⁸ Commercialisation Advisers are independent, professional advisers with extensive experience in commercialisation. They provide guidance, assess business needs, explore alternative means for financing, guide and assist operational matters, monitor business progress and develop professional networks to assist businesses.

⁹ The business felt they received incorrect information from their adviser and were asked to provide significantly more information than required. They requested a change of adviser but were informed that they were not able to.

4. What outcomes occurred for the business as a result of participation in the program?

The AC customer information guide notes that eligible AC projects must aim to achieve at least one of the following outcomes:

1. Engage external professionals, for example to confirm the market opportunity, develop the business model, identify potential partners, develop an IP strategy, raise capital or prepare an Information Memorandum
2. Complete development of a novel product, process or service
3. Prove commercial viability of a novel product, process or service to a customer, investor or strategic partner
4. Make the first sales of the novel product, process or service in Australia or overseas
5. Engage a senior experienced executive to fill a key gap in the management team, which is essential to achievement of your commercialisation outcomes.

The table below maps the aims achieved by each of the case study businesses.

Table 5.1: Case study project aims

	Engage external professionals	Complete development	Prove commercial viability	First sales
Business 1				
Business 2	X	X	X	X
Business 3	X	X		X
Business 4		X		X
Business 5		X		X
Business 6				
Business 7	X	X		X
Business 8	X			

Source: Interviews

Expected outcomes for AC are also outlined in the Entrepreneurs' Programme Outcome Measurement Framework as:

- Participants improve their ability to attract private investment
- Participants extend their networks to accelerate their commercialisation process
- Participants improve their ability to commercialise intellectual property
- Participants commercialise novel products, processes and services.

Information about additional outcomes such as 'change in the number of employees' has also been sought in the interviews.

4.2 Ability to attract investment

A common theme across all case studies was that the grant improved businesses' ability to attract private investment. Businesses consistently reported that receiving the grant helped boost credibility among investors and enabled them to secure capital. The amount and sources of funding the businesses received were perceived to have increased due to AC.

One business reported that their main investor had 'indicated that their grant recipient status increased his comfort level'. Similar statements were made by other businesses:

Gaining the AC funding was a badge of support, the government backing definitely helped persuade investors.

100%, it [the AC grant] helps build a story and credibility, especially overseas.

Two businesses noted that while their ability to attract private investment was initially strong, the 'reputational effect' of the grant was not sustained. One business has struggled to build and maintain adequate funding for their project and a second business has closed. Both businesses acknowledged that external factors (outside of AC) have proved to be significant barriers to commercialisation, including political/market factors, and the business not achieving product-market fit.

4.3 Networks

The majority of businesses consulted have extended their networks as a result of receiving the grant, either through the adviser, the expert network or the grant funding.

The role of the adviser was most commonly credited for assisting the businesses to extend their investor and mentor networks:

The Commercialisation Adviser opened doors that we never had.

We've spoken with capital raisers, financial licence service, AFS providers through our adviser.

Two businesses extended their networks through the Expert Network group and the grant funding, which helped extend peer, investor and client networks. Three businesses used the grant funding to employ executives to whom the adviser had introduced them as business development managers and/or directors. The combination of grant funding and adviser contact helped these businesses extend their networks and leverage off contacts the new employees brought to the business.

The grant funding enabled one business to employ marketing and sales staff to help build their client networks. A second business used the grant funding to travel in order to secure international distribution networks and build contacts for the domestic market.

Two businesses noted that although they did extend their networks through the expert network and their adviser, they didn't leverage off the program as much as they could have, as they already had proactive investors and contacts and/or felt they were working in a small sector.

Only one business reported that they had not extended their networks through AC, due to the small domestic sector. They credited the Austrade Export Market Development Grants (EMDG) for facilitating networking opportunities with American companies.

4.4 Ability to commercialise and gain new skills/knowledge

The majority of businesses reported improving their ability to commercialise IP and gaining new skills and knowledge through the grant. Different aspects of the grant contributed to improved ability and skill building in different ways.

The **grant application process** forced businesses to answer questions they hadn't previously considered and expanded their knowledge about what other grants were available and what they were for. One business noted that the application process helped 'get his ducks in a row' which had positive flow-on effects for the project and product development.

The **grant funding** contributed to improved business capacity, skills and knowledge, enabling five businesses to engage and consult 'higher skill' experts. For example, one business noted that the grant had helped fund team development and capacity building to improve the team's skill set.

Overall, businesses commented that they would apply their learnings from AC to other projects and product commercialisation. For example, participation in AC helped one business learn the 'language of business'. Other businesses reported an increase in general knowledge about the product development process.

4.5 Commercialising novel products, process and services

The grant helped put all businesses on the path to commercialisation. Businesses reported that the grant enabled them to:

- Manufacture the hardware for their product
- Bring technology to market and put it into the hands of more people than expected
- Pivot to a higher security product offering
- Develop a final version product and progress development on a second product
- Outsource web-development to improve their product
- Secure patents for their technology
- Assess whether there was a market opportunity for the product overseas.

4.6 Change in the number of employees

All but one business reported a change in number of employees. Change varied from a modest increase of one additional employee to a significant increase of 10+ employees.

Three businesses attributed a modest increase in employees to the grant. One noted that although they had only increased the number of employees by one, the grant assisted the business to pay their employees market rates. This helped retain staff and build team capacity. One business noted a modest increase in the number of employees, but did not attribute the increase to AC.

Three businesses reported a significant increase in the number of staff. However, it was unclear whether the scale of increase in staff had occurred as a direct result of the grant or due to subsequent capital-raising efforts.

The business that reported no change in the number of employees noted that although the team had not grown, the make-up of the team had changed considerably. The grant allowed the business to pivot and change focus, initially leading to a decrease in the number of employees. Subsequently, however, it allowed the business to recruit new staff which built the staff numbers back up to the previous high.

5. To what extent can business outcomes be linked to participation in AC?

5.1 Attribution

The attribution of the business outcomes to AC is complex. For some case studies the grant has supported the whole business. For other case studies, the grant has funded a specific project within the business that has sat alongside other projects and activities. This has blurred the distinction between AC project outcomes and business outcomes as many interviewees used the terms interchangeably. This is particularly problematic for determining the increase in the number of employees for the business. For example, one interviewee noted that AC funding had allowed them to employ one additional employee but that the business as a whole had employed four additional employees separate to any contribution made by AC.

For some businesses, outcomes such as the ability to attract funding and extend their networks was clearly attributed to the grant. However, for other businesses and outcomes, the grant has contributed to a more complex story where businesses have used other government services and programs to build their success. For example, one business noted that their outcomes were:

Not specifically attributed to the (AC) program but in general, coupled with the other things we've done, the puzzle has come together...AC has been one facet of an apprenticeship for the business.

The majority of businesses interviewed received other forms of government support including from other DIIS programs, other Federal Government department programs and/or state government programs. Common sources across the case studies (in order of frequency mentioned) include:

- R&D Tax Incentive, DIIS
- Commercialisation Australia, DIIS
- Export Market Development Grants, Austrade
- Clean Technology Innovation/Investment programs, DIIS
- Innovation Connection element of the Entrepreneurs' Programme, DIIS
- Australian Renewable Energy Agency funding
- Cooperative Research Centres, DIIS
- State government grants and/or services (various).

Additional factors that were considered to have contributed to the businesses' outcomes and success included private investors/capital, perseverance, clear vision and raw tenacity.

5.2 Likely outcome without AC

Despite the challenges around attribution, three businesses suggested that their project would not have proceeded without the grant.

We wouldn't have been able to build the hardware because we wouldn't have been able to fund it.

I don't think that we'd exist right now. We've flown close to the wind and nearly failed six times.

If we hadn't received the first grant, we wouldn't have proceeded at all.

All eight businesses consistently expressed the view that without the AC assistance, the progress of their business or projects would have been much slower and at a much higher risk. One sample comment is:

Well, the product probably would've got to market regardless, but it just could've been very high risk. The money would've been very, very, very tight if not for AC, and it probably would've been a much longer slog.

5.3 Participants value the program

Only one business strongly disagreed that the benefits of the grant justified the effort required to apply. The remaining seven businesses felt the benefits of the grant outweighed the challenges of the application process.

The majority of businesses would recommend AC to others and were very satisfied overall. The perceived value of the program was most influenced by the quality of advice and support from the Commercialisation Advisers, alignment between adviser background and applicant business, and the grant amount.

Appendix A

Interview guide

1. Can you please tell us about your role in the business and the AC project?
2. Can you please provide a brief overview of your AC project?
3. What were the main reasons you applied for AC assistance?
4. Did your business receive other sources of funding? If so – what were these?
 - 4.1 What percentage of total funding/investment was from AC?
5. Did your business use other government support services? (e.g. support from DIIS, other federal departments and/or state government in the form of programs, information services, workshops, funding)?
 - 5.1 What services? Who provided them?
6. When did you stop receiving AC support? What has happened since then?
7. How did you find the administrative/delivery aspects of the program?
8. What was your experience with your Commercialisation Adviser? How much assistance did you receive from your adviser?
9. What outcomes have been achieved through your participation in the AC program?
10. Which one of these outcomes do you feel is the most significant?
11. In your view, what aspects of the program have contributed to these outcomes?
12. In your view, what other factors outside of AC have contributed to these outcomes?
13. What do you think would have been the likely outcome of your project without the AC assistance?
14. Has the AC program met your needs? Are there any other forms of support that would have assisted your project?
15. Do you think there are any aspects of the program which could be enhanced or improved?
16. Would you recommend this program to a friend or colleague who was interested in commercialising a product, business or service? Can you explain your view on this?

17. Thinking about the AC program overall, how satisfied are you with...

EOI application process (first stage) (including the information and advice available to assist you to prepare your application, the ease of completing the form etc.)?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Grant application process (second stage) (including the information and advice available to assist you to prepare your application, the ease of completing the form etc.)

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Outcome of the application (including timeliness of the application assessment and the helpfulness of the assessment feedback)

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Contract negotiation process (including the time it took to negotiate the contract and the clarity of the contact documentation outlining your rights and obligations)

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Advice / support you received from your Adviser(s) as part of the program

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Reporting process in which you are required to provide a report to the Department about the progress or end-of-project outcome

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

Thinking about all services, advice and support received, how would you rate the overall value of the AC to your business?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

To what extent do you agree that the benefits of the AC program justify the effort required to apply?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					

How likely are you to recommend participating in the program to other businesses?

Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know/ Not applicable
1	2	3	4	5	99
(if less than satisfied i.e. 3, 4, 5) Why do you say that?					