

# Evaluation Sheet

🕒 Read Time: 15 m

---

## Introduction to the ICO Evaluation Framework

### Overview of the Evaluation System

This framework introduces a systematic approach to assessing the viability and potential of Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) through a detailed scoring system. Designed to guide users through a structured evaluation process, it helps uncover the strengths and weaknesses of different ICO projects.

### Application-Driven Evaluation

The evaluation will be facilitated by a smart application, developed in Rust, with a user-friendly interface. This application will automate a scoring and weighting process, ensuring a streamlined and consistent evaluation experience returning a vast array of information into a single document that, will provide a clear and defined picture of the situation.

### Scoring System

The evaluation is based on a series of ratings ranging from -5 to +5, where:

- **-5** indicates that an aspect of the ICO is extremely inadequate, suggesting significant concerns or risks.
- **0** represents a neutral stance, indicating that the aspect meets basic expectations without significant strengths or weaknesses.
- **+5** signifies that an aspect is excellent, demonstrating outstanding qualities or advantages that significantly enhance the ICO's appeal.

### Macro Areas of Evaluation

The system categorizes ICO characteristics into six major areas, each containing specific elements to be evaluated:

1. **Idea**: Evaluates the novelty, necessity, and economic impact of the ICO's core concept.
2. **Technology**: Assesses the technical feasibility, innovation, and scalability of the technology used.
3. **Blockchain Specifics**: Examines the choice of blockchain, token economics, and alignment with project needs.
4. **Team**: Reviews the experience, expertise, and reliability of the team behind the ICO.
5. **Execution**: Considers the operational strategy, legal compliance, and financial planning of the ICO.
6. **Market Potential**: Analyzes the market demand, competition, and growth potential of the ICO.

## Weighting System

Each macro area carries a different weight, reflecting its relative importance in the overall evaluation of an ICO. Users can assign multipliers to each macro area based on their individual assessment priorities, with values ranging from 1 to 3:

- A multiplier of **1** suggests standard importance.
- A multiplier of **2** indicates increased importance.
- A multiplier of **3** denotes critical importance.

These multipliers are used to adjust the impact of each macro area's score on the overall evaluation, allowing for a customized and prioritized assessment that aligns with the user's strategic investment criteria.

## Purpose of the Framework

This evaluation framework is intended to provide investors, analysts, and enthusiasts with a comprehensive tool to assess ICOs systematically.

**This type of scoring is crucial for the following reasons:**

**Quantifies the Decision:** It transforms subjective impressions and qualitative assessments into an objective number that can be easily compared and analyzed.

**Guides Investors:** It provides a clear foundation upon which investors can base their decisions, especially in a complex field like cryptocurrencies and ICOs, where the amount of information can be overwhelming.

**Standardizes Evaluations:** It creates a standardized method for assessing different ICOs, making it easier for investors to compare various investment opportunities based on consistent metrics.

Therefore, this type of scoring system not only helps simplify the decision-making process but also contributes to reducing uncertainty and providing greater clarity, making the ICO investment evaluation process more transparent.

# IDEA

---

## Question 1

Is it a game changer?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The problem the ICO attempts to solve is irrelevant or has a negligible economic impact. There is no evidence of a real market need or economic benefits derived from the proposed solution

**0**

### Neutral

The problem has some economic impact, but is not central or critical. Sufficiently effective solutions already exist, and the proposal does not offer significant improvements over these.

**+5**

### Excellent

The problem addressed is of great economic significance. The proposed solution has the potential to transform the market, offering significant benefits and improvements over existing solutions.

## Question 2

Is there a market?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The problem the ICO tries to solve does not exist or is artificially created to justify the project. There are no signs of real need or market demand.

**0**

### Neutral

The problem exists but is marginal, with limited market attention. The solution may attract some interest, but it is unclear whether the market will evolve to support this initiative.

**+5**

### Excellent

The problem is well recognized and widely discussed in the market, with a clear demand for better or innovative solutions. The ICO offers a solution that directly addresses this existing need, promising high potential for adoption.

## Question 3

Is there a middle layer resistance?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The ICO aims to disrupt a market layer where intermediaries are not a significant factor or where the resistance from existing players is almost guaranteed to prevent adoption.

**0**

### Neutral

There is a moderate layer of intermediaries, and while some resistance is expected, it is not clear how significant this will be or if the proposed solution can overcome it.

**+5**

### Excellent

The problem involves a thick layer of middle people, with the proposed ICO solution providing a clear, effective, and economically advantageous alternative that could significantly reduce costs or improve service, despite potential resistance.

## Question 4

Is the advantage enough to be profitable?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The product offers no clear advantages over existing solutions or the advantages are not sufficient to justify a profitable business model.

0

### Neutral

The product has some advantages, but they are not overwhelmingly compelling or it is uncertain whether these advantages can be monetized effectively in the current market.

+5

### Excellent

The product offers substantial and unique advantages that clearly surpass existing solutions and are likely to result in significant profitability due to market demand and superior performance.

## Question 5

Is the idea social, having scalability properties?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The idea requires widespread adoption to be successful but has little appeal or relevance to a broad audience, making large scale adoption highly unlikely.

0

### Neutral

The idea has potential for large scale adoption, but this is dependent on factors such as market trends or additional innovations that are not yet guaranteed.

+5

### Excellent

The idea inherently requires and facilitates large scale adoption, with strong appeal to a broad market segment, making it highly likely to achieve the necessary scale for success.

# TECHNOLOGY

---

## Question 1

Is there a white paper?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

No white paper exists. There is no technical documentation explaining or supporting the project, or the documentation available is completely inadequate or incomprehensible.

0

### Neutral

A white paper exists but it is superficial, lacking crucial technical details, or not written by the development team, raising concerns about their direct technical competence or involvement in the project.

+5

### Excellent

The white paper is detailed, clearly written by the development team with in-depth technical explanations. It demonstrates a thorough understanding of the problem to be solved and the technologies employed.

## Question 2

Is there a better technical solution?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

There are readily available and significantly superior technical solutions that address the same problem more effectively, making the proposed technology redundant or obsolete.

0

### Neutral

There are other solutions that are comparable in effectiveness; however, the proposed technology has some differentiating features that could provide marginal benefits.

+5

### Excellent

The proposed technology is clearly superior to existing solutions, offering significant improvements in efficiency, cost, or other key metrics that address the problem uniquely and effectively.

## Question 3

Is blockchain technology necessary (or even efficient) to solve the problem?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The use of blockchain is unnecessary for the problem at hand and introduces complexity without clear benefits, or simpler, more efficient technologies could achieve better outcomes.

0

### Neutral

Blockchain could provide some benefits for the problem, but it's not clear if these outweigh the complexities or costs involved compared to other technologies.

+5

### Excellent

Blockchain is integral to the solution, offering unique advantages such as decentralization, security, or transparency that are critical for solving the problem effectively.

## Question 4

Is the solution feasible today or does it rely on future events?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The solution relies on unproven or undeveloped technology and its success is contingent on technological advancements that are not currently available.

0

### Neutral

The solution is feasible with today's technology, but its optimal performance and success depend on enhancements or developments that are likely but not guaranteed in the near future.

+5

### Excellent

The solution is fully feasible with current technology and does not depend on uncertain future developments to be successful. It is ready to be implemented and scaled.

# BLOCKCHAIN SPECIFICS

---

## Question 1

Is this a coin or a token? Is this choice appropriate?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The project uses a token when a coin is necessary for operational independence, or vice versa, which significantly undermines its functionality or regulatory compliance.

**0**

### Neutral

The choice between a coin and a token neither significantly benefits nor detracts from the project's goals; it is functional but not optimal.

**+5**

### Excellent

The decision to use a coin or a token is perfectly aligned with the project's needs, enhancing functionality and regulatory posture.

## Question 2

Could it use other Blockchains?(does it need its own coin?)

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The project creates a new coin when existing solutions like ETH or BTC would meet its needs, leading to unnecessary complexity and fragmentation.

**0**

### Neutral

The project could potentially leverage existing cryptocurrencies like ETH or BTC but opts for a new coin for slight improvements or specific features.

**+5**

### Excellent

The project justifiably requires its own coin to offer unique features or functionalities not provided by existing cryptocurrencies.

## Question 3

What type of blockchain underlies the ICO - public or private? Is the type of blockchain appropriate to solve the problem?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The choice of blockchain type is misaligned with the project's needs, such as using a private blockchain when transparency is critical.

**0**

### Neutral

The blockchain type generally fits the project's requirements but may not fully leverage the potential benefits of the selected technology.

**+5**

### Excellent

The type of blockchain (public or private) is ideally suited to the project's specific requirements, maximizing efficiency and effectiveness.

## Question 4

If a token, what kind of token, ERC-20, ERC-721; is this a utility token?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The type of token chosen does not fit the functional requirements of the project, such as using a utility token when a security token is needed.

**0**

### Neutral

The token type adequately supports the project's basic requirements but does not fully exploit the capabilities of blockchain technology.

**+5**

### Excellent

The token type, such as ERC-20 or ERC-721, is perfectly chosen to match the project's goals, providing clear functional benefits.

## Question 5

If a coin, what is the monetary policy? What are the incentives to run nodes? What will the distribution look like (how much does management/owners keep)?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The monetary policy is poorly designed, heavily favoring early investors or founders, which may lead to trust issues and centralization.

**0**

### Neutral

The monetary policy and incentives are standard and do not particularly encourage or discourage participation beyond basic levels.

**+5**

### Excellent

The monetary policy is transparent and equitable, with incentives that encourage robust participation and long-term network health.

## Question 6

If permissioned, what are the security protocols for the nodes?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The security protocols are inadequate, exposing the permissioned blockchain to significant risks of attack or failure.

**0**

### Neutral

The security protocols meet industry standards but do not exceed them, providing basic protection.

**+5**

### Excellent

The security protocols are exceptionally robust, tailored to the specific needs of a permissioned blockchain, ensuring high levels of integrity and trust.



# TEAM

---

## Question 1

What is the experience of the management team? Do they have a track record in launching a business?

-5

**Extremely Inadequate**

The management team lacks relevant experience and has no proven track record in business or the specific industry, posing significant risks to the project's success.

0

**Neutral**

The management team has limited experience in the industry or in launching businesses, but possesses some relevant skills that could contribute to the project.

+5

**Excellent**

The management team has a strong track record in launching and managing successful businesses, particularly in related industries, demonstrating strong capability to lead the project to success.

## Question 2

Does management understand blockchain technology?

-5

**Extremely Inadequate**

The management completely lacks understanding of blockchain technology, which is critical to the project's core operations.

0

**Neutral**

The management has a basic understanding of blockchain technology sufficient to operate in the field but lacks deep technical expertise.

+5

**Excellent**

The management has extensive knowledge and understanding of blockchain technology, ensuring innovative and efficient use of blockchain in the project.

## Question 3

Does management have the technical expertise to design the blockchain technology?

-5

**Extremely Inadequate**

There is a significant lack of technical expertise within the management team, which could hinder the technical development and implementation of the project.

0

**Neutral**

The management has general technical expertise but may need to rely on additional experts or consultants for blockchain-specific development

+5

**Excellent**

The management team includes individuals with high-level technical expertise specifically in blockchain, capable of leading sophisticated project developments.

## Question 4

Is the development team in place?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

No development team is in place, which severely threatens the project's progress and successful delivery.

**0**

### Neutral

The development team is partially assembled, but missing critical roles that are necessary for project completion.

**+5**

### Excellent

A fully equipped development team with all necessary roles filled is in place, well-prepared to meet the project's technical demands.

## Question 5

Is there key-person risk?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The project heavily relies on one or a few key individuals, whose absence could derail the entire initiative.

**0**

### Neutral

There are a few key personnel the project depends on, but there are contingency plans in place to mitigate potential impacts.

**+5**

### Excellent

The project's success does not depend on any single individual; responsibilities and knowledge are well-distributed across the team.

## Question 6

Are there advisors and who are they?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The project lacks advisors, or the advisors involved have questionable reputations or no relevant experience, which could impact credibility and guidance.

**0**

### Neutral

The project has advisors with general experience, though not specifically tailored to the project's unique needs.

**+5**

### Excellent

The advisors are well-respected industry experts with direct experience and success in areas critical to the project's success.

## Question 7

Are there any red flags arising from marketing materials that may be exaggerated or even deceptive?  
Are they hyping?

**-5**

### **Extremely Inadequate**

Marketing materials contain clear exaggerations or deceptive claims, posing serious concerns about transparency and honesty.

**0**

### **Neutral**

Marketing materials are somewhat aggressive in their promotion but remain within reasonable bounds of accuracy.

**+5**

### **Excellent**

All marketing materials are accurate, transparent, and free from misleading information, reflecting the project's integrity and realistic prospects.

# EXECUTION

---

## Question 1

Will there be an ICO or a private capital raise (and potentially an airdrop)?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

Plans for funding are unclear or overly reliant on uncertain ICO success without alternative strategies, which may jeopardize the project's financial stability.

**0**

### Neutral

The project has plans for an ICO, with some consideration for a private raise as a backup, but lacks detailed strategies for execution or contingency planning.

**+5**

### Excellent

The project has a well-structured plan for capital raising, including a mix of ICO, private investments, and potential airdrops, with clear steps and realistic goals.

## Question 2

Is there legal or regulatory risk associated with the ICO? Is the ICO a security?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The ICO has significant legal and regulatory risks, and it is classified as a security without compliance measures in place, posing a high risk of legal challenges or penalties.

**0**

### Neutral

There are some legal and regulatory risks associated with the ICO; it may be classified as a security, and the team is in the process of ensuring compliance.

**+5**

### Excellent

The ICO has been thoroughly vetted for legal and regulatory compliance, ensuring that it is not inappropriately classified as a security, or if it is, all necessary compliance measures are in place.

## Question 3

Does the business require a money transfer license?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The business model requires a money transfer license which has not been obtained, risking operational legality and function.

**0**

### Neutral

The need for a money transfer license is recognized, and the process to obtain it is underway, though not yet secured.

**+5**

### Excellent

All necessary licenses, including money transfer, are secured, ensuring legal operations and avoiding any potential disruptions.

## Question 4

Has there been a pre-sale? What was the motivation for the pre-sale?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

There was a pre-sale driven primarily by the need to quickly raise funds due to poor financial planning, which may indicate financial instability.

**0**

### Neutral

A pre-sale has occurred, aimed at securing some early funds and testing market interest; however, the full implications and motivations are not transparently communicated.

**+5**

### Excellent

The pre-sale was strategically planned to build community and validate the project's market demand, with clear communication about its purpose and the funds' usage.

## Question 5

Does the company have initial backing and from whom? Does the company have initial backing and from whom?

**-5**

### Extremely Inadequate

The company lacks significant initial backing, or the sources of initial funding are questionable, undermining credibility and potential for success.

**0**

### Neutral

The company has some initial backers, though they are not particularly influential or committed long-term, which could affect future funding opportunities.

**+5**

### Excellent

The company is backed by credible, well-known investors or organizations that bring not only funds but also valuable expertise and networks, significantly enhancing the project's prospects.

# MARKET POTENTIAL

---

## Question 1

Is the idea scalable? What is a realistic share of the market?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The idea lacks a clear path to scaling and faces significant market entry barriers that have not been addressed, indicating a low potential to capture any significant market share.

0

### Neutral

The idea has moderate scalability and a somewhat defined market share projection, but faces competition and market saturation risks that could hinder substantial growth.

+5

### Excellent

The idea is highly scalable with a well-defined strategy for market penetration and expansion. Projections show a significant and attainable market share, supported by strong demand and unique competitive advantages.

## Question 2

Is there positive convexity to apply a similar idea in related applications?

-5

### Extremely Inadequate

The idea is too niche or specific, with limited applicability to other markets or sectors, offering no clear advantages or synergies when considered for expansion into related areas.

0

### Neutral

The idea has potential applicability in related fields, but benefits and practical implementations are not yet clear or fully explored, leading to uncertainties about its broader impact.

+5

### Excellent

The idea not only serves its initial market but also demonstrates strong potential for cross-sector application. It shows positive convexity, meaning that adaptations of the core concept could lead to significant benefits and new opportunities in related industries.