

RECRUITING & INTERVIEW PREPARATION

Venture Capital Recruiting & Interview Playbook

Map the market. Test the evidence. Explain the bet.

Fund fit & applications

Sourcing & sector theses

Customer & founder diligence

Cap tables & fund economics

Original investment cases

Interview simulations & solutions

Contents

01. Explain the bet before defending the price
02. Read the fund before choosing the role
03. Build an application someone can inspect
04. Build a thesis that can lose an argument
05. Source with a method, not a long list
06. ParcelSignal: separate activity from traction
07. Customer and founder diligence
08. Startup economics: find the hidden service cost
09. Cash to evidence: fund the observation period
10. Customer interviews: more calls can preserve the same bias
11. Marketplace exercise: follow completed transactions
12. Hardware diligence: price the milestone and the cash gap
13. Seed ownership and an option-pool top-up
14. Follow-on capital is a new decision
15. Financing terms: calculate the waterfall you are given
16. Conversion exercise: a discount needs a share price
17. Fund math changes the meaning of a win
18. A marked fund becomes a realized distribution
19. Reserve planning and opportunity cost
20. Independent committee case: two companies, one mandate
21. Committee solution: ownership and the reserve constraint
22. Contrasting memos: invest and pass without rewriting the facts
23. Write an investment memo with an explicit next step
24. Technical questions with explained answers
25. First-round simulation: show your research method
26. Final-round simulation: recommend a next step
27. Work with the practice files
28. Preparation plan and source notes

Explain the bet before defending the price

An early-stage investment is a decision under incomplete evidence. A venture interview answer should make that uncertainty visible: what you believe, what supports it, what could invalidate it, and how the ownership and fund economics affect the decision. Enthusiasm is useful; unsupported certainty is not.

This playbook is for students and early-career candidates targeting venture investment analyst or associate roles. It assumes basic percentages and financial statements. It covers fund fit, recruiting evidence, sourcing, startup diligence, ownership, financing and fund math. It does not provide introductions, employer questions, live coaching, legal advice or an investment recommendation. Later-stage growth, buyout modeling and specialist scientific diligence need additional preparation.

All companies, funds, candidate stories, conversations, cap tables and investment exercises are fictional. Dollar amounts are USD. Cases specify simplifications; actual contracts and cash flows govern real investments. The practice rounds and rubrics are original study tools, not hiring standards or predictions.

The decision chain

Use five linked statements: the customer problem, the evidence of a useful solution, the reason the company may build a durable business, the investment economics and the next test. Do not jump from a large market to a valuation without the middle steps.

For example: “Dispatch teams lose time coordinating exceptions. A small pilot suggests this product helps one workflow. I need to test repeat use, willingness to pay and deployment cost before extrapolating. At the proposed ownership, the exit outcome required to matter to this fund is substantial. I would continue diligence on those questions before recommending a check.”

This is a stronger starting point than “logistics is a huge market.” It allows another person to disagree with a specific assumption.

Read the fund before choosing the role

A seed fund, a multi-stage platform and a corporate venture team can evaluate the same company differently. Stage, check size, ownership objectives, geography, sector knowledge, follow-on capacity and strategic constraints affect fit. A good company can be unsuitable for a particular fund.

Build a fund card using public sources: stated strategy, team, announced investments, role description, application requirements and dates checked. Mark inferences separately. A past investment does not prove that the current fund has the same mandate. Fundraising announcements do not tell you exactly

how much uncommitted capital remains.

Bessemer's analyst-program description includes sourcing, research and working with founders and its investing team. It is an employer-specific example, not a universal role or recruiting calendar. Its public page can contain application labels alongside dated deadlines; always follow the current application portal and eligibility details rather than assuming an old “open” label is current. [S1]

Map the actual responsibilities

ROLE EMPHASIS	EVIDENCE YOU CAN PREPARE	WHAT IT DOES NOT PROVE
Sourcing	A defined market map and prioritized company	Proprietary access to founders
Diligence	A customer question tree and decision memo	That a real investment was approved
Technical analysis	A reproducible product or scientific assessment	Commercial demand by itself
Portfolio support	A truthful operating example	Ownership of the entire company's result

Read the job description before choosing an artifact. Investor relations, fund finance and portfolio operating jobs are valuable but have different responsibilities from an investment analyst role. Do not prepare a stock pitch for every job with “venture” in the title.

03

Build an application someone can inspect

Show an example of judgment and the work behind it. For a student, this might be a public-source sector map. For an operator, it might be a product adoption problem with a clearly bounded personal contribution. For a banker or consultant, it might be a decision you can discuss without disclosing confidential information.

Fictional resume example. Weak: “Researched disruptive startups with strong investment potential.” More useful, if true: “Mapped dispatch-software workflows for small logistics operators using public product documentation; compared implementation constraints and wrote a two-page diligence memo distinguishing pilot activity from paid usage.” The second version describes inspectable work and its limits.

Do not imply that independent research was commissioned by a fund. Do not call unpaid interviews customers or a spreadsheet an investment track record. If you have no authorized customer access, say so and present the questions you would test.

A concise why-venture answer

Connect your experience to the work: “I enjoyed investigating why a product was used in one team but abandoned in another. That pushed me toward questions about adoption, incentives and business models. I built a small research project to test that interest. This role's sourcing and diligence responsibilities are the parts I want to develop.” Only use the elements that are true for you.

For “why this fund,” identify a specific mandate, a relevant public investment and a question that shows you have considered the strategy. Avoid copying a firm's marketing language into a compliment. Explain how your existing work is relevant without claiming you already perform the job perfectly.

Useful outreach

Original practice wording: “I am applying for your analyst role and have been studying software for regional logistics teams. Your published investment in an operations platform led me to compare deployment constraints across vendors. I can share a short public-source map. I would appreciate your perspective on how analysts turn sourcing research into a first diligence discussion.”

Keep messages truthful and brief. Respect confidentiality, consent and requests not to follow up. A useful artifact creates a reason for a conversation; it does not entitle you to a reply. No outreach is sent by this guide.

04

Build a thesis that can lose an argument

A sector thesis should specify the buyer, problem, current alternative, adoption constraint, timing hypothesis and disconfirming evidence. “AI will transform logistics” is too broad to guide company selection.

Consider this fictional thesis: regional logistics operators need better exception handling when drivers, warehouses and customer-service teams use different systems. A focused assistant may reduce coordination time, but integration effort, data quality and error responsibility could prevent adoption. The investment question is whether a company can solve a narrow workflow repeatedly and expand economically.

The evidence ladder

Separate statements into observation, interpretation and test. Observation: four pilot users returned in week two. Interpretation: the workflow may have recurring value. Test: measure use after the novelty period, ask what job it replaces and determine whether a budget owner will pay. Four returning users do not establish a scalable market.

THESIS ELEMENT	ORIGINAL QUESTION	DISCONFIRMING SIGNAL
Pain	What happens when an exception is unresolved?	The problem is rare or inexpensive
Buyer	Who controls a relevant budget?	Users like it but no buyer owns the decision
Deployment	What must change before first use?	Integration cost exceeds plausible value
Durability	Why would users continue or expand?	Usage stops after a demonstration
Economics	What costs scale with each customer?	Service labor consumes the contract value

Record your source, date and uncertainty for each claim. Do not present a demo as proof of production reliability. A technically impressive model can still produce a weak business if usage is expensive or the purchasing process is impractical.

05

Source with a method, not a long list

Create explicit inclusion rules before collecting company names. For the fictional logistics thesis: target regional operators, focus on exception workflows rather than route optimization, and identify products that integrate with existing systems. This makes the search reproducible and exposes gaps.

Start with public product pages, documentation, industry events and permitted professional conversations. Keep an evidence log. Classify incumbents, new specialists, internal tools and manual alternatives. A spreadsheet with fifty unverified names is less useful than a short map with clear boundaries and unanswered questions.

An original prioritization exercise

You find three fictional companies. ParcelSignal has six paying pilot customers but high onboarding effort. RouteBloom has impressive demo accuracy but no paid deployments. YardLink has slower growth and a clear budget owner. You do not have enough evidence to rank their investment returns.

Prioritize research instead. ParcelSignal permits a customer and implementation-cost test. RouteBloom needs evidence of a buying process and real-world reliability. YardLink needs an explanation of growth constraints and whether its current niche can expand. A sourcing recommendation can be “take a first meeting to answer this question,” rather than a premature investment approval.

Bottom-up market sizing

Suppose the initial reachable segment has 12,000 operators that meet the product's integration requirements. An assumed annual contract of \$18,000 gives a **\$216 million** segment opportunity. If 25% can realistically enter the initial sales channel under the exercise assumptions, that pool is **\$54 million**. At 10% share of that pool, revenue would be **\$5.4 million**. These are scenario inputs, not observed market facts or a forecast.

To support a much larger revenue outcome, identify a credible expansion path: more customers, additional workflows, higher pricing or another geography. Each requires evidence. Do not describe a \$216 million niche as a billion-dollar revenue opportunity simply because the surrounding industry is large.

06

ParcelSignal: separate activity from traction

ParcelSignal sells an exception-management tool to logistics operators. You receive the following fictional data: 20 organizations signed pilot agreements, 12 actually activated the product, six pay \$1,000 per month, and four of the paying customers still use it weekly after three months. Treat these as small-sample observations.

Pilot activation is $12 / 20 = 60\%$. Paid conversion from signed pilots is $6 / 20 = 30\%$; conversion from activated pilots is $6 / 12 = 50\%$. Four of six paying customers are weekly active after three months: **66.67%** under this exercise's activity definition. That is not a contractual renewal rate, a revenue-retention measure or a reliable forecast of future cohorts.

Current monthly recurring revenue is **\$6,000**, annualized to **\$72,000** if the current run rate persists. This is not \$240,000 from all signed pilots. It is also not proof that the six customers will renew for a year. Ask whether contracts are cancellable, whether pricing is discounted and whether payments were collected.

What would you request next?

Reconcile signed agreements, activation logs, invoices, collections and weekly workflow use at the customer level. Define activation before interpreting it. A login is not necessarily successful use of the core workflow. Ask which customers stopped using the tool and what they returned to.

Two paying customers account for most of the usage. That can indicate a focused segment or concentration risk. Segment by operational complexity and deployment effort before averaging. If the founder manually resolves every exception for the two active customers, the apparent software usage may conceal a services operation.

A traction statement you can defend

“The pilot has six paying customers at a \$6,000 monthly run rate, with limited and uneven use data. We have an early signal of willingness to pay, but not validated retention or repeatable acquisition. I would test whether the workflow value persists without founder intervention.” This states progress without overstating it.

07

Customer and founder diligence

Begin with a real workflow. Ask the customer to explain the last time the problem occurred, the workaround, the cost of delay, who approved the purchase and what changed after adoption. Ask for examples rather than leading with “would you buy an AI solution?” Hypothetical enthusiasm is weaker than behavior tied to a budget.

Original customer dialogue

Candidate: “What did the team do before ParcelSignal?” Customer: “A dispatcher coordinated exceptions by phone.” Candidate: “What changed after the pilot?” Customer: “The dashboard helps, but we still call the founder when the data is wrong.” Candidate: “How often does that happen, and who handles it when the founder is unavailable?”

The point is not to attack the product. It is to discover which part of the value is software and which is scarce human effort. A founder-assisted pilot may be a sensible learning stage. The investment case must explain how the service burden changes as customers grow.

Founder questions with a purpose

Ask why the team selected this initial customer, what it learned that contradicted its original view, which technical or commercial risk is hardest, and what milestone the next financing should reach. Separate confidence from evidence. A founder who changes a view in response to data is not necessarily less

committed.

Check reference scope and permissions. Do not solicit protected information from an employee or treat an informal remark as a verified fact. Background checks, legal diligence, security and scientific validation require appropriate specialists and authorization. A short recruiting exercise cannot substitute for them.

A diligence log

For each issue, write the current evidence, competing explanation, next test and decision consequence. Example: high support hours may reflect one-time integration or a permanent product weakness. Observe a new implementation, classify the work and compare later cohorts. The decision consequence is a revised margin and hiring model, not simply a red or green label.

08

Startup economics: find the hidden service cost

Assume ParcelSignal's six customers pay \$6,000 monthly in total. Monthly cloud and inference cost is \$1,500; direct support and onboarding labor allocated to these customers is \$3,000. Ignore other costs for this gross-margin exercise.

Gross profit is **\$1,500 per month**, or **25% gross margin**. Excluding the direct labor would suggest 75%, a very different business. Debate the allocation with evidence; do not exclude labor merely because founders perform it without a salary today. The cash and normalized economic views can differ.

Suppose an additional customer pays \$1,000 monthly, needs \$150 of cloud cost and \$200 of ongoing direct support once mature. Incremental mature gross profit is **\$650**, or **65%**. If acquiring and onboarding that customer costs \$7,800 separately from those recurring costs, simple steady-state gross-profit payback is **12 months**. Avoid double-counting the same onboarding labor in both the recurring and one-time expense assumptions.

The mature unit does not prove that current company margins will reach 65%. Sales ramp, churn, deployment variation and hiring efficiency still matter. Use cohort evidence as the company learns.

Cash and milestones

Assume \$1.2 million unrestricted cash and current net burn of \$100,000 per month. Simple runway is **12 months**. A \$200,000 one-time security and integration project leaves **10 months** at the same steady burn. If hiring raises monthly burn to \$125,000 immediately after the project, runway is **eight months**.

Define the milestone that the money should buy. For example, the exercise could require three deployments completed without founder intervention and evidence of continued paid use after six months. Those are proposed learning goals, not proof that a later financing will be available. Include time

for fundraising, uncertainty and the consequence of missing the milestone.

09

Cash to evidence: fund the observation period

A financing milestone should specify what the company can learn before cash runs out. “Launch the product” is incomplete if the investment thesis depends on observing customers continue to use and pay for it afterward. This exercise returns to ParcelSignal's operating cash before any new seed financing. It does not add the separate hypothetical seed round from the cap-table chapter.

Opening unrestricted cash is **1.20 million**. A security and integration project requires **0.20 million immediately**. Planned net cash burn is **0.125 million per month in Months 1–3, 0.150 million in Months 4–6, and 0.175 million in Months 7–9**. These figures already include the expected collections and operating payments for each period; do not subtract revenue again. No additional financing or interest is available in the initial plan.

The technical/commercial milestone is six customer deployments completed by the **end of Month 6**, followed by three full months of observed paid workflow use. The observation period therefore ends in **Month 9**. Completion of deployment alone does not satisfy the thesis. The board also wants at least **0.25 million cash** throughout the plan.

Reconcile cash and the learning deadline

After the immediate project, cash is **1.00 million**. Three months at 0.125 burn use 0.375, leaving **0.625**. Months 4–6 use another 0.450, leaving **0.175** at the deployment milestone. Month 7 uses the remaining 0.175, leaving **zero**. Month 8 reaches **-0.175** and Month 9 **-0.350** without new funding.

The negative figures show an unfunded plan. They are not an operating option. At the end of Month 6, the company has completed the stated deployment work but has not funded the full observation period or preserved the desired buffer. To reach Month 9 with 0.25, the costless funding diagnostic is **0.60 million**, before financing costs or any adverse deviation.

The cash buffer is breached before cash reaches zero. End-Month-5 cash is 0.325; end-Month-6 cash is 0.175, below the 0.25 requirement by 0.075. A financing timed for Month 8 would arrive after the first buffer breach and after the model reaches zero. The relevant date is the actual cash need, not the date management hopes the fundraising process will finish.

Slower hiring changes both sides of the plan

Suppose an alternative holds net burn to **0.100 million per month for Months 1–6 and 0.125 million for Months 7–11**, with the same 0.20 upfront project. Cash at Month 9 would be $1.20 - 0.20 - 0.60 - 0.375 =$ **0.025 million**. That looks better than the original Month-9 deficit, but the smaller team now completes the six deployments at the **end of Month 8**. Three full observation months end in **Month 11**.

The extra two months cost another 0.25. End-Month-11 cash is **-0.225 million**, and the gap to the 0.25 buffer is **0.475 million**. Slower hiring reduces the funding requirement from 0.60 to 0.475 under these assumptions; it does not eliminate it. Comparing only cash at Month 9 would miss the postponed evidence deadline.

Neither plan is automatically better. Compare the quality and speed of learning, contractual commitments, customer readiness and the cost of financing. If the smaller team cannot deliver reliable deployments, the alternative's lower burn may not buy the required evidence at all. If the larger team mainly adds coordination cost, the faster plan may be unjustified. Identify the operational mechanism behind the schedule rather than treating every hire as productive immediately.

Write the milestone specification

For each deployment, record the permitted customer ID, start date, completion definition, founder hours, customer workflow use, billing status and end of the observation window. Define a successful deployment before seeing the result. A login, a demonstration and a live operational workflow are different observations.

The proposed release condition for further capital could be: six deployments completed within the stated implementation budget, followed by the defined paid-use observation period, with cash remaining for the next decision. This is a fictional committee condition. It is not a claim that any particular employer or investor uses that threshold, and it does not imply that six observations establish a statistically reliable retention rate.

If the milestone is missed, distinguish a timing delay from a failed hypothesis. A customer delaying rollout for an unrelated internal project differs from abandoning the product because it creates more work. Both can consume cash. Your revision should explain the evidence and the funding consequence together.

10

Customer interviews: more calls can preserve the same bias

Suppose management offers eight references: four unusually active customers and four personal contacts who have seen demonstrations. All eight speak positively about the product. A candidate proposes asking twenty more people selected by the founder to estimate market demand. What does the extra volume solve?

It may provide more examples of the selected group's experience, but it does not establish how less active customers, lost buyers or noncustomers behave. The four personal contacts also have not demonstrated the same willingness to pay as the four customers. Combining their answers into "eight satisfied users" changes the population and the evidence. A larger count from the same selective process can preserve the original problem.