

Product

**Ascension EIS Fund and Knowledge
Intensive EIS fund**

Tax Status

Enterprise Investment Scheme

Fund Group

Ascension Ventures Limited

Risk Warning

This communication is provided for informational purposes only. This information does not constitute advice on investments within the meaning of Article 53 of the Financial Services and Markets Act (Regulated Activities) Order 2001. Should investment advice be required this should be sought from a FCA authorised person.

Editors

Martin Churchill
Hugh Rogers

Tax Efficient Review is published by
Tax Efficient Review Ltd
35 The Park
London
NW11 7ST
Tel: +44 (0)20 8458 9003
www.taxefficientreview.com

Copyright © 2023 Tax Efficient Review Ltd.
All Rights Reserved. The information, data and opinions (“Information”) expressed and contained herein: (1) are proprietary to Tax Efficient Review Ltd and/or its content providers and are not intended to represent investment advice or recommendation to buy or sell any security; (2) may not normally be copied or distributed without express license to do so; and (3) are not warranted to be accurate, complete or timely.

Tax Efficient Review Ltd reserves its rights to charge for access to these reports.

Tax Efficient Review Ltd is not responsible for any damages or losses arising from any use of the reports or the Information contained therein.

The copyright in this publication belongs to Tax Efficient Review Ltd, all rights reserved, and for a fee the author has granted Ascension Ventures Limited an unlimited non-exclusive and royalty free licence to use the publication.

28March202311:58

Table of Contents

RISK WARNINGS AND DISCLAIMERS	4
GENERAL RISK WARNINGS	4
ADDITIONAL RISK WARNINGS	4
Factsheet.....	5
Summary	5
Disclaimer	5
Classification.....	6
Review based upon	6
Sunset' Clause.....	7
Review Process.....	7
Structure	7
The Offer.....	8
Track Record/Performance.....	9
The Manager	13
Fees and Costs.....	14
Conclusion	16

RISK WARNINGS AND DISCLAIMERS

This communication is provided for informational purposes only. This information does not constitute advice on investments within the meaning of Article 53 of the Financial Services and Markets Act (Regulated Activities) Order 2001. Should investment advice be required this should be sought from a FCA authorised person.

Tax Efficient Review' (the "Review") is issued by Tax Efficient Review Limited ("TER"). The Review is provided for information purposes only and should not be construed as an offer of, or as solicitation of an offer to purchase, investments or investment advisory services. The investments or investment services provided by TER may not be suitable for all readers. If you have any doubts as to suitability, you should seek advice from TER. No investment or investment service mentioned in the Review amounts to a personal recommendation to any one investor.

GENERAL RISK WARNINGS

Your attention is drawn to the following risk warnings which identify some of the risks associated with the investments which are mentioned in the Review:

Fluctuations in value of investments

The value of investments and the income from them can go down as well as up and you may not get back the amount invested.

Suitability

The investments may not be suitable for all investors and you should only invest if you understand the nature of and risks inherent in such investments and, if in doubt, you should seek professional advice before effecting any such investment.

Past performance

Past performance is not a guide to future performance.

Legislation

Changes in legislation may adversely affect the value of the investments.

Taxation

The levels and the bases of the reliefs from taxation may change in the future. You should seek your own professional advice on the taxation consequences of any investment.

ADDITIONAL RISK WARNINGS

Enterprise Investment Scheme offerings:

- EIS companies are unquoted
- The value of EIS Shares can fluctuate and Investors may not get back their investment;
- There is no market for EIS Shares and Shareholders may not be able to realise their shareholding unless the EIS company is sold or floated on a recognised Stock Exchange. Dividends may not be paid
- Potential Investors should consider that past performance of the EIS Manager is no indication of future performance and there can be no guarantees that the EIS Company will meet its objectives.
- Investment in unquoted companies can offer good investment returns, but, by its uncertain nature involves a much higher degree of risk than investment in a quoted portfolio
- Whilst it is the intention of the EIS Directors that an EIS company will be managed so as to qualify as an EIS, there can be no guarantee that it will maintain such status. A failure to qualify could result in the Company losing the tax reliefs previously obtained, resulting in adverse tax consequences for Investors, including a requirement to repay the 30 per cent. income tax relief
- The past performance of investments should not be regarded as an indication of the future performance of an investment
- Levels and bases of, and relief from, taxation are subject to change. Such changes could be retrospective.
- From 6 April 2014 changes to scheme rules:
 - For investments made on or after 30 November 2015, trades which consist substantially in making available reserve energy capacity, or using that capacity to generate electricity, will no longer be qualifying trades
 - For investments made on or after Royal Assent November 2015, new legislation prevents all the following types of acquisitions from being a qualifying use of money:
 - an interest in another company such that that company becomes a 51% subsidiary of the issuing company
 - a further interest in another company which is already a 51% subsidiary of the issuing company
 - a trade
 - intangible assets employed for a trade
 - goodwill employed for the purposes of a trade
- For investments made on or after Royal Assent November 2015, there is an age limit on companies issuing EIS shares of 7 years from the date of first commercial sale, or 10 years in the case of a knowledge-intensive company

Factsheet

Ascension EIS Fund and Knowledge Intensive EIS fund

Type	Generalist EIS
Manager	Ascension Ventures Ltd
Custodian	Mainspring Nominees Ltd
Promoter	RAM Capital LLP
Focus	Investing in technology focussed EIS companies
Approved Fund & Unapproved Fund Available	Yes but the Knowledge Intensive EIS fund closes on 4th April 2023
Minimum investment	£25,000
Closing dates	4th January, 4th April, 4th July, 4th October
Deployment estimates	Full deployment is estimated within 12 months and in 8-10 companies
Issue costs	5% (no VAT)
Annual costs	1% (plus VAT) per annum of the original subscription amount, deferred and contingent on sale proceeds
Initial advisor charges	If charged, these will be facilitated by the EIS on subscription.

Summary

Table 1: Tax Efficient Review summary of offering Pros and Cons

PROs	CONs
Four EIS companies have achieved an exit since 2020 ZigZag (6x), Percent (4x) Greendeck (5x) and Bizzon (1.6x), plus a partial exit on Mutt Motorcycles	Relatively small amounts of money has been raised to date for their EIS to date, but they EIS fund reviewed here sits alongside two other EIS funds and institutional funds
Ascension do not participate in the pricing of follow-on investment rounds as companies move from SEIS funding to EIS funding	The Ascension EIS fund launched in 2017/2018 which is a relatively short time period against which to compare them with the likes of Molten and MMC
The Ascension EIS has a performance hurdle which properly aligns the investment team with the risk investors undertake	Whilst early investors have seen good returns, Ascension will need to be able to demonstrate the ability to generate profitable exits from later tranches

Disclaimer

This communication is provided for informational purposes only. This information does not constitute advice on investments within the meaning of Article 53 of the Financial Services and Markets Act (Regulated Activities) Order 2001. Should investment advice be required this should be sought from an FCA authorised person.

Classification

Tax Efficient Review currently classify EIS managers using the following three categories:

- Established EIS managers with a track record in growth return EIS investments (e.g. MMC, Parkwalk)
- Established EIS managers who have had to change their investment strategy to making growth return investments (e.g. Puma, Great Point Media, Ingenious)

- EIS managers who make growth return EIS investments, but are without a significant track record of investing in and exiting these investments

TER classify the Ascension EIS offer as “EIS Growth fund, established provider, Non sector specific, with track record”.

Review based upon

This review is based upon the Brochure dated January 2023, phone calls and meetings with the

investment team and data provided by Ascension Ventures Ltd.

Table 2: **Funds under management as at 12th March 2023**

Product Name	Net assets £m	Annual Management fee	Still to be invested £m
EIS FUNDS			
EIS 2017-2020	3.62	1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0
EIS 2020-2022	5.00	2%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years. Optional 50% discount for upfront payment	0
EIS 2022+	1.41	5% up front management fee, with a further 1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0.20
Momentum	0.92	1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0
Unicorn Fund	0.62	1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0
Conduit Fund	4.95	5% up front management fee, with a further 1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	1.45
Life Fund	2.94	5% up front management fee, with a further 1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0.60
Fair By Design EIS	1.24	5% up front management fee, with a further 1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0.05
Carry Back EIS Fund	0.96	5% up front management fee, with a further 1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0.1
NON EIS FUNDS THAT CAN CO-INVEST WITH EIS FUNDS			
Fair By Design Institutional	20.33	2% pa Average over 10 years	2.80
Good Food Fund	1.44	1.5% pa average 5 over years	0.25
SEIS 2013-2020	18.48	1%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years	0
SEIS 2021	2.35	2%, deferred until realisations capped at 5 years. Optional 50% discount for upfront payment	0
Blended SEIS 2022	1.48		0.80
NON EIS FUNDS THAT CANNOT CO-INVEST WITH EIS FUNDS			
None			
TOTAL UNDER MANAGEMENT	£65m		£6.15m

Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd

Sunset' Clause

The 'Sunset Clause' was introduced by the Treasury for EIS and VCT reliefs to be reviewed and renewed by 6 April 2025. The clause provides that income tax relief will no longer be given to subscriptions made on or after 6 April 2025, unless the legislation is amended to make the scheme permanent, or the "sunset clause" is extended. The government has the power to extend or remove the sunset clause through sec-

ondary legislation, which would allow the VCT & EIS schemes to operate in their current form beyond the current expiry date of the scheme. The then Chancellor Kwasi Kwarteng announced during his mini-budget of 23 September 2022 that venture capital schemes will be safeguarded beyond 2025 but no further details were given as to how this will be implemented.

Review Process

Tax Efficient Review has enhanced the contents of the EIS reviews to focus more on the areas of investment performance and underlying fees.

To increase the comparison of performance, we now include Table 3 which details and amalgamates how many investments the EIS manager has made and their performance across the following categorisations:

1. Exited above cost (EAC - creating a profit for investors)

2. Exited below cost (EBC - creating a loss for investors)
3. Completely written-off (CWO - resulting in no return for investors)
4. Still Held (SH)
5. Partially exited (PART)

We also now compare total five year simulated fees between products (Tables 5 & 6).

Structure

This offering is classified by the provider as a non-UCIS discretionary managed investment service. TER by reviewing the product does not validate, ratify, endorse or confirm its classification.

As an approved fund is also available until 4th April 2023, the initial income tax relief will be linked to the close date for the fund - 4th April 2023. This will therefore allow investors to claim their tax relief in the 2022/23 tax year, with the potential to carry back to 2021/22 tax year. However, it should be noted that a claim can only be made on receipt of an EIS 5 Certificate and this will only be issued once the fund is 90% invested. This is markedly different from the unapproved fund where tax relief is claimed piecemeal upon receipt of the individual EIS3 certificates issued after each investment is made.

There are two key differences related to the receipt of tax relief:

- **Tax carry-back:** in the Approved Fund the total investment made by an investor should

be capable of being carried-back to tax year 2021/22 (as the date of investment for HMRC purposes is 28th March 2023, the closing date of the fund). In an Unapproved fund only investments made in the tax year 2021/22 are available for carry-back to 2020/21 (if any are made).

- **Tax payment timings:** in an Unapproved Fund, tax relief can be claimed as EIS individual 3 certificates are received. This is likely to be earlier than the receipt of the EIS 5 certificate in the Approved Fund

There is no difference between both offerings for CGT and IHT purposes, reliefs for both are linked to the dates when the underlying investments within the fund are made.

Companies that are hoping to attract subscriptions under the EIS can seek an assurance from HMRC, in advance of inviting applications for shares, to the effect that it is accepted that the conditions of the scheme will be satisfied. The response to a request for

an assurance will take the form of a statement as to whether, on the basis of the information provided, HMRC would be able to authorise the company to issue certificates under ICTA/S306 (2) or ITA/S204 in respect of the shares to be issued, following receipt of a form EIS1 satisfactorily completed.

The Ascension EIS Fund is an unapproved fund so tax relief will only be available from the date of the underlying EIS investments, including the

ability to carry back to the previous tax year. The risk for investors in an unapproved fund is that they cannot be sure how much tax relief will be available in a certain tax year, as it is driven by the investment rate of the provider, nor when they will become fully invested.

Please note Tax Efficient Review does not give tax advice.

The Offer

This is a review of the Ascension EIS Fund, and it is also the first time that Ascension are offering a Knowledge Intensive EIS fund version of their EIS.

As an approved fund, initial income tax relief will be linked to the close date for the fund – which will be 4th April 2023. This will therefore allow investors to claim their tax relief in the 2022/23 tax year, with the potential to carry back to 2021/22 tax year. However, it should be noted that a claim can only be made on receipt of an EIS 5 Certificate and this will only be issued once the fund is 90% invested. This is markedly different from the unapproved fund where tax relief is claimed piecemeal upon receipt of the individual EIS3 certificates issued after each investment is made.

There are two key differences related to the receipt of tax relief:

- **Tax carry-back:** in the Approved Fund the total investment made by an investor should be capable of being carried-back to tax year 2021/22 (as the date of investment for HMRC purposes is 28th March 2023, the closing date of the fund). In an Unapproved fund only investments made in the tax year 2021/22 are available for carry-back to 2020/21 (if any are made).
- **Tax payment timings:** in an Unapproved Fund, tax relief can be claimed as EIS individual 3 certificates are received. This is likely to be earlier than the receipt of the EIS 5 certificate in the Approved Fund

There is no difference between both offerings for CGT and IHT purposes, reliefs for both are linked

to the dates when the underlying investments within the fund are made.

Ascension has been investing in early-stage technology companies since 2014, with its first EIS Fund beginning in 2017. The Ascension EIS invests in a tranches throughout the year and offers 8-10 investments per tranche. Ascension focuses specifically on the following sectors:

- Fintech
- Digital Health
- Sustainability
- Next Generation Media
- Commerce and DeepTech

Ascension also offers relevant investors Business Investment Relief (BIR) across its tax efficient funds.

Ascension Ventures started life in 2012 and was set up by Sanjay Wadhvani (ex-Ingenious) and Jean de Fougerolles. They initially raised a £1.6m SEIS Fund to invest across seed level tech investments.

Jean de Fougerolles bought out Sanjay in January 2015 and was joined by Kieran Hill, and they relaunched the Ascension SEIS fund in 2014. Since then the Ascension team has grown to 7 full time staff and they have launched an annual SEIS fund. In 2017 Ascension launched its inaugural EIS fund to back companies at the next stage of development (post SEIS, but pre-series A), and have raised money annually for their EIS deployment. We cover the track record of these funds raising later in this report.

The Ascension EIS Fund splits investor monies across at least 8 companies, but typically 10-12

companies, which are run on a discretionary basis by the Ascension Ventures team. Investors do get a choice to participate in follow-on funding if one of the companies in their 'pot' decides to raise further funds. They aim to deploy investor capital within 12 months of the date of investment.

The Ascension EIS Fund invests in the form of initial lump sums into investee companies which have passed their due diligence process. They typically look to invest in pre-Series A companies raising between £500,000 and £3m, within a £4m-£8m (pre-money) valuation range and alongside a lead investor.

Rather uniquely, the Ascension EIS Fund is limited as a follow-on funding vehicle for Ascension's SEIS investments. The maximum follow-on SEIS investments the EIS fund can undertake is 4, meaning the majority of the investments within the Ascension EIS will be new investments. Additionally, Ascension does not participate in the pricing of any follow-on investments, which must be priced by a third party lead investor

It is common to see EIS managers run different "pots" of money to accompany investee companies on their development. Starting off with SEIS money at the earliest stage and then

progressing through EIS and VCT if things go to plan. But, this can also be an area of concern in terms of who prices these companies as they progress and have they really been subjected to the rigour of a third party valuation? So, it is welcome to see Ascension remove themselves from this pricing process.

The majority of investments need to show at least £20,000 of monthly recurring revenues prior to investment. They target companies with sufficient cash to last for at least 12 months with no further revenue growth over that time. Ascension aims to support the increased revenues of investee companies to a £100,000 a month level via their investment and the mentoring and contacts of the Ascension team.

The EIS market is starting to show a split along the lines of those managers whom invest as lump sums into the investee companies and those whom invest in smaller, irregular tranches (which is primarily linked with fund raising). Ascension are in the first group and invest in lump sums as in the same equity position as the founders (i.e. they do not use preferential equity).

Track Record/Performance

Performance measurement in the EIS area is difficult to measure and this is down to a number of factors:

- EIS providers have moved away from raising funds in tranches where all investors received holdings in the same set of investee companies (and where performance of the set of companies could be measured) and have moved to multiple closings. This means that investors have more individual portfolios.
- Some providers are reluctant to provide data on individual portfolio performance claiming that, in some instances, poor performance can be down to pressure from investors to invest quickly and therefore ending up with little diversification which can lead to poor performance.
- With very few exits, performance becomes driven by manager valuation of unquoted holdings.
- There are multiple variations to performance

measurement, both in methodology (Internal Rate of Return, multiple of cost) and whether fees and tax breaks are included or excluded from the calculation.

As part of our review process, we compile a performance measure (Table 3) as follows:

- Initially it will be based on investment cash flows to provide a current valuation compared to initial cost.
- The data will be compiled by tax year of investment (not calendar year).
- Follow-on investments will be shown in the year the follow-on investment is made, whereas in the Holdings table any follow-on investment is included in the initial cost figure.
- Fees and tax breaks will not be accounted for.
- The output will be a table showing, for each year of investment since tax year 2013/14, figures for "Cost", "Total Value (Realised

ASCENSION EIS FUND AND KI EIS FUND

Table 3 (1 of 2): Summary of EIS Performance by Tax Year - Gross multiple of investments made in the tax year

	Ascension EIS Fund	Blackfinch	Calculus	Deepbridge Tech	Deepbridge Life Sciences	Downing Healthcare	Edition	Fuel Ventures Follow-On Fund	Guinness
Tax Year	as at 31/12/2022	as at 07/02/2023	as at 05/10/2022	as at 31/12/2022	as at 31/12/2022	as at 31/1/2022	as at 31/12/2022	as at 31/12/2022	as at 31/01/2023
2013/14			1.38x 11 (1 EAC, 1 EBC, 5 CWO, 3 SH, 1 PART)	3.12x 3 (1 EAC, 1 SH, 1 PART)		0.00x 1 (1 CWO)			
2014/15			1.54x 12 (3 EAC, 3 EBC, 4 CWO, 2 SH)	3.04x 4 (1 EAC, 2 SH, 1 PART)		8.27x 2 (2 SH)			
2015/16			1.36x 14 (3 EAC, 1 EBC, 4 CWO, 6 SH)	2.64x 6 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 3 SH, 1 PART)		3.50x 4 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 2 SH)			
2016/17			1.12x 11 (4 EAC, 2 EBC, 1 CWO, 4 SH)	1.68x 11 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 8 SH, 1 PART)	2.40x 2 (2 SH)	2.66x 5 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 2 SH)	1.08x 8 (8 SH)		
2017/18	2.61x 14 (4 EAC, 1 CWO, 8 SH, 1 PART)		0.62x 10 (1 EAC, 1 EBC, 3 CWO, 5 SH)	1.21x 14 (2 CWO, 12 SH)	1.09x 14 (2 CWO, 12 SH)	1.18x 5 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 3 SH)	0.82x 7 (7 SH)		1.62x 15 (3 EAC, 2 CWO, 7 SH, 3 PART)
2018/19	1.58x 11 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 9 SH)	0.66x 4 (2 CWO, 2 SH)	1.93x 11 (4 EAC, 1 CWO, 6 SH)	1.33x 20 (3 CWO, 17 SH)	1.35x 20 (20 SH)	1.08x 6 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 4 SH)	1.39x 14 (14 SH)	2.19x 5 (5 SH)	2.15x 15 (1 EAC, 3 CWO, 11 SH)
2019/20	1.03x 4 (1 CWO, 3 SH)	0.77x 10 (1 EAC, 3 CWO, 6 SH)	0.82x 9 (1 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 5 SH)	1.39x 23 (3 CWO, 20 SH)	1.07x 26 (1 CWO, 25 SH)	0.80x 6 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 4 SH)	1.13x 15 (15 SH)	5.06x 5 (1 EAC, 3 SH, 1 PART)	1.21x 18 (1 EAC, 4 CWO, 13 SH)
2020/21	1.64x 10 (10 SH)	1.10x 14 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 11 SH)	1.31x 11 (11 SH)	1.29x 20 (1 CWO, 19 SH)	1.06x 20 (20 SH)	0.93x 8 (1 EAC, 7 SH)	1.03x 16 (16 SH)	1.50x 11 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 8 SH, 1 PART)	1.57x 14 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 12 SH)
2021/22	1.05x 10 (10 SH)	0.98x 16 (16 SH)	1.17x 8 (8 SH)	1.09x 22 (22 SH)	0.99x 29 (1 CWO, 28 SH)	1.03x 10 (10 SH)	1.03x 9 (9 SH)	1.00x 7 (7 SH)	1.00x 17 (17 SH)
2022/23	1.00x 6 (6 SH)	1.01x 8 (8 SH)	1.05x 6 (6 SH)	1.00x 0 (0)	1.02x 28 (28 SH)	1.01x 6 (6 SH)			1.00x 4 (4 SH)

Source: Return calculations from providers, analysis by Tax Efficient Review 26/03/2023. Annual numbers of investments include new and follow-on

Table 3 (2 of 2): Summary of EIS Performance by Tax Year - Gross multiple of investments made in the tax year

	Hambro Perks	Mercia	MMC	Molten	Oxford Capital	Octopus Ventures	Par	Parkwalk	Praetura Ventures
Tax Year	as at 28/02/2023	as at 30/09/2022	as at 30/09/2022	as at 31/12/2022	as at 05/10/2022	as at 14/02/2023	as at 31/12/2022	as at 31/01/2023	as at 28/02/2023
2013/14		4.84x 6 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 3 CWO)	2.48x 10 (3 EAC, 1 EBC, 5 CWO, 1 PART)	2.50x 7 (4 EAC, 2 EBC, 1 SH)			9.38x 3 (2 EAC, 1 CWO)	1.85x 17 (5 EAC, 1 EBC, 6 CWO, 5 SH)	8.61x 4 (1 EBC, 1 CWO, 2 SH)
2014/15		2.21x 11 (1 EAC, 8 WO, 2 SH)	2.10x 11 (3 EAC, 1 EBC, 3 CWO, 3 SH, 1 PART)	1.43x 8 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 3 SH)			1.02x 6 (2 CWO, 4 SH)	1.41x 22 (3 EAC, 3 EBC, 7 CWO, 9 SH)	5.33x 9 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 3 CWO, 3 SH)
2015/16		1.51x 22 (3 EAC, 11 CWO, 8 SH)	3.51x 13 (3 EAC, 5 CWO, 3 SH, 2 PART)	2.84x 10 (4 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 3 SH)			0.50x 1 (1 SH)	1.39x 31 (6 EAC, 4 EBC, 10 CWO, 11 SH)	1.65x 9 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 3 CWO, 3 SH)
2016/17		1.51x 19 (2 EAC, 5 CWO, 12 SH)	3.52x 11 (3 EAC, 2 CWO, 4 SH, 2 PART)	2.25x 11 (2 EAC, 4 CWO, 5 SH)	2.79x 12 (1 EBC, 4 CWO, 7 SH)		0.80x 6 (2 EAC, 3 CWO, 1 SH)	1.79x 34 (6 EAC, 4 CWO, 24 SH)	3.52x 11 (1 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 7 SH)
2017/18		1.42x 27 (3 EAC, 1 EBC, 7 CWO, 16 SH)	2.03x 12 (3 EAC, 3 CWO, 5 SH, 1 PART)	1.15x 6 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 1 SH)	3.12x 10 (2 EAC, 2 CWO, 5 SH, 1 PART)		2.23x 7 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 4 SH)	1.26x 39 (3 EAC, 1 EBC, 10 CWO, 25 SH)	1.50x 9 (2 EBC, 2 CWO, 5 SH)
2018/19		0.72x 15 (1 EAC, 7 CWO, 7 SH)	2.64x 14 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 9 SH)	1.76x 14 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 4 CWO, 7 SH)	1.41x 10 (4 CWO, 6 SH)		0.84x 9 (2 CWO, 7 SH)	1.55x 39 (4 EAC, 3 EBC, 7 CWO, 5 SH)	1.63x 7 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 5 SH)
2019/20	2.49x 13 (13 SH)	1.77x 18 (1 PART, 3 CWO, 14 SH)	3.19x 16 (1 EAC, 1 EBC, 14 SH)	1.53x 15 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 12 SH)	1.75x 6 (1 CWO, 5 SH)		1.39x 11 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 8 SH)	1.74x 35 (2 EAC, 1 EBC, 2 CWO, 30 SH)	1.27x 12 (2 CWO, 10 SH)
2020/21	2.14x 9 (1 CWO, 8 SH)	1.05x 22 (1 CWO, 21 SH)	4.10x 12 (1 EAC, 1 CWO, 10 SH)	1.71x 10 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 7 SH)	1.77x 5 (1 CWO, 4 SH)	1.05x 4 (4 SH)	1.06x 13 (2 CWO, 11 SH)	1.47x 37 (1 EAC, 2 CWO, 34 SH)	1.08x 12 (1 CWO, 11 SH)
2021/22	1.20x 10 (10 SH)	0.93x 17 (1 CWO, 16 SH)	1.24x 15 (1 EAC, 14 SH)	1.00x 11 (1 CWO, 10 SH)	1.02x 6 (6 SH)	1.10x 21 (21 SH)	1.15x 14 (14 SH)	1.12x 43 (1 EAC, 42 SH)	1.02x 20 (1 CWO, 19 SH)
2022/23	1.00x 5 (5 SH)	1.00x 8 (8 SH)		1.22x 6 (6 SH)	1.00x 5 (5 SH)	1.00x 18 (18 SH)			1.00x 17 (17 SH)

IMPORTANT NOTE: The main constituent in the valuation is the manager's view of their investments (as there are few exits) - where an investee company is still held then the manager has provided the valuation. As a result of this element of discretion, valuations can vary materially, so a detailed analysis of the manager's valuation methodology is recommended in order to make meaningful comparisons

HOW TO READ THIS TABLE: This table seeks to provide some performance data related to unquoted investments made by the EIS managers in each tax year. As no investor investing in the tax year will have received holdings in each investee company, it does not reflect individual portfolio performance. In addition, different valuation dates between providers makes comparison a difficult task

Gross Valuation multiple and position in year group → **1.23x** 1st of 8
 Colour of cell indicates tercile position of that year's performance
 ■ indicates first tercile (best) ■ indicates second tercile ■ indicates third tercile (worst)
 → Number of investments (including follow-on) and current status
 EAC Exit Above Cost EBC Exit Below Cost PART Partial Exit SH Still Held

Provider fees have not been accounted for nor have any EIS tax breaks such as up-front tax relief or Loss Relief

For each tax year in column 1, the numbers in columns for each provider show the current value of all the investments made by the provider in that tax year followed by the number of holdings. So for example, a figure of 1.4x means that the value of the investments made that tax year are now valued by the manager at 1.4 times cost. A figure below 1 means the current value has declined below cost

Source: Return calculations from providers, analysis by Tax Efficient Review 26/03/2023. Annual numbers of investments include new and follow-on

Table 4: Average time to exit by provider

Providers with data going back at least five years (in alphabetical order)	Exited Above Cost	Exited Below Cost	Partially Exited	Completely Written-Off	All Exits
Ascension EIS Fund as at 31/12/2022	3.11 years (5 Companies)	None	2.23 years (1 Company)	3.02 years (3 Companies)	2.98 years (9 Companies)
Calculus as at 05/10/2022	4.5 years (11 Companies)	5.3 years (5 Companies)	7 years (1 Company)	4.4 years (9 Companies)	5.3 years (28 Companies)
Deepbridge Tech as at 31/12/2022	4 years (1 Company)	None	2 years (1 Company)	3 years (2 Companies)	3 years (4 Companies)
Deepbridge Life Sciences as at 31/12/2022	None	None	None	2 years (1 Company)	2 years (1 Company)
Downing Healthcare as at 31/1/2022	6.54 years (1 Company)	2.95 years (1 Company)	None	6.33 years (2 Companies)	5.54 years (4 Companies)
Edition as at 31/12/2022	None	None	None	None	None
Guinness as at 31/01/2023	3.01 years (5 Companies)	None	2.68 years (3 Companies)	1.99 years (5 Companies)	2.54 years (13 Companies)
Mercia as at 30/09/2022	5.2 years (10 Companies)	2.4 years (3 Companies)	1.8 years (1 Company)	4.1 years (8 Companies)	4.3 years (22 Companies)
MMC as at 30/09/2022	4.7 years (8 Companies)	8 years (1 Company)	6.3 years (2 Companies)	2.9 years (7 Companies)	4.4 years (18 Companies)
Molten as at 31/12/2022	4.4 years (11 Companies)	3 years (3 Companies)	None	3.8 years (6 Companies)	4 years (20 Companies)
Oxford Capital as at 05/10/2022	2.5 years (2 Companies)	1.3 years (1 Company)	5.6 years (1 Company)	4.6 years (7 Companies)	4 years (11 Companies)
Par as at 31/12/2022	5.5 years (5 Companies)	4.2 years (2 Companies)	0 years (0 Companies)	5 years (5 Companies)	5.1 years (12 Companies)
Parkwalk as at 31/01/2023	3.9 years (22 Companies)	4.5 years (7 Companies)	None	5.3 years (26 Companies)	4.6 years (55 Companies)
Praetura Ventures as at 28/02/2023	3.2 years (5 Companies)	4.7 years (1 Company)	None	4.8 years (5 Companies)	4.1 years (11 Companies)

Data from providers for exits where EIS offering has been in existence for at least five years. Where an exited company has received more than one investment then only the time from the first investment to the first exit receipt has been counted
Report produced 26/03/2023

& Unrealised)” and “Gross Multiple of investments purchased in the tax year” as a multiple of cost.

The data will help to compare performance between providers but suffers from the following restrictions:

- The performance measure will not reflect any individual investor unless they happened to participate in all investments made by the provider in any one tax year and in exactly the same proportions.
- Individual performance will need to reflect fees which will not be included in the measurement and so the TER measure will inflate return number.
- The measure will be heavily dependent upon provider valuations of current holdings.
- It will not differentiate between performance based on realisations and that based on

provider valuation of holdings.

- It will not recognise early return of capital in the way that an Internal Rate of Return based calculation does.

Data for Ascension is in Tables 3 to 11:

- As an estimate of performance to compare EIS managers, Table 3 compares the growth figures by tax year for all investments made by a manager in that tax year. Actual investor return data is not available so data for performance for tax years 2013/14 to 2022/23 is compared to some of the other Growth EIS providers.

The performance analysis of the Ascension EIS is from 2017/18 onwards, which is the data we have for the EIS fund. Ascension have been investing in smaller companies since 2012, but TER look at the performance of the fund, which only started

life in 2017.

Whilst the performance for the Ascension EIS is not as long as many others in the peer group, it has shown promise over the relatively short time period.

The rest of the peer group positions by tax year are as follows:

2017/18	3rd out of 15
2018/19	8th out of 17
2019/20	15th out of 18
2020/21	6th out of 19
2021/22	9th out of 19

In order to amalgamate all these positions together, for the main providers with over five years track record, we sum the yearly positions and divide by the number of data points. This gives a single number representing the average yearly position in their peer group and where a lower number is better.

The results are:

Providers with at least five years track record	Average yearly position (lower is better)
MMC	3
Oxford	6
Fuel	7
Praetura	7
Molten	7
Deepbridge Tech	8
Parkwalk	8
Ascension	8
Guinness	8
Calculus	9
Downing	9
Mercia	9
Par	9
Deepbridge Life	11
Edition	13
Blackfinch	14

Table 4 is a new table included in TER EIS reviews and it is designed to show (for providers with at least five years of track record) the average

length of time for an exit to be achieved in an investee company. This includes exits above cost, below cost and completely written off. As can be seen in the table, just under 3 years is the average for Ascension EIS which is better than the average of the exits achieved by its peer group.

As part of our review process, we normally compile a performance measure showing, for each tax year of investment since 2013/14, figures for “Cost”, “Total Value (Realised & Unrealised)” and “Gross Multiple of investments purchased in the year” as a multiple of cost.

Looking at the oldest vintage of investments from 2017/18, this comprised of 14 investments with an average investment cost of £50,000 per company. This is a small investment amount in the context of the EIS market, but Ascension were constrained by funds under management at that stage.

But within the 14 investments there have been four exits above cost from ZigZag Global, Albert, Bizzon and Percent, plus a partial exit from Mutt Motorcycles. There was also a complete write off from Format Zone. But overall this is an impressive number of exits from early stage companies in a relatively short time period.

Investments in the cohorts of years after 2018/19 are all still held, which is to be expected, except for an exit in Greendeck and the complete write off of BRB.

Table 8 in the appendix shows the breakdown of the investment portfolio by valuation with 47% held at cost, which reflects the young age of the investment in the majority of the companies within the portfolio. But 46% have seen an uplift in valuation.

The valuation policy for Ascension EIS fund is that all the uplifted valuations are based on the latest price paid for allotted shares. Ascension tell us that all these uplifts are from further fund raisings with new (3rd party) investors pricing the rounds. Ascension also point out a number of businesses have recently raised on convertible loan notes which are not recognised as value increases until they convert.

The Manager

Ascension has two arms to its business;

1. Tax efficient investing
2. Institutional funds

Whilst this review is focussed on the Ascension EIS fund, there are also the following funds within the Ascension stable:

1. Ascension Seed EIS
2. Ascension Fair By Design Impact EIS
3. Conduit EIS Impact Fund, a partnership between Conduit and Ascension

In conjunction with tax efficient investing, Ascension has raised a £15m institutional fund, Fair By Design, which focuses specifically on alleviating the poverty premium. Ascension say it is backed by Nationwide Building Society and Big Society Capital and that it gives Ascension access to unique deal flow for their EIS funds.

Ascension is also currently raising a £50m fund, Ascension Fund III, which is the next milestone in its work around the poverty premium, backing ventures with mass market potential that improve how people live and work.

The team is detailed below and has grown as assets under management have increased. Table 11 in the appendix shows the time allocated to each task by investment team members.

The 2015 and 2016 fund raisings were almost exclusively from high net worth individuals and from 2017 onwards Ascension started to approach the IFA market. The level of funding from financial advisers has increased since then, and with RAM Capital now promoting them, this should increase in coming years.

The Ascension Investment Management team comprises of:

- **Kip Meek:** Chairman of Ascension, Inquiry Chair at the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA), Chairman of A Million Ads (an Ascension investee company) and a Senior Adviser to the Wireless Infrastructure Group. He is also the co-founder of the Communications Chambers, a network of senior communications industry professionals, providing public policy and strategic advice to the industry. He was previously

a board member of Ofcom and held senior positions at BT and EE.

- **Jean de Fougerolles:** founder of Ascension and has over 20 years experience working in media and technology. He guides the team in each investment decision and also supports the portfolio to scale. After obtaining his MBA from INSEAD in 1996, he became Head of Distribution for MTV Europe out of the London office. Jean then started working at Two Way Media, a pioneer in interactive technology, where he became CEO and led its sale to Virgin Media and a leading private equity group. Jean is originally from Montreal where he received his BA in History with Honours from McGill University. He then became an economist in New York, having completed a Masters Degree in International Relations from Columbia University.
- **Remy Minute:** Partner. He was the founder and CEO of CSC Media Group Ltd, which he sold to Sony Pictures Television for £107m in 2014. Remy has worked in broadcast and technology for nearly 20 years and is an active angel investor. Remy has been a Partner at Ascension since 2018 and is responsible for leading its (S) EIS investments with Jean and Nico Albanese. Additionally, Remy has been a member of the Ascension Investment Committee for its (S)EIS Funds since 2016.
- **Rakesh Murria:** Chief Operating Officer. He runs investor relations, operations and portfolio management. He joined Ascension in January 2019. Previously, Rakesh built a 20-year career within the technology, media, and telecommunications (TMT) sector, including roles such as Head of Strategy and Director of Product at EE across mobile, fixed line, TV and B2B. Most recently, Rakesh co-founded a FinTech start-up and was pivotal in the product build, commercialisation and growth of the business as it raised £3m in funding. Rakesh also has several years of advisory work with early-stage and growth companies across the technology spectrum, as well as angel investing since 2017.

- **Chris Wheatcroft:** Investment Partner. He runs the Ascension Life Fund, a specialist biotech and life sciences investor and the Syndicate. He has been raising funds for early-stage technology businesses for over eight years. After graduating from Edinburgh University, Chris started his own business, the Well Dressed Salad Company, before joining Fizzback, a pioneer in customer engagement software which was sold to NICE Systems for c.\$80m. After the Fizzback exit, he joined Angels Den and set up and managed their Tech, FinTech and InsurTech Clubs where he raised investment for 110+ early-stage businesses over 6 ½ years.
- **Emma Steele:** Partner. Prior to joining Ascension in January 2018, Emma spent five and a half years in the corporate banking division of Santander UK as a Credit Partner in the Large Corporates team and Associate Director in the Healthcare Finance team. Emma holds an MSc in Development Economics from the University of Sussex and a BSc in Philosophy, Politics & Economics from the University of Warwick.
- **Nico Albanese:** Principal. Nico is responsible for sourcing, screening and performing due diligence on investment opportunities - he manages Ascension's 2,500+ annual deal-flow pipeline. Nico joined Ascension in September 2018 after impressing during Ascension's summer intern programme. Prior to Ascension, Nico was a student in the World Bachelor of Business programme, a triple-degree undergraduate programme between the University of Southern California, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and Università Bocconi, that allows students to study across three continents over 4 years
- **Sonia George :** Investment Associate - In 2017, Sonia moved from Lebanon to pursue an MEng Biomedical Engineering degree at Imperial College London. In parallel to her studies, Sonia co-founded an EdTech startup during the pandemic; an online study space for university students with the aim of increasing productivity while working from home. After graduating, Sonia joined Amazon as a Program Manager, analysing data to better understand customer behaviour and strategy at Amazon Fresh Stores.
- **Iulia Tudor:** Portfolio Director. Iulia joined in May 2021. Iulia has spent nearly a decade working in tech - at the Startup Institute and at TechHub (one of London's oldest communities for startups) - in operations, community building and business development. She experienced first hand the challenges of expansion, built teams and planned/executed on go-to-market strategies. Previously, Iulia was at Digital Catapult where she focused on building relationships with the investor community and helped startups with their fundraising strategy.
- **Hadley Diest:** Investment Manager. Responsible for sourcing, screening and performing due diligence on investment opportunities for the Conduit EIS Impact Fund, a partnership between Conduit and Ascension. She has a background in investment banking with a focus on leveraged finance, and also in non-profit finance and strategy. Most recently, she worked as an investment manager at CAF Venturesome, where she led social investing transactions for charities and social enterprises. Prior to that, she worked for Eastside Primetimers as a consultant to charities looking to access social investment, helping them with their financial and business planning work. She holds a MBA from the New York University – Stern School of Business and a BA in economics and philosophy from Wellesley College.

Fees and Costs

The difficulty in trying to compare fees and costs between EIS offers is that they can be charged to both the EIS investor directly or indirectly through the underlying EIS companies. TER consider that any charges made to the EIS companies affects the return to the EIS investor and therefore TER amalgamates both direct and indirect fees to compile a total “five year cost of ownership”. In order to compile the comparison table to illustrate the effect of total charges on a £100,000 portfolio invested for five years, TER have had to make a few assumptions which by definition are not “real world”. The key ones are:

- Level of charges are based on data provided by the portfolio manager
- The 20% assumed annual growth rate of investee companies is made by Tax Efficient Review for modelling purposes only. No estimate is either intended nor implied. Investee company values can go down as well as up.
- No investee company is written-off and all companies are sold together after five years
- Some providers have higher annual costs to reflect the more extensive levels of in-house management and administration of their EIS activities

From the data, TER has compiled two tables. Table 6 shows the detail of how the fees and charges accrue over five years together with a potential exit value of the portfolio if sold after five years and an annual growth rate of 20% has been achieved by all investee companies.

Table 5 then compares the total fees for all the EIS providers and relates total fees to the level of gain driven by the assumed 20% growth rate of the portfolio.

When TER last reviewed the Ascension EIS in 2020 there was no initial fee for investors and a deferred 2% per annum annual management charge which was only paid once distributions have been made. In November 2021 this fee structure was changed quite dramatically. There is now a 5% upfront charge plus a 1% deferred Annual Management fee paid from distribution.

The fees for the Ascension EIS Fund and the Knowledge Intensive EIS fund are as follows:

LEVIED ON INVESTEE COMPANIES

Ascension tell us they levy a 5% fee on investments into investee companies selected for Fund.

LEVIED ON INVESTORS

- **Initial Charge:** 5%
- **Dealing Fee:** 0.25% per investment. Included in the upfront investment fee, but 0.25% charged on exits.
- **Annual management charge :** 1%+VAT. This is a deferred annual management charge which is capped at a maximum of 5 years and is paid out of distributions to investors
- **Performance Fee:** 20% (no VAT) performance fee. After a hurdle rate of 130p on on the investors original £1 (nominal) subscription has been achieved via cash returns from investee companies. There is an “enhanced performance fee” of 30% if investor returns exceed 230p on a £1 investment, and this replaces the standard performance fee, for proceeds beyond 230p per £1 investment, if this hurdle rate is achieved.

As can be seen from Table 5 despite the change in fees to levy an upfront 5% fee, they are still relatively competitive compare with their EIS peer group, appearing as sixth in the table.

It is also encouraging to see a high (by EIS industry standards) performance hurdle of 130p which is set at a “fund” level rather than at an individual “investment” level like that seen within the Octopus Ventures EIS. In addition this is a real hurdle by which we mean the performance fee is only paid on returns over the 130p hurdle. Too often the word hurdle refers to when a performance fee can be paid and the fee is then anything over original cost.

Conclusion

The Ascension EIS first launched in 2017, but Ascension themselves have been investing in smaller companies since they were formed in 2012. This review is focussed on the Ascension EIS fund, but they also have an SEIS fund, the Fair By Design EIS and the Conduit EIS Impact fund. This review also covers the first time that Ascension EIS have launched a Knowledge Intensive fund version of their EIS. As an approved fund, initial income tax relief will be linked to the close date for the fund – which will be 4th April 2023.

The good points about the Ascension EIS are that they have managed to deliver five profitable exits, and one partial exit, over that relatively short period and investors in their first EIS tranche should be happy with the funds which have been returned back to them. It's not all been a bed of roses, there have of course been some complete write offs as well, but the profitable exits certainly outweigh the failures.

These demonstrable exits put Ascension in a different class to many other EIS funds of this size and ilk, as many of their peer group have not yet achieved any profitable exits and can only point to increases in valuations as an indicator of their performance. The valuation of EIS companies is a minefield of interpretation and may not represent what another entity would be willing to pay for that company. The valuations are also fairly meaningless to an investor in that company, as there is no route via which they can sell their holding at that valuation if they so desired. This is why, at TER, we put more emphasis on those EIS managers who have managed to return EIS funds to investors via a successful sale of an investee company to a 3rd party.

The Ascension EIS has also structured their performance fee in a way which properly aligns their performance with the interests of their investors by having to achieve a hurdle of 130p on 100p invested before they receive a performance fee and the fee is then only on returns over the hurdle.

In summary the Ascension team have achieved a lot for their investors since 2017, particularly against the backdrop of the COVID-19 pandemic which froze a lot of activity in the small cap market. Although they remain small in term of fund raising, with only £2m raised this year, they are emerging from the pack of EIS managers and we will watch their progress with interest.

Tax Efficient Review Total rating: 86 out of 100 (for "EIS Growth fund from an established provider with track record")

Table 5: EIS offers estimated five year costs ranked by cost per £1 of profit

Provider	Simulated 5 year return net of fees and charges based on 20% growth per annum	Simulated 5 year fees and charges based on 20% growth per annum	Simulated 5 year cost per £1 of investor profit (column 3 divided by excess of column 2 over £100,000) Lower is better	% of costs charged to investors	% of costs charged to investee companies	Provider treatment of VAT on fees (Note 1)		
						VAT charged on Initial charge?	VAT charged on AMC?	VAT charged on Performance Fee?
GUINNESS	£243,358	£47,078	£0.33	72%	28%	N/A	N/A	Yes
FUEL VENTURES	£217,094	£38,913	£0.33	62%	38%	N/A	Yes	No
EDITION EIS	£201,885	£34,521	£0.34	59%	41%	N/A	Yes	No
ASCENSION	£200,314	£33,913	£0.34	86%	14%	N/A	Yes	No
CALCULUS	£199,828	£35,322	£0.35	85%	15%	Yes	Yes	Yes
PAR EQUITY	£202,935	£35,996	£0.35	73%	27%	Yes	Yes	Yes
BLACKFINCH	£202,446	£36,774	£0.36	57%	43%	No	No	No
HAMBRO PERKS	£190,565	£35,373	£0.39	100%	0%	N/A	No	No
PARKWALK	£182,545	£34,086	£0.41	100%	0%	No	Yes	No
PRAETURA	£194,997	£42,536	£0.45	91%	9%	Yes	Yes	Yes
MOLTEN	£178,003	£36,205	£0.46	100%	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
DOWNING VENTURES	£191,645	£44,349	£0.48	94%	6%	No	Yes	Yes
DOWNING HEALTHCARE	£191,327	£44,666	£0.49	94%	6%	No	Yes	Yes
DEEPBRIDGE TECH	£198,507	£48,592	£0.49	52%	48%	N/A	N/A	Yes
DEEPBRIDGE LIFE SCIENCES	£198,507	£48,592	£0.49	52%	48%	N/A	N/A	Yes
OXFORD CAPITAL	£179,883	£43,741	£0.55	97%	3%	Yes	Yes	Yes
MMC	£172,627	£44,248	£0.61	100%	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
OCTOPUS	£189,614	£54,797	£0.61	100%	0%	No	Yes	Yes
MERCIA EIS	£178,210	£50,378	£0.64	80%	20%	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note 1: The treatment of VAT on fees differs between offers. "Yes" indicates that VAT is charged by the provider. "N/A" indicates that the fee is not charged. "No" indicates that the fee is not subject at present to VAT. This could change in the future. TER does not give VAT advice

This table illustrates the effect of total charges on a £100,000 portfolio invested for five years

Level of charges based on data provided by the portfolio manager

Some providers have higher annual costs to reflect the more extensive levels of in-house management and administration of their EIS activities

Key unrealistic assumptions made by Tax Efficient Review for modelling purposes only: 20% annual growth rate of all investee companies, no investee company is written-off, all companies are sold together after five years

No estimate of return is either intended nor implied. Investee company values can go down as well as up. TER does not give tax advice

Source: Data from Provider, Calculation by Tax Efficient Review. Report produced 26/03/2023

Table 6: Tax Efficient Review Estimate of Total Charges over a five year period for ASCENSION

Fee type	Amount	Description
Investor- Initial charge	5.00%	Up front investment fee of 5% no vat
Investor- Annual management charge	1.20%	Deferred 1% +VAT based on net initial investment
Investor- Annual operating costs	0.00%	None
Investor- Transaction specific costs	0.25%	0.25% No VAT on exit only
Investor- Performance hurdle	130.00%	None
Investor- Performance Fee	20.00%	20% no VAT (30% above 230p based on distributions over net initial subscriptions
Investor- Custodian Fees-Admin per annum	0.00%	None
Investee companies- arrangement fees	5.00%	5% no VAT
Investee companies- annual monitoring fees	0.00%	None
Investee companies- Exit fees	0.00%	None
Held back upfront to cover fees	5.00%	This is the up front charge
% of fund invested in yr1	100.00%	
% of fund invested in yr2	0.00%	
Assumed growth*	20.00%	Tax Efficient Review assumption

Cell colour indicates fee charged to Investor (Yellow) or Investee Company (Pink)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	TOTAL 5 YEAR FEES
Value of portfolio beg year	£100,000	£108,300	£129,960	£155,952	£187,142	
Less Initial charge	£5,000	£0	£0	£0	£0	£5,000
Less Transaction fees	£0	£0	£0	£0	£468	£468
Less Annual Operating Costs	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Less Annual management charge	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Less Arrangement fee	£4,750	£0	£0	£0	£0	£4,750
plus Assumed growth*	£18,050	£21,660	£25,992	£31,190	£37,335	
Monitoring fees	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0
Exit fees/Deferred fees	£0	£0	£0	£0	£6,000	£6,000
Performance Fee	£0	£0	£0	£0	£17,695	£17,695
Value of portfolio at year end	£108,300	£129,960	£155,952	£187,142	£200,314	£33,913
Total cumulative charges	£9,750	£9,750	£9,750	£9,750	£33,913	

This table illustrates the effect of total charges on a £100,000 portfolio invested for five years.

Level of charges based on data provided by the portfolio manager.

Some providers have higher annual costs to reflect the more extensive levels of in-house management and administration of their EIS activities

*Assumed annual growth rate of investee companies is made by Tax Efficient Review for modelling purposes only.

No estimate is either intended nor implied. Investee company values can go down as well as up.

£108,300

Source: Fees data from Providers, Calculation by Tax Efficient Review. Report produced 26/03/2023

£90,250

Table 7: Analysis of Ascension EIS unquoted investments by year as at 13th March 2023

Follow-on investments to be shown in year actually made and not aggregated with first investment					
Tax Year	Company Name	Current Status (Exited, Partial Exit, Still held, Complete Write-off)	Total Investment Cost (not per share price) £m	Total Value (Realised & Unrealised) £m	Gross Multiple of investments pur- chased in the year
2017-2018	Localistico	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.1011	2.02
2017-2018	Night Zookeeper	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.0784	1.57
2017-2018	Visionable	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.4816	9.63
2017-2018	ZigZag Global	Exit Above Cost	£0.0500	£0.3210	6.42
2017-2018	Albert	Exit Above Cost	£0.0535	£0.0779	1.46
2017-2018	Avuxi	Still Held	£0.0650	£0.0650	1.00
2017-2018	Bizzon	Exit Above Cost	£0.1500	£0.2427	1.62
2017-2018	Concured	Still Held	£0.0747	£0.0845	1.13
2017-2018	Driftrock	Still Held	£0.0750	£0.0750	1.00
2017-2018	Format Zone	Complete Write-off	£0.0250	£0.0000	0.00
2017-2018	Mobilus Labs	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.1137	2.27
2017-2018	Mutt Motorcycles	Partial Exit	£0.0760	£0.1483	1.95
2017-2018	Percent	Exit Above Cost	£0.0472	£0.2026	4.29
2017-2018	WeGift	Still Held	£0.1000	£0.3984	3.98
2017-2018 Total			£0.9165	£2.3901	2.61
2018-2019	A Million Ads	Still Held	£0.0415	£0.0415	1.00
2018-2019	Feast It	Still Held	£0.0750	£0.1413	1.88
2018-2019	Globechain	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.0500	1.00
2018-2019	iDefigo	Still Held	£0.0800	£0.0800	1.00
2018-2019	Blokur	Still Held	£0.1204	£0.1204	1.00
2018-2019	BRB	Complete Write-off	£0.0300	£0.0000	0.00
2018-2019	Greendeck	Exit Above Cost	£0.0200	£0.0932	4.66
2018-2019	Incuto	Still Held	£0.0989	£0.0742	0.75
2018-2019	Monolith	Still Held	£0.0990	£0.2848	2.88
2018-2019	Poplar	Still Held	£0.0200	£0.0499	2.50
2018-2019	Secret Spa	Still Held	£0.1190	£0.2676	2.25
2018-2019	Feast It	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.0529	1.06
2018-2019	Secret Spa	Still Held	£0.0300	£0.0579	1.93
2018-2019 Total			£0.8338	£1.3137	1.58
2019-2020	Supply Compass	Complete Write-off	£0.0475	£0.0000	0.00
2019-2020	Beem	Still Held	£0.0345	£0.0345	1.00
2019-2020	Bulbshare	Still Held	£0.0403	£0.0934	2.32
2019-2020	SmartCom	Still Held	£0.0400	£0.0400	1.00
2019-2020 Total			£0.1624	£0.1680	1.03
2020-2021	Hammock	Still Held	£0.2000	£0.4289	2.14
2020-2021	Homepl	Still Held	£0.1000	£0.1659	1.66
2020-2021	Nomio	Still Held	£0.0750	£0.0750	1.00
2020-2021	Better Nature	Still Held	£0.1500	£0.1500	1.00
2020-2021	Dala	Still Held	£0.0800	£0.0800	1.00
2020-2021	Epoch Biodesign	Still Held	£0.1250	£0.4537	3.63
2020-2021	Homepl	Still Held	£0.0625	£0.0870	1.39
2020-2021	Julienne Bruno	Still Held	£0.0500	£0.2809	5.62
2020-2021	Pangaea	Still Held	£0.2000	£0.2000	1.00
2020-2021	Spill	Still Held	£0.1250	£0.1250	1.00
2020-2021	Unhidden Beauty	Still Held	£0.2000	£0.2000	1.00
2020-2021 Total			£1.3675	£2.2463	1.64
2021-2022	Boost Technology	Still Held	£0.1577	£0.2804	1.78
2021-2022	Fuzey	Still Held	£0.2034	£0.2034	1.00
2021-2022	HURR	Still Held	£0.2993	£0.2993	1.00
2021-2022	MindLabs	Still Held	£0.1840	£0.1840	1.00
2021-2022	Superjoi	Still Held	£0.3000	£0.3000	1.00
2021-2022	Thursday	Still Held	£0.2500	£0.2500	1.00

Table 7: **Analysis of Ascension EIS unquoted investments by year as at 13th March 2023**

Follow-on investments to be shown in year actually made and not aggregated with first investment					
Tax Year	Company Name	Current Status (Exited, Partial Exit, Still held, Complete Write-off)	Total Investment Cost (not per share price) £m	Total Value (Realised & Unrealised) £m	Gross Multiple of investments pur- chased in the year
2021-2022	Veratrak	Still Held	£0.3000	£0.3240	1.08
2021-2022	Mobilus Labs	Still Held	£0.3050	£0.3050	1.00
2021-2022	Captur	Still Held	£0.2969	£0.2969	1.00
2021-2022	MiAlgae	Still Held	£0.3210	£0.3210	1.00
2021-2022	Mobilus Labs	Still Held	£0.3050	£0.3050	1.00
2021-2022 Total			£2.9223	£3.0690	1.05
2022-2023	Bonnet	Still Held	£0.2183	£0.2183	1.00
2022-2023	Dines	Still Held	£0.2400	£0.2400	1.00
2022-2023	FarmLend	Still Held	£0.0645	£0.0645	1.00
2022-2023	HubBox	Still Held	£0.1500	£0.1500	1.00
2022-2023	Titan Academy	Still Held	£0.1500	£0.1500	1.00
2022-2023	Untap	Still Held	£0.1055	£0.1055	1.00
2022-2023 Total			£0.9283	£0.9283	1.00
Total			£7.1307	£10.1154	1.42

Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd

ASCENSION EIS FUND AND KI EIS FUND

Table 8: Ascension Ventures Unquoted portfolio analysis for Tax Efficient Review as at 13th March 2023

Investee name	Amount invested	Current Value	Date of this investment	Syndicated	Lead Investor	Structure of investment	Industry sector	Financing stage	Valuation method	Multiple of cost
Visionable Ltd	£49.99	£481.60	Oct-17	Y	N				Note 1	9.63
ZigZag Global Ltd	£50.00	£320.95	Jul-17	Y	N				Note 1	6.42
Julienne Bruno Ltd	£50.00	£280.88	Mar-21	Y	N				Note 1	5.62
Greendeck Technologies Ltd	£20.00	£93.22	Apr-19	Y	N				Note 1	4.66
The Voucher Market Ltd	£50.00	£199.19	Feb-18	Y	N				Note 1	3.98
The Voucher Market Ltd	£50.00	£199.21	Feb-18	Y	N				Note 1	3.98
Epoch Biodesign Limited	£125.01	£453.69	Jan-21	Y	N				Note 1	3.63
Monolith AI Ltd	£97.78	£281.29	Mar-19	Y	N				Note 1	2.88
FF Poplar Ltd	£19.99	£49.92	Apr-19	Y	N				Note 1	2.50
Bulbshare Ltd	£40.32	£93.45	Mar-20	Y	N				Note 1	2.32
Noto Technologies Ltd	£50.03	£113.71	Apr-18	Y	N				Note 1	2.27
Secret Spa London Ltd	£24.96	£56.15	Apr-19	Y	N				Note 1	2.25
Secret Spa London Ltd	£94.00	£211.50	Jan-19	Y	N				Note 1	2.25
Hammock Financial Services Ltd	£200.00	£428.91	Dec-20	Y	N				Note 1	2.14
Localistico Ltd	£50.00	£101.07	Oct-17	Y	N				Note 1	2.02
Mutt Motorcycles Ltd	£38.00	£74.17	Feb-18	Y	N	Equity Ordinary Shares	Software & Computer Services	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Note 1	1.95
Mutt Motorcycles Ltd	£38.00	£74.17	Feb-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.95
Secret Spa London Ltd	£30.00	£57.86	Mar-20	Y	N				Note 1	1.93
Karamu Ltd	£74.20	£139.79	Nov-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.88
Boost Technology Ltd	£157.67	£280.37	Jun-21	Y	N				Note 1	1.78
Homeppl Ltd	£99.99	£165.85	Oct-20	Y	N				Note 1	1.66
Agent Cash Ltd	£79.13	£128.02	Mar-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.62
Agent Cash Ltd	£70.87	£114.66	Mar-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.62
Wonky Star Ltd	£50.00	£78.36	Oct-17	Y	Y				Note 1	1.57
HQ Mobile Ltd	£53.52	£77.92	Mar-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.46
Homeppl Ltd	£62.50	£86.98	Mar-21	Y	N				Note 1	1.39
Concured Ltd	£74.73	£84.48	Feb-18	Y	N				Note 1	1.13
Veratrak Ltd	£300.00	£323.99	Dec-21	Y	N				Note 1	1.08
Karamu Ltd	£50.00	£52.91	Mar-20	Y	N				Note 1	1.06
Honeypot Dating Ltd	£242.49	£242.49	Jun-21	Y	Y				Cost	1.00
Blokur Ltd	£120.39	£120.39	Mar-19	Y	N				Cost	1.00
A Million Ads Ltd	£41.53	£41.53	May-18	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Included Games Limited	£193.85	£193.85	Feb-23	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Nomio Limited	£74.51	£74.51	Dec-20	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Captur Ltd	£296.88	£296.88	Feb-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
HoloMe Ltd	£34.51	£34.51	Mar-20	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Pangaea Data Ltd	£200.00	£200.00	Jan-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00

ASCENSION EIS FUND AND KI EIS FUND

Table 8: Ascension Ventures Unquoted portfolio analysis for Tax Efficient Review as at 13th March 2023

Investee name	Amount invested	Current Value	Date of this investment	Syndicated	Lead investor	Structure of investment	Industry sector	Financing stage	Valuation method	Multiple of cost
Spill App Ltd	£125.00	£125.00	Feb-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Dala Technologies Ltd	£79.99	£79.99	Mar-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
We Are Mind Labs Ltd	£184.00	£184.00	Sep-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Hurr Limited	£299.33	£299.33	Nov-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Fuzey Ltd	£203.40	£203.40	Nov-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Superjoi Ltd	£299.99	£299.99	Dec-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Noto Technologies Ltd	£305.00	£305.00	Jan-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
MiAlgae Ltd	£321.02	£321.02	Apr-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Farmlend Ltd	£64.52	£64.52	Jul-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Dines App Limited	£240.00	£240.00	Oct-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Bonnet Ltd	£218.27	£218.27	Dec-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Convenient Collect Limited	£150.00	£150.00	Dec-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Titan Academy Limited	£150.00	£150.00	Dec-22	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Vochlea Music Ltd	£195.17	£195.17	Jan-23	Y	N	Equity Ordinary Shares	Software & Computer Services	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Cost	1.00
Payaable Ltd	£194.85	£194.85	Feb-23	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Disrupting Beauty Ltd	£200.00	£200.00	Mar-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
iDefigo Group Ltd	£80.00	£80.00	Oct-18	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Avuxi Ltd	£65.00	£65.00	Jan-18	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Globechain Ltd	£50.00	£50.00	Jul-18	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Driftrock Ltd	£75.00	£75.00	Feb-18	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Incall Ltd	£40.02	£40.02	Mar-20	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Better Nature Limited	£150.00	£149.94	Mar-21	Y	N				Cost	1.00
Incuto Limited	£98.89	£74.17	Apr-19	Y	N				Write-down 16%-25%	0.75
Format Zone Ltd	£25.00	£0.00	Feb-18	Y	N				Write-down 76%-100%	-
Project Dora Limited	£30.01	£0.00	Apr-19	Y	N				Write-down 76%-100%	-
Supply Compass Ltd	£47.51	£0.00	Jun-19	Y	N				Write-down 76%-100%	-
Team First App Ltd	£47.23	£202.60	Apr-18	Y	N				Note 1	4.29
TOTALS	£7.3m	£10.3m								1.41

Note 1: Uplift in value, manager valuation based on price of recent funding round which included new external investor(s)
Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd

Table 9: Realisation analysis including write-offs - last three years to 23rd July 2021

Investee Company Name	HQ Mobile Ltd	Mutt Motorcycles Ltd	ZigZag Global Ltd	Format Zone Ltd	Team First App Ltd	Agent Cash Ltd	Greendeck Technologies Ltd	Project Dora Limited
Structure of investment (Equity/Debt)	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares	Equity Ordinary Shares
Sector	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services	Software & Computer Services
Financing stage when first invested	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion	Later Stage, Pre-profit expansion
Board Seat	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Syndicated	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Amount EIS originally invested (£000)	54	76	50	25	47	142	20	30
Date	13/03/2018	27/02/2018	19/07/2017	09/02/2018	04/04/2018	07/03/2018	5/4/2019	5/4/2019
Further investment amounts (if any) (£000 & dates)			14.51 (19/12/2018)					
Realisations/Dividends (£000 & dates)	78 23/12/2018	148 23/05/2020	321 19/03/2021	0 16/10/2020	203 16/10/2020	229 16/10/2020	93.22	£0.00
Annual internal rate of return	61.76%	34.87%	66.00%	TOTAL LOSS	77.53%	20.21%	63.34%	TOTAL LOSS
Length of investment (years)	<1 Year	2 Years	4 Years	2 Years	2 Years	2 Years	3 Years	3 Years

Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd

Table 10: Ascension EIS unquoted portfolio analysis of valuation methodology (% of original cost) as at 13/03/2023

Cost	47%
Write-down 16%-25%	2%
Write-down 76%-100%	5%
Uplift in value, manager valuation based on price of recent funding round which included new external investor(s)	46%
TOTAL	100%

Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd

Table 11: Matrix of individual responsibilities Ascension Ventures 13th March 2023

NAMES	Jean de Fougerolles	Remy Minute	Nico Albanese	Rakesh Murria	Chris Wheatcroft
EIS RELATED WORK					
Deal origination	10%	15%	15%	1%	12%
General enquiries			5%	1%	
New deal doing	10%	35%	20%		6%
Investee board observer seat					2%
Investee board director seats No.	0	0	0	0	1
Sitting on Boards/Monitoring	4%	15%	5%		5%
Fund raising	4%	8%		25%	5%
Internal issues	2%	5%	5%	4%	
Exits	4%	2%		3%	
NON EIS WORK					
Non EIS work	66%	20%	50%	66%	70%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Years in venture capital	13	7	6	5	13
Years involved with EIS Funds	8	7	4	4	13
Years with current team	8	7	4	4	4

Notes:

1. Only includes people with more than 2 years experience in Venture Capital and spending more than 20% of their time on EIS activities
2. This is for the Ascension EIS only and excludes Ascension's other EIS and Institutional Funds
3. All investee company monitoring is within the sitting on boards section (%)

Source: Ascension Ventures Ltd