

PARTNER TALENT BRIEF

Builders who ship, shown through the work.

An evidence-bound view of product seriousness, technical substance, originality, execution, and validation across the applicant community.

38 of 286 (13%)

advanced or exceptional technical depth

80 of 286 (28%)

differentiated problem framing

17 of 286 (6%)

primary or end-to-end execution

17 of 286 (6%)


explicit external validation observed

HOW MUCH DEMAND CONVERTED INTO PARTICIPATION?

01

Demand and participation

One people-based story. Width shows volume from application to reviewed attendance.



Applicant starting point

Application-reported team status



Applied without a pre-formed team

128 of 286 (45%)

Applied with a pre-formed team

158 of 286 (55%)

Team delivery

This is a team-level completion measure, not a participant quality signal or the count of people whose reviewed evidence cited an event submission.

20 of 20

final teams submitted a project

What people have actually built

A protected cohort matrix compares positive evidence and denominators without treating selection as quality.

Comparable cohort signals Descriptive shares, not a selection score	All applicants Denominator 286 · Unknown withheld	Accepted participants Denominator 83 · Unknown withheld	Confirmed attendees Denominator 78 · Unknown withheld
Prototype or beyond ¹	187 of 286 All applicants · 65% of cohort	67 of 83 Accepted participants · 81% of cohort	59 of 78 Confirmed attendees · 76% of cohort
Advanced or exceptional technical depth ²	38 of 286 All applicants · 13% of cohort	22 of 83 Accepted participants · 27% of cohort	17 of 78 Confirmed attendees · 22% of cohort
Differentiated problem framing ³	80 of 286 All applicants · 28% of cohort	38 of 83 Accepted participants · 46% of cohort	31 of 78 Confirmed attendees · 40% of cohort
Moderate-or-stronger technical depth ⁶	150 of 286 All applicants · 52% of cohort	59 of 83 Accepted participants · 71% of cohort	51 of 78 Confirmed attendees · 65% of cohort

Positive evidence available for the full applicant pool	Primary or end-to-end execution ⁴	17 of 286	Explicit external validation observed ⁵	17 of 286
---	--	-----------	--	-----------

Nested cohort counts are withheld by the privacy rule.
Missing evidence is not a negative assessment.


Public-project evidence used 172/286 applicants · 56/83 accepted participants · 50/78 confirmed attendees. Non-use is not a quality judgment.

Who is in the applicant community

Student, seniority, founder, and technical-function context, with source boundaries and unknowns visible.

Application-reported primary role or stage

One mutually exclusive role or career-stage category per applicant; the distribution totals 100%, including unknown.



Reviewed founding evidence

Current and former founder states are mutually exclusive here; founder state may overlap the primary role or stage shown at left.

Current founder

22 of 286 (8%)

Former founder

7 of 286 (2%)

Career functions

Top functions shown. Functions supported by available career evidence; people may span several.

Software

engineering

164 of 286 (57%)

Data and AI

117 of 286 (41%)

Product

29 of 286 (10%)

Research

29 of 286 (10%)

Operations

22 of 286 (8%)

100%

Primary role
or stage

Independent overlays ⁷

The founder / co-founder role can be one primary role or stage. Reviewed founder state and career functions are non-exclusive; the same person may appear in more than one overlay. Different standards; do not add these counts. Dedicated career-provider evidence was not used in this release.

WHERE DO ROLE, TECHNICAL FUNCTION, AND SHIPPED-PRODUCT EVIDENCE INTERSECT?

04

How applicant signals intersect

Each applicant appears in exactly one intersection row. Filled dots mark recorded signals; empty dots mean signal not recorded, not a negative assessment.

Founder / co-founder evidence			Technical function		Shipped-product evidence	
53 of 286			213 of 286		84 of 286	
Founder	Technical	Shipped	Exact intersection	People	Share	
☐	☒	☐	Technical only	125	43.7%	
☐	☒	☒	Technical + shipped	53	18.5%	
☐	☐	☐	None recorded	48	16.8%	
☒	☒	☒	Founder + technical + shipped	18	6.3%	
☒	☒	☐	Founder + technical	17	5.9%	
☒	☐	☐	Founder only	12	4.2%	
☐	☐	☒	Shipped only	7	2.4%	
☒	☐	☒	Founder + shipped	6	2.1%	

Unclassified or insufficient context: Insufficient founder context: 209 · Unclassified role or stage: 133 · Unclassified function: 55 · Insufficient shipping context: 60.

Exact reviewed application-evidence intersections across founder role, technical function, and shipped-product evidence.

HOW TO READ IT

One exact partition

286 applicants

The eight rows reconcile to the full applicant pool. This is application classification evidence, not a quality score.

ADDITIONAL PUBLISHABLE CROSS-SECTION

Student stage + shipped-product evidence

12 of 286

Separate, non-additive application evidence. It does not imply externally verified product delivery.

PUBLICATION BOUNDARY

Safe intersections only

Additional cross-sections appear only when they remain publishable under the small-group privacy rule.

What the community can build

Concrete methods and capabilities, followed by the market contexts visible in the reviewed work.

Technical methods

Technical approaches visible in the evidence-bound work; people may use several.

Applied AI / ML 111 of 286 (39%)	
Full-stack web 82 of 286 (29%)	
Automation orchestration 67 of 286 (23%)	
Data engineering 53 of 286 (19%)	
Natural language processing 51 of 286 (18%)	
Realtime systems 21 of 286 (7%)	

Demonstrated capabilities

Capabilities demonstrated by concrete work, not self-declared skill lists.

Product engineering 134 of 286 (47%)	
Data and AI engineering 123 of 286 (43%)	
Backend engineering 115 of 286 (40%)	
Frontend engineering 78 of 286 (27%)	
Research experimentation 36 of 286 (13%)	
Infrastructure / DevOps 32 of 286 (11%)	

Where the work is aimed

Top domains shown; reviewed market context; categories may overlap.


Commerce consumer 58 of 286 (20%)		Developer infrastructure 39 of 286 (14%)		Enterprise operations 34 of 286 (12%)	
Financial services 27 of 286 (9%)		Media creative 24 of 286 (8%)		Healthcare and life sciences 17 of 286 (6%)	

What evidence was available

Reviewed source use, explicit non-use, and the boundary between coverage and quality.

Evidence source use

Assessment boundary. These counts mean a source was cited in a person-level evidence review, not attendance, submission completion, or a quality score. The partner output excludes names, contacts, profile links, and raw provider records.



Coverage is not quality

A source not being used only means the evidence review did not use it. It does not downgrade the person or project.

18 of 286 (6%) unresolved

Missing or conflicting reviewed evidence receives no positive claim in this report; this is not a negative assessment.

Aggregate output only

Names, contacts, profile links, and person-level browsing remain outside the partner report.

How to read the evidence

Evidence definitions

1 Prototype or beyond

Prototype, working-product, or production maturity.

3 Differentiated problem framing

The work addresses a specific non-routine problem with a distinct approach or constraint; topic keywords alone do not qualify.

5 Explicit external validation observed

Reviewed evidence explicitly names users, adoption, traction, or credible third-party recognition. Non-observation means the current sources did not support this positive claim; it is not a negative rating.

7 Category overlap

Primary role or stage is exclusive. Founder state, career functions, capabilities, methods, and domains are independent overlays; a person may appear in several. Do not sum the overlays or add them to the 100% distribution.

2 Advanced or exceptional technical depth

Non-trivial architecture, systems constraints, or production methods are visible in the work; language and stack lists alone do not qualify.

4 Primary or end-to-end execution

Application or submitted-project evidence attributes primary or end-to-end delivery to the participant; repository ownership alone does not qualify.

6 Moderate-or-stronger technical depth

Concrete implementation or systems evidence supports at least moderate technical depth; a stack list alone is insufficient.

Definitions, denominators, unknown states, and privacy rules for every claim.

Interpretation

Denominator

Evidence shares use the full eligible applicant population. Source-use coverage is reported separately and is not a quality score.

Unknown

Evidence was missing, insufficient, unavailable, or unresolved. Unknown never means a negative assessment.

Unclassified

The available inputs did not support one controlled career, role, capability, or domain category.

Not in this release

Gender, age, nationality, location, and graduation year were unavailable or unreviewed and were not inferred.

Whole-person unresolved

18 of 286 (6%) had missing or conflicting reviewed evidence. They remain outside positive claims; this is not a negative judgment.

Privacy threshold

Counts, complements, and related intersections under 5 are withheld.