

Investor Criteria of early stage ventures in New Zealand

Hattaf Ansari, David Tripe & William Wilson

Massey University. Auckland, New Zealand

Supported by the Massey University E-centre

HATTAF ANSARI was a Masters student at Massey University's School of Economics and Finance Albany. This article is based on Hattaf's Master's project. Prior to studying in New Zealand Hattaf worked in the private equity industry in Dubai, as a student he completed an internship at the E-centre and is now employed by the New Zealand Venture Investment Fund. Email: hattafansari2@gmail.com;

DAVID TRIPE SF Fin, is an Associate Professor at the School of Economics and Finance at Massey University, New Zealand. Email D.W.Tripe@massey.ac.nz;

WILLIAM WILSON is a Senior Lecturer at Massey University's School of Economics and Finance Albany. Email: W.R.Wilson@massey.ac.nz;

Abstract: Information asymmetry is a common problem for venture capital markets globally and this is especially true in New Zealand. Investor criteria of early stage ventures in New Zealand is compared with the criteria of investors in the US. This study shows significant differences between the New Zealand venture capital market and developed markets, such as that in the U.S., with New Zealand investors valuing different investment criteria, with a somewhat shorter term focus in comparison to criteria with a longer term horizon as evident in the U.S. market. These differences are likely due to the young age and very small size of the New Zealand market. A better understanding of the characteristics of the New Zealand market should aid its development.

Keywords: venture capital, smart money, investment criteria, New Zealand, culture, angel investment, early stage venture, match making

Investor Criteria of early stage ventures in New Zealand

New Zealanders have a shared heritage with other English-speaking countries, but the history and environment has resulted in differences, foremost of which would be the small size of New Zealand and its isolation from the rest of the world. Research by Weber and Hsee (1998) confirms culture shapes our perception of risk. Investing in the early stage ventures market (start-ups) is a high-risk activity. This study investigates criteria of investors in early stage ventures in New Zealand using interviews with industry leaders, a survey and focus group discussion, with results compared to investor criteria previously identified in the United States. This comparison was made because the United States has a more developed venture capital industry, and although there are significant differences such as size and age, it also has much in common such as its political, economic and legal system.¹

If entrepreneurs have a better understanding of how to present start-ups these may be more attractive to New Zealand investors. Obvious differences in domestic market characteristics, limited viable investment opportunities, little specialized labour and a general scarcity of investment capital suggest the environment for New Zealand investors might be different from that for U.S. investors who have a longer history of involvement in venture capital. Many U.S. investors who invest in start-ups are successful entrepreneurs in their own right and tend to invest in industries where they have experience and expertise. They invest in ventures close to where they live, so they can be more involved with the operations of the company and visit the company offices (Benjamin and Margulis, 2001). U.S. investors want transparency in business dealings and have a preference for being involved in company operations (Bruton and Ahlstrom, 2003).

Until now there has been no data on the behaviour of New Zealand investors or on how the New Zealand culture impacts on investor criteria in early stage ventures. The closest was a small study conducted in Australia by Hindle and Wenban (1999), based on just 36 respondents, which speculated that the informal venture capital market was a lot larger than the formal market. It suggested Australian investors had an affinity to accumulate more wealth and chase financial returns, compared to the subjects of a UK study.

¹ Other venture capital markets, such as Australia, were considered for comparison, but studies such as that by Hindle and Wenban (1999) were considered too small for this purpose.

The objective of this study is to inform New Zealand entrepreneurs on the needs and wants of New Zealand investors looking to invest in early stage ventures, potentially enabling entrepreneurs to improve the effectiveness of their capital raising efforts. Successful entrepreneurs are seen as being of vital importance for New Zealand, as the country is dependent on selling products and services to the rest of the world. Immigration New Zealand has a special Entrepreneur Residence Category if immigrants have established a high growth and innovative business with export potential in New Zealand (Immigration New Zealand, 2017). A problem identified by the Chairman of the Angel Association of New Zealand, Marcel van den Assum, is that capital for early stage ventures is not as readily available as in developed and larger economies saying; “Despite all the funds being pumped into start-ups, more is needed for the country’s young businesses to realize their full potential” (Pullar-Strecker, 2016)

Literature and current venture capital best practice encourages entrepreneurs to match their business with appropriate investors. This enables the entrepreneur to generate more value from the relationship after the initial capital has been raised. The entrepreneur can also leverage the investor’s connections and professional network to gain credibility in the industry and fast track development. Successful matching allows the entrepreneur to raise money from experienced and well informed investors with the right connections, ensuring the best chance of success for their entrepreneurial idea.

A lack of information is a primary reason for a lack of standardisation in the investment process in New Zealand. Our research shows that New Zealand investors are more accepting of an informal approach and the industry has already identified a tendency for a lack of due diligence prior to investment. This research confirms this lack of information. While the model used to develop the findings for our conclusions has been used previously in the U.S., it only paints a picture of the average behaviour of investors, who have a wide diversity of approaches and behaviours when they invest.

The key prior pieces of work on which our study is based are Angel Investor Criteria (Sudek, 2007), Angel Investors Handbook (Benjamin & Margulis, 2000) and *Angel Investing: Matching Startup Funds with Startup Companies--The Guide for Entrepreneurs and Individual Investors* (Van Osnabrugge & Robinson, 2000).

Method

Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000), Harvard professors and angel investors, published their survey of over 300 empirical studies from the U.S. and other countries as a guide for entrepreneurs, investors, venture capitalists and policy makers. Their call for improved funding for start-up companies was endorsed at the time by the Chairman of the U.S. National Venture Capital Association (NVCA) and by the then Chief Economist of the U.S. Small Business Administration. The Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000) book also served as a guide for a study by Sudek (2006) who looked at how angel investors in southern California prioritise their investment criteria. The criteria identified and ranked by Sudek (2006) were used to develop a survey suitable for New Zealand.

The survey was circulated through the E-centre (Massey University technology incubator), the New Zealand Venture Capital Association, the New Zealand Venture Investment Fund (NZVIF), Angel Association of New Zealand (Government), to reach their investor networks. We thus reached out to fifteen private angel networks and three venture capital funds across New Zealand. Qualified responses were received from 88 investors who had invested in New Zealand ventures in the past 48 months. The sample comprised angel investors, private investors, venture capitalists, members of crowd-funding platforms and members of professional angel groups. Insights obtained from the survey were then validated through a focus group session involving investors across different investor types. This sample was deemed reliable enough because the entire New Zealand venture capital ecosystem is estimated to have between 600 and 800 investors.

The main difference between our approach and Sudek's was that we shared the survey first and then conducted a focus group instead of the other way around. We also added an extra question to the survey to distinguish between domestic and international sales potential, reflecting the greater importance of international sales for New Zealand venture capitalists.

Results – NZ investor criteria Vs. U.S. investor criteria

Ruhnka and Young (1991) identify Investing in early stage ventures (start-ups) as very risky business. Investors often have limited tangible substance to go on when investing in early stage ventures and the focus is usually on the entrepreneur themselves. Multiple studies cite factors linked to the entrepreneurs' personality, such as the intelligence, enthusiasm, trustworthiness, charisma, expertise & experience of the entrepreneur and his team to be the most important criteria (along with their idea)

for investment in early stage companies (Sudek, 2006, Bruton and Ahlstrom, 2003, Mishra, 2004, Certhoux and Perrin, 2013).

Table 1 ranks the importance of each criteria to New Zealand investors compared to the criteria ranking identified by Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000) using the research methodology of Sudek (2006). Respondents scored each criterion with a rank, from 1 to 6. The mean and standard deviations of the scores from the 88 scores respondents are shown in Table 1, and compared to the Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000) results. Key differences are identified and discussed below, however it must be accepted that while differences between the two studies are apparent we do not have the means and standard deviation for the Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000) study so it is not possible to explore these differences statistically.

Insert Table 1 about here

Entrepreneur characteristics

Not surprisingly both surveys rank the personal characteristics of the entrepreneur highly with the New Zealand survey ranking *trustworthiness* first place (U.S. 2) and enthusiasm third place (U.S. 1). The entrepreneur's *track record* is ranked 13 (U.S. 10) while the *expertise of the entrepreneur* is ranked 9 in New Zealand (U.S. 4) and the *first impression of the entrepreneur* is ranked 16 (U.S. 5) suggesting U.S. investors are investing more in the entrepreneur than New Zealand investors. This may reflect New Zealand being an emerging venture capital market in contrast with the much more developed U.S. market. However, insights from the focus groups suggest New Zealand investors are more cautious when building relationships and take longer to get to know founders.

Market Characteristics

Both studies ranked *growth potential* highly: New Zealand ranked 2 (U.S. 6) with New Zealand investors ranking *international sales potential* 5. The Californian study didn't rank international sales but did rank *domestic sales potential* 3 in contrast to the New Zealand rank of 28. This may be the reality of New Zealand investors recognising the small size of the domestic market in contrast to a large U.S. market in which ventures can be scaled.

The majority of capital raised in New Zealand for seed stage has been concentrated in just four industries; software as a service (SaaS), biotechnology, life sciences and pharmaceuticals (NZVIF, 2016).

New Zealand investors have a preference for ventures that can scale, a factor which may explain the concentration in just four industries. According to the NZVIF study on valuations of New Zealand early stage ventures, at the seed stage, software investments were 33% of the total and pharma-biotech 46% (by deal value). At the start-up stage, those sectors were 41% and 20%, respectively (NZVIF, 2016). The report goes on to describe a similar pattern in the U.S. with 48% of angel investments being made in software and healthcare (NZVIF, 2016).

Investor Characteristics

Investors in the U.S. are generally looking to invest in industries in which they have experience and expertise with *investor filling the gaps in the venture* ranked at 14 in the U.S. compared to 28 in New Zealand. The willingness of New Zealand investors to invest in ventures they have little experience may reflect the small size and age of the New Zealand venture capital market. The rank of 21 (U.S. 13) for *investor involvement through skills and network* may also reflect this with most investors having made their initial capital in industries other than software and pharm-biotech, meaning they don't have this network. The longer track record of these industries in the U.S. has resulted in a large pool of potential angel investors who built their experience in those industries. This suggests that New Zealand investors frequently invest in areas (ventures) where they lack expertise and many are not able to contribute to the venture after their investments, with some investors holding portfolios in multiple start-ups across diverse industries. Moreover, the funds run by New Zealand investors are generally small, meaning that they may be operating at less than optimal scale (Cumming, 2006). The focus group suggested that many New Zealand investors are not able to commit much time to ventures they invest in.

This further explains the higher ranking for the *expertise of the entrepreneur*, because with New Zealand investors investing in fields in which they have no experience, they need the founders of the venture to have that experience. In the U.S., investors with experience are more willing to mentor, train and coach entrepreneurs so they are less concerned about the entrepreneur's previous experience. Investors in the focus group also pointed out that successful New Zealanders were more likely to relocate overseas in pursuit of new opportunities and this has a negative impact on the availability of investors in New Zealand with experience.

Investment Characteristics

Fundamental to any investment decision are risk and return trade-offs, New Zealand investors ranked *expected returns* at 4 (U.S. 8) and *exit potential (or liquidity)* at 7 (U.S. 24). New Zealand investors appear

less willing to risk their capital compared to U.S. investors and wished to invest in ventures that were more liquid than U.S. investors. A similar picture is revealed when looking at competition with New Zealand investors ranking the *nature of competition* at 8 (U.S. 17) and competitive protection at 10 (U.S. 21). The focus group suggested that there might be a cultural difference in how the two investor groups perceive risk. Failure is often celebrated and encouraged in the U.S. because it is seen as a stepping stone to success, while in New Zealand we still have a 'tall poppy syndrome' and investors are more cautious and careful.

Top Five Characteristics

Overall there were many similarities between the two studies with both sets of participants valuing trust and enthusiasm very highly. The most significant difference in the top five criteria was the drive in New Zealand for international sales versus the U.S. acceptance of domestic sales though this is likely just New Zealand investors believing future growth potential must come from outside New Zealand's small market.

Investor Type

Survey respondents classified themselves as either angel investors (27), venture capitalists (11), private investors (41) or angel syndicate investors (9). With an overall sample of 88 respondents it was not possible to undertake meaningful statistical testing of differences among groups, but results presented below suggest there is value in a larger more robust study being undertaken.

Insert Table 2 about here

Angel investors were very particular about investing in ventures with a strong potential for international sales. They preferred ventures with high margins and were the type most concerned about overall competitive protection of the venture they were investing in. Angel investors in groups or syndicates were most sensitive to size of investment. This is because many only co-invest as a group and are very particular on the amount they are willing to invest. Consistent with this, they were also the type most concerned the venture had low overheads.

Those who identified as venture capitalists exhibited behaviour that was closest to U.S. investors. They wish to be more involved after the capital has been raised than other investor types. They have a preference for the venture being local so they can get more involved with the company's operations.

They are the most likely category of investors that can help entrepreneurs raise smart money in New Zealand. Some venture capitalists in New Zealand invest in seed capital and Series A capital which is uncommon in the U.S.

Private investors were more similar to the New Zealand average and did not have extreme positions like other investors. They were least likely to be interested in being involved with the venture after initial investment and were most concerned with the track record of the entrepreneur, preferring to invest in experienced entrepreneurs.

The desire for financial returns

The investment criteria which are related but opposites of each other, expected return and philanthropy (non-financial return) show a wide dispersion with mean scores of 5.05 and 2.88, respectively.

Insert Table 3 about here

Venture capital firms are judged solely on their expected returns whereas the firms they invest in and angel investors can have other objectives. Our survey results confirm these different objectives and incentives. Venture capital investors on the other hand rank philanthropy as least important with a mean of 2.00.

These results suggest entrepreneurs would be wise to tailor their pitch for funding to which group of investors they are approaching. Other insights revealed by the study are that, when approached for investment, New Zealand entrepreneurs rely on personal networks. 27.91% welcomed direct contact by entrepreneurs and 39.53% preferred referrals from friends and trusted advisors. This is in contrast to a study in the U.S. by Benjamin and Margulis (2001) who found that 57% of investors found their deals through personal contacts, 31% found deals through professional networks and only 12% from (direct contact) unsolicited contacts from non-family members. New Zealand entrepreneurs rely less on direct connections and more on indirect connections.

75% of investors generally conduct their own due diligence with around half of these relying only on their own expertise. This implies that New Zealand investors frequently invest in ventures they do not have adequate knowledge or expertise in and hence rely on others to help them decide where to invest. It is a way to minimize the risk of investing in ventures they do not have experience in. The focus group noted that New Zealand culture is more cautious and not overconfident and so many would like to get

a second opinion on their due diligence. It also affirms that they typically do not have standardised investment procedures. This observation from our research is consistent with Debra Hall's insights (as a member of the expert panel of the Business Intelligence Forum)² and suggests a cultural element. The majority of New Zealand investors are passive investors and prefer to let a minority of active investors do the heavy lifting on due diligence rather than do it themselves (Lowndes, 2016).

The majority of New Zealand investors in our sample selected indicated they would be willing to invest in any stage of the company, which was a surprising find. The risk and return trade-off between the different stages of company operation is very significant and so is the amount of capital required to make an investment. New Zealand investors do not have hard and fast investment rules for themselves regarding industries they want to invest in, the exact amount they are willing to invest (ranked twenty fifth) or the stage of company operations they wish to invest in. New Zealand investors are not as particular (can be seen as less sophisticated) about their investment process as compared with U.S. investors. New Zealand investors are more likely to take each investment opportunity on a case by case basis. This may have implications in terms of limiting the professionalisation of firms after venture capital involvement (See Hellman & Puri, 2002).

Previous studies in the U.S. and other markets find the characteristics of the entrepreneur to be very important. An important finding of this study is the importance of the financial characteristics of a project with New Zealand investors ranking this at 4. The outlook for investors also differs with New Zealand investors considering a venture successful only if it has export potential, whereas U.S. investors are content in the larger U.S. domestic market. The final difference is that U.S. investors are looking to how they can make a non-financial contribution to the success of the venture by contributing their expertise and network of contacts. With smaller and younger tech industries in New Zealand most investors have little tech experience as they have earned their capital in more traditional fields such as farming and general business.

² See <https://www.business-intelligence.co.nz/assets/PDFs/2016-Valuable-Advice-Workshop-5.pdf>

Conclusions

The criteria identified in this report are a snapshot of New Zealand investor preferences. The findings should encourage better matchmaking within the industry, promote awareness about the requirements of New Zealand investors based on facts rather than beliefs. The other important finding of the study was the apparent philanthropic inclination of New Zealand Angel investors who are prepared to look at non-pecuniary benefits when investing. Results from this study should assist in the country's future development, with political leaders accepting New Zealand's future is dependent on working smarter.

While the sample of this study was small with only 88 responses, this reflected the limited size of the New Zealand investor base which is estimated at only 600 to 800 investors. However, our results were consistent with the views expressed in the follow up focus group sessions as well as personal discussions with industry leaders. The size of the New Zealand market is changing with a rise in foreign investment and an influx of wealthy immigrants looking to invest (NZVIF, 2016). These changes are likely to manifest themselves fairly quickly and will impact on New Zealand investor criteria in the future. It is therefore recommended that this research be repeated every 3-5 years.

References

- Benjamin, G. A. & Margulis, J. 2001. The angel investor's handbook. *Bloomberg: Princeton*, 1-368.
- Bruton, G. D. & Ahlstrom, D. 2003. An institutional view of China's venture capital industry: Explaining the differences between China and the West. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 233-259.
- Certhoux, G. & Perrin, A. 2013. Business Angels' practices in the screening stage: A study of knowledge transfer to the entrepreneur. *13rd EURAM Conference*. Istanbul, Turkey. Available: <http://hal-audencia.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00853184>.
- Cumming, D. J. 2006. The determinants of venture capital portfolio size: empirical evidence. *Journal of Business*, 79 (3), 1083-1126.
- Hellmann, T. & Puri, M. 2002. Venture capital and the professionalization of start-up firms: empirical evidence, *Journal of Finance*. LVII (1), 169-197.
- Hindle, K. & Wenban, R. 1999. Australia's informal venture capitalists: an exploratory profile. *Venture Capital: An international journal of entrepreneurial finance*, 1, 169-186.

- Immigration New Zealand. 2017. *Entrepreneur Residence Category* [Online]. Wellington. Available: <https://www.newzealandnow.govt.nz/move-to-nz/new-zealand-visa/visas-to-invest/entrepreneur-visa> [Accessed 2017 6 May].
- Lowndes 2016. Valuable Advice from Workshop 5 | Growth Companies: Capturing the Synergies between Entrepreneurs and Smart Capital. *Lowndes Law*. Available: <http://www.lowndeslaw.com/valuable-advice-from-workshop-5-growth-companies/>.
- Mishra, A. 2004. Indian Venture Capitalists (VCs): Investment Evaluation Criteria. *ICFAI Journal of Applied Finance*, 10, 71-93.
- NZVIF. 2016. *Early-stage company investment valuations* [Online]. Auckland: New Zealand Venture Investment Fund. Available: <https://www.nzvif.co.nz/assets/publications/SCIF-Valuation-Research-Report-August-2017.pdf> [Accessed 5 May 2017].
- Pullar-Strecker, T. 2016. *Angel Investors need help to get young businesses to full potential*. Retrieved from Stuff.Co.Nz: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/industries/85623295/Angel-investors-need-help-to-get-young-businesses-to-full-potential>
- Ruhnka, J. C. & Young, J. E. 1991. Some hypotheses about risk in venture capital investing. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6, 115-133.
- Sudek, R. 2006. Angel investment criteria. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 17, 89.
- Van Osnabrugge, M. & Robinson, R. J. 2000. *Angel Investing: Matching Startup Funds with Startup Companies--The Guide for Entrepreneurs and Individual Investors*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Weber, E. U. & Hsee, C. 1998. Cross-cultural differences in risk perception, but cross-cultural similarities in attitudes towards perceived risk. *Management Science*, 44, 1205-1217.

Table 1 NZ investor criteria Vs. US investor criteria

Investment Criteria	NZ Rank	Mean	Std Dev	US Rank
Trustworthiness of entrepreneur	1	5.53	0.68	2
Future growth potential of venture	2	5.46	0.61	6
Enthusiasm of entrepreneur	3	5.46	0.72	1
Expected return (perceived financial rewards)	4	5.05	0.94	8
International sales potential	5	5.02	1.06	-
Quality of venture products/service	6	4.82	0.93	7
Liquidity (potential exit)	7	4.71	1.29	24
Nature of competition	8	4.39	1	17
Expertise of entrepreneur	9	4.35	1.01	4
Overall competitive protection	10	4.34	1.16	21
Informal competitive protection	11	4.33	1.17	12
Investor understands venture	12	4.28	1.04	24
Track record of entrepreneur	13	4.13	1.11	10
High profit margin of venture	14	4.10	1.09	15
Size of investment	15	4.02	1.34	20
Investor liked entrepreneur on first meeting	16	4.02	1.08	5
Venture targets niche market	17	3.81	1.42	9
Presence of (potential) co-investors	18	3.77	1.48	26
Venture is local (HQ in country of investor origin)	19	3.64	1.6	23
Low initial cost to test market	20	3.61	1.21	22
Investor involvement possible (networks, skills, etc.)	21	3.54	1.46	13
Low overheads of venture	22	3.50	1.1	16
Formal protection (Patents)	23	3.10	1.37	27
Low capex needed initially (fixed assets)	24	2.99	1.17	19
Further investment required to breakeven	25	2.98	1.46	18
Philanthropy (non-financial rewards)	26	2.88	1.25	-
Investor strength fills gaps in the venture (expertise)	27	2.79	1.36	14
Domestic sales potential of venture	28	2.76	1.31	3

Table ranks the importance of each criteria to New Zealand investors compared to the criteria ranking identified by Van Osnabrugge and Robinson (2000) using the research methodology of Sudek (2006). A rank, from 1 to 6, was provided based on the average score of each response for each criterion. The mean shows how far apart criteria were between ranks while the standard deviation measures the level of disagreement among investors relating to that particular criterion with a smaller standard deviation indicating more consensus.

Table 2 Selected Rankings by investor type

Investor criteria	Angel Investor	Angel Syndicate	Venture Capitalist	Private Investor
Sample Size N	27	9	11	41
Expected return (financial rewards)	6	8	1	4
Investor involvement possible	21	23	8	22
Venture is local	23	17	14	19
International sales potential	1	1	5	6
Low overheads of venture	19	15	23	21
High profit margins of venture	12	20	17	16
Size of investment required	18	5	19	15
Overall competitive protection	9	21	12	12

Table reports the ranking of selected criteria for different types of New Zealand investors. The numbers of responses were too small to allow us to conduct meaningful tests for the significance of the differences.

Table 3 Philanthropy versus Monetary benefits

Investor Type	Philanthropy		Monetary benefit	
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev
Angel Syndicate (9)	3.43	0.90	5.78	0.42
Angel Investor (27)	3.08	1.15	5.00	0.85
Private Investor (41)	2.81	1.27	4.83	0.94
Venture Capitalist (11)	2.00	0.67	4.57	1.29
All investors (88)	2.88	1.25	5.05	0.94

Table reports the mean and standard deviation of criteria of Expected return (Monetary benefits) and Philanthropy (non-financial rewards), out of 6, to demonstrate the motivations of different types of New Zealand investors.