



Your Partner in Process Scaling: Test Tubes to tonnes



Confidential Investment Memorandum

On _____

Final / Draft #

Invoice/Reference Number:

FOR

Client

BY

Delta 3 Core Tech LLC
1600 Claymore Rd.
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Date



Report: [Report Title]
Subject: [Technology/Topic]
Provider: [Provider Name] (“Provider”)
Client: [Client Name] (“Client”)
Date: [Effective Date]

Confidential Investment Memorandum

Alternate Title: This is an example template to provide potential clients with an example report. This has no factual data. A fully researched diligence TEA report takes anywhere between 1 to 3 months depending on the scope of work.

PREPARED BY:

Dr Palash Gangopadhyay, PhD
Delta 3 Core Tech LLC

1. **Preparation & Standard of Care.** This techno-economic and investment diligence report (the “Report”) was prepared by Provider with reasonable care, skill, and diligence consistent with customary practices for similar work.
2. **Confidentiality & Reliance.** The Report is confidential to Client. Provider does not accept responsibility or liability of any kind to any third party to whom the Report may be disclosed or who may rely on it.
3. **Ownership.** Provider retains all right, title, and interest in and to the Report and all underlying intellectual property. No assignment or transfer of intellectual property is made or intended.
4. **Sources & Third-Party Information.** The Report contains Provider’s proprietary analysis and information obtained from public sources. It does not include confidential materials of any third party unless expressly stated.
5. **License Grant.** Provider grants Client a non-exclusive, perpetual, non-transferable license to use the Report for internal purposes and in client-facing deliverables (e.g., excerpts, slides, derivative analyses).
6. **Use Restrictions.**
 - a) No resale or public redistribution of the Report in full.
 - b) Maintain source citations where they appear.
 - c) Do not remove or alter proprietary notices.
7. **No Warranty; Limitation.** The Report is provided “as is” based on information available as of the date above. Provider disclaims all warranties to the maximum extent permitted by law and assumes no duty to update.



Table of Contents

Cover Page	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Author, & Licensing Information	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Confidential Investment Memorandum	1
Alternate Title: This is an example template to provide potential clients with an example report. This has no factual data. A fully researched diligence TEA report takes anywhere between 1 to 3 months depending on the scope of work.	
TITLE	4
Executive Summary	4
The Opportunity	4
Technology & Competitive Moat.....	4
Key Diligence Findings.....	4
Financial Projections & Valuation.....	5
The Ask & Use of Proceeds	5
Recommendation	5
I. Strategic Market Landscape & Opportunity Analysis	5
A. Market Dynamics for Critical Materials.....	5
B. Competitive Landscape	7
C. Regulatory, Geopolitical, and ESG Imperatives	8
II. Technology & Process Assessment	9
A. Core Process Description and Innovation Claims	9
B. Technology Readiness Level (TRL) and Scalability Analysis	10
C. Benchmarking Against Incumbent and Competing Technologies	11
D. Process Modeling (Preliminary).....	12
III. Intellectual Property (IP) Diligence	12
A. Analysis of Existing IP Portfolio.....	12
B. Competitive IP Landscape and Whitespace Analysis	13
C. Freedom to Operate (FTO) Assessment and Risk Mitigation	14
IV. Technoeconomic & Financial Analysis	15
A. Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) Estimation	15
B. Operating Expenditure (OPEX) Breakdown and Benchmarking	17
C. Financial Projections and Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Valuation.....	18
D. Key Investment Metrics	19



V. Risk Assessment & Sensitivity Analysis	19
A. Identification of Key Risks	19
B. Sensitivity & Scenario Analysis	20
C. Risk Mitigation Strategies	21
VI. Investment Thesis & Allocation Framework	21
A. Final Investment Recommendation and Rationale.....	22
B. Proposed Deal Structure and Valuation	22
C. Framework for Staged Fund Allocation	22
D. Post-Investment Strategic Support Plan	23
<u>References</u>.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.5



TITLE

Palash Gangopadhyay, PhD
Delta 3 Core Tech LLC

To: Investment Committee

From: Deep-Tech Industrial Ventures

Subject: Technoeconomic Analysis and Investment Recommendation for

Executive Summary

The Opportunity

This memorandum presents a comprehensive technoeconomic analysis and investment recommendation for. The company has developed a novel materials processing technology poised to disrupt the supply chains for rare earth elements (REEs) and lithium-ion (Li-ion) battery materials. The core investment thesis is predicated on the technology's potential to address the critical dependency of Western economies on China-dominated critical materials processing through a proprietary, low-cost, and environmentally superior method. This presents a unique opportunity to invest in a strategically vital sector, supported by strong geopolitical tailwinds and a clear technological moat.

Technology & Competitive Moat

The company's core technology is a [brief, high-level description of the technology, e.g., novel solvent extraction process using proprietary ligands]. This process has demonstrated significant performance advantages over incumbent methods, including an estimated 20% higher recovery rate for key elements like Neodymium and Praseodymium (NdPr) and a projected 30% reduction in operating expenditures (OPEX) due to lower reagent and energy consumption. The technology's primary competitive moat is secured by a robust portfolio of [number] issued patents and [number] pending applications, covering the core process chemistry and key equipment designs.

Key Diligence Findings

Our exhaustive diligence process has yielded several key findings. The technology is currently assessed at a Technology Readiness Level (TRL) of 4, having been validated at the component level in a laboratory environment.¹ The projected all-in unit production cost for NdPr oxide is estimated at approximately \$45/kg, positioning it competitively against the target costs of established Western producers and well below the breakeven point required for new greenfield projects.² Market analysis confirms that demand for REEs and Li-ion battery materials is set for explosive growth, driven primarily by the electric vehicle (EV) and renewable energy sectors.³ The primary risks

4 | The content, diagrams, and information shared in this white paper are confidential and the proprietary property of Delta 3 Core Tech, LLC. These materials are intended solely for the use of the recipient for the limited purpose of either exploring a potential collaboration, or a result of an ongoing one, or as part of a purchase. No part of this material may be used, reproduced, or disclosed to third parties without prior written authorization, unless it is part of a purchase. By accepting these materials, the recipient agrees to maintain attribution and acknowledges that Delta 3 Core Tech retains all ownership and rights, unless otherwise assigned under a written engagement agreement.



identified are technical scale-up challenges associated with moving from TRL 4 to a pilot-scale demonstration (TRL 6-7) and market price volatility.

Financial Projections & Valuation

Based on a detailed 10-year Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) model, the project demonstrates compelling financial potential. The analysis projects a Net Present Value (NPV) of [\$X Million] and an Internal Rate of Return (IRR) of, assuming a Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) of [Z%], which reflects the early-stage nature of the venture. The proposed pre-money valuation for this financing round is [\$A Million], based on the intrinsic value derived from the DCF and market comparables for deep-tech materials companies.

The Ask & Use of Proceeds

The company is seeking a [\$15 Million] Series A investment. The proceeds will be strategically deployed to achieve critical de-risking milestones, primarily to fund the design, construction, and operation of a 1 tonne/day pilot plant. This will enable the company to validate its process at scale, achieve TRL 7 demonstration, and provide product samples to potential offtake partners, thereby unlocking significant enterprise value.

Recommendation

Based on the detailed analysis herein, this report issues a definitive **INVEST** recommendation. represents a high-conviction opportunity to secure a foundational position in a technology that is not only economically promising but also of immense strategic importance to national and economic security. The combination of a strong technical advantage, a massive and growing market, and a clear, milestone-driven development plan provides a compelling case for investment.

I. Strategic Market Landscape & Opportunity Analysis

This section establishes the commercial context, defining the size of the prize and the strategic imperatives driving the opportunity. A thorough understanding of the market dynamics, competitive pressures, and overarching geopolitical and environmental factors is essential to framing the investment thesis.

A. Market Dynamics for Critical Materials

The markets for rare earth elements and lithium-ion battery materials are characterized by robust, non-cyclical growth driven by the global transition to a low-carbon economy.



Market Sizing and Growth Forecasts

The target markets for the proposed technology are substantial and expanding rapidly.

- **Rare Earth Elements (REEs):** The global REE market was valued at approximately \$5.3 billion in 2023 and is projected to grow at a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 12.67% to reach \$12.23 billion by 2030.⁵ Other forecasts project a CAGR of approximately 6.2%, reaching over \$11.6 billion by 2035 from a 2025 base of \$6.4 billion.³ This growth is overwhelmingly driven by the demand for high-strength permanent magnets (NdFeB), which are critical components in EV motors and wind turbine generators. The demand for NdFeB magnets alone is forecast to more than double, from 130,000 tons in 2020 to 265,000 tons by 2030, underscoring the acute need for the magnet-focused rare earths Neodymium (Nd), Praseodymium (Pr), Dysprosium (Dy), and Terbium (Tb).⁵
- **Lithium-Ion (Li-ion) Battery Materials:** The Li-ion battery materials market is experiencing even more dramatic growth. Valued at approximately \$41.93 billion in 2024, it is projected to surge to \$120.92 billion by 2029, reflecting an aggressive CAGR of 23.6%.⁴ This expansion is directly tied to the exponential growth of the EV market and the increasing deployment of battery energy storage systems (BESS) for grid stabilization.⁴

Demand Drivers & Value Chain Analysis

The primary demand drivers are structural and long-term. The International Energy Agency (IEA) reported that the share of electric cars in total automotive sales surged from just 4% in 2020 to 18% in 2023, with global sales reaching approximately 14 million units.⁶ This trend is reinforced by government mandates and consumer preferences for cleaner transportation. Similarly, the expansion of renewable energy sources like wind and solar necessitates massive investments in both REE-containing turbines and Li-ion battery storage, creating a synergistic demand pull.³

The value chain for these materials—from mining and concentration to separation, refining, and manufacturing of high-purity compounds and metals—is complex. Significant value is captured in the midstream processing and refining stages, where raw concentrates are converted into the high-purity oxides and salts required by end-users. This segment is also the most significant bottleneck in the Western supply chain, presenting a clear point of entry for a disruptive processing technology.

Price Dynamics and Volatility

The prices for these critical materials are notoriously volatile, subject to supply-demand imbalances, geopolitical events, and speculative trading.⁴ For instance, REE prices saw a major spike in 2022 due to supply constraints and geopolitical tensions before declining.⁷ This price volatility represents a significant risk for new projects, making a low-cost production structure a



critical determinant of long-term viability. A technology that can remain profitable at the lower end of the price cycle possesses a fundamental competitive advantage.²

B. Competitive Landscape

The competitive environment is defined by a small number of dominant incumbents and a growing field of emerging technology developers.

Incumbent Technologies & Players

The global REE market is dominated by Chinese state-linked producers, such as China Northern Rare Earth Group, which control an estimated 85-90% of global processing capacity.³ Outside of China, the key players are Lynas Corporation (Australia) and MP Materials (United States).³ The incumbent processing technology is conventional solvent extraction, a chemically intensive and complex process that has been refined over decades. In the broader specialty chemicals and battery materials space, major players include established giants like BASF, DOW Inc., and Solvay S.A., who possess immense scale, R&D capabilities, and market access.⁹ Any new technology must be benchmarked against the cost and performance of these established players and their deeply entrenched processes.¹⁰

Emerging Competitors & Alternative Technologies

A number of junior mining companies and technology startups are working to develop new REE and battery material assets and processes. These efforts are often focused on novel feedstocks (e.g., coal ash, recycled materials) or alternative separation techniques. Furthermore, the market faces potential disruption from substitute technologies. For Li-ion batteries, alternatives like sodium-ion batteries and hydrogen fuel cells are being developed, though they currently face their own technical and infrastructure challenges and are suited for different applications.⁴ Continuous monitoring of these alternative technology vectors is crucial.

Barriers to Entry & Sustainable Competitive Advantage

The barriers to entry in this sector are formidable. They include:

1. **High Capital Intensity:** Building a commercial-scale processing facility requires hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars in capital investment.
2. **Technical Complexity:** The chemical processes for separating and purifying these materials are highly complex and require specialized expertise.
3. **Intellectual Property:** Incumbent players often hold extensive patent portfolios covering key aspects of their processes.
4. **Regulatory Hurdles:** Projects face long and arduous environmental permitting processes.

The sustainable competitive advantage for the target technology must be clearly defined within this context. A superior cost structure, a significantly reduced environmental footprint, or the ability to



process a unique feedstock that incumbents cannot are examples of durable moats that can overcome these barriers.

C. Regulatory, Geopolitical, and ESG Imperatives

The strategic importance of critical materials has placed them at the center of geopolitical, regulatory, and ESG considerations, which now act as primary market-shaping forces.

Geopolitical Supply Chain Risk

The extreme concentration of REE and, to a lesser extent, battery material processing in China is no longer viewed as a mere economic efficiency but as a significant strategic vulnerability for Western nations.⁸ This has prompted governments in the United States, Europe, Canada, and Australia to enact policies aimed at onshoring or "friend-shoring" these supply chains. Initiatives like the U.S. Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and the EU's Critical Raw Materials Act provide substantial financial incentives, such as tax credits and grants, to develop domestic production capacity.¹² This geopolitical context fundamentally alters the investment calculus. A purely commercial economic model that cannot compete with China's state-subsidized industry is often the wrong lens through which to view these projects.² The ability of a project to align with and capture value from these government initiatives is a key factor in its success. The investment thesis must therefore be framed not just on commercial merit but on its role in building a resilient, secure domestic supply chain.

Permitting and Regulatory Hurdles

Developing new mining and processing facilities in Western jurisdictions is a complex and lengthy undertaking. Projects often require permits from multiple federal, state, and local agencies with overlapping and sometimes conflicting mandates.⁸ Environmental impact assessments, public consultation periods, and the potential for legal challenges from community or environmental groups can extend project timelines by years, adding significant cost and uncertainty. A technology that offers a demonstrably lower environmental impact—for example, by using less water, generating less hazardous waste, or having a smaller physical footprint—may face a more streamlined and less contentious permitting pathway. This can be a significant source of competitive advantage.

Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Factors

ESG considerations have transitioned from a secondary concern to a primary driver of investment decisions and a prerequisite for securing a social license to operate in the materials sector.¹³ Investors, lenders, and offtake partners now conduct rigorous ESG diligence.

- **Environmental:** The key environmental metrics under scrutiny are carbon footprint (energy consumption), water management (usage and discharge quality), waste reduction and circularity (e.g., reprocessing of tailings), and biodiversity impact and land reclamation plans.¹³
- **Social:** Securing community support and the free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) of

8 | The content, diagrams, and information shared in this white paper are confidential and the proprietary property of Delta 3 Core Tech, LLC. These materials are intended solely for the use of the recipient for the limited purpose of either exploring a potential collaboration, or a result of an ongoing one, or as part of a purchase. No part of this material may be used, reproduced, or disclosed to third parties without prior written authorization, unless it is part of a purchase. By accepting these materials, the recipient agrees to maintain attribution and acknowledges that Delta 3 Core Tech retains all ownership and rights, unless otherwise assigned under a written engagement agreement.



Indigenous peoples is non-negotiable.¹⁵ Projects that fail to engage transparently and share benefits with local communities face significant risk of delays and opposition.

- **Governance:** Strong governance, demonstrated through transparent reporting against established frameworks (e.g., Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures, Global Reporting Initiative), robust risk management, and anti-corruption policies, is essential for attracting institutional capital.¹⁵

A technology's inherent ESG profile is therefore a core element of its value proposition. A process that is fundamentally cleaner, safer, and more efficient is not just ethically preferable; it is financially less risky. It will face lower hurdles in permitting, attract a wider pool of capital at a potentially lower cost, and be more appealing to downstream customers who are themselves under pressure to report on their Scope 3 emissions.¹⁴ This direct link between a superior ESG profile and enhanced financial returns is a central pillar of the investment case.

II. Technology & Process Assessment

This section provides a rigorous, evidence-based evaluation of the technology itself, moving from scientific claims to engineering reality. The objective is to validate the core innovation, assess its maturity and scalability, and benchmark its performance against established alternatives.

A. Core Process Description and Innovation Claims

A clear understanding of the technology's fundamental principles and process flow is the starting point for any technical diligence.

Scientific Principles

The technology is based on [a clear, concise explanation of the underlying chemistry and physics of the process, e.g., the use of a novel class of phosphonic acid extractants that exhibit significantly higher selectivity for heavy rare earths at ambient temperatures, reducing the need for costly heating and multi-stage separation circuits]. This scientific foundation is supported by [mention of peer-reviewed publications, laboratory data, or third-party validation reports].

Process Flow and Unit Operations

The end-to-end process, as described in the company's technical documentation, can be summarized in the following sequence of unit operations¹⁷:

1. **Feed Preparation & Leaching:**
2. **Primary Separation:**
3. **Stripping and Purification:**
4. **Product Precipitation:**



Key Innovation Claims

The company makes several specific, quantifiable claims about the technology's advantages over incumbent processes:

- **Higher Recovery/Yield:** Achieves a [XX]% recovery of valuable materials from the feedstock, compared to the industry average of%.
- **Improved Product Purity:** Delivers a final product with [ZZ.Z]% purity, exceeding the specifications required for [specific high-value application, e.g., permanent magnet manufacturing].
- **Reduced Reagent Consumption:** Reduces the consumption of [specific key reagent, e.g., hydrochloric acid] by [AA]% per kilogram of product.
- **Lower Energy Intensity:** Operates at [ambient temperature / lower pressure], resulting in an estimated% reduction in energy consumption (kWh/kg) compared to the energy-intensive incumbent process.
- **Process Simplification:** Consolidates what is typically a [e.g., 50-stage] separation process into a [e.g., 20-stage] circuit, resulting in a smaller physical footprint and lower CAPEX.

B. Technology Readiness Level (TRL) and Scalability Analysis

Assessing the maturity of the technology is critical for understanding the nature and magnitude of the risks involved in its commercialization.

Formal TRL Assessment

The Technology Readiness Level (TRL) scale is a systematic method for estimating technology maturity.¹ Based on a review of the company's experimental data and development history, the technology is assessed at **TRL 4: Component and/or breadboard validation in a laboratory environment**.¹ This assessment is justified by the following evidence:

- The core chemical principles (TRL 1-2) and the proof-of-concept (TRL 3) have been successfully demonstrated in bench-scale experiments.
- Individual components of the process (e.g., the novel solvent extraction chemistry, the precipitation step) have been tested and validated independently in a controlled laboratory setting.
- However, the individual unit operations have not yet been integrated into a complete, end-to-end prototype system operating in a relevant environment. This integration and demonstration are the key requirements to advance to TRL 5 and 6.

The TRL score is not merely a technical classification; it is a direct indicator of the investment's risk profile. An investment at TRL 4 is fundamentally an investment in de-risking the technology itself. This reality dictates that the funding structure must be milestone-based, with capital tranches tied directly to the successful achievement of subsequent TRLs.¹⁹ This aligns capital deployment with tangible progress in risk reduction, protecting investor capital while incentivizing the technical team to focus on the most critical development tasks.



Identification of Critical Technology Elements (CTEs)

The most significant technical risks are concentrated in the Critical Technology Elements (CTEs)—the novel components that represent the biggest departure from established engineering practice.¹ For this technology, the primary CTEs are:

1. **The long-term stability and reusability of the proprietary solvent:** While effective in short-term lab tests, its performance over hundreds of cycles of loading and stripping at scale is unproven.
2. **The solid-liquid separation post-precipitation:** The physical characteristics of the precipitate at a larger scale could present unforeseen challenges for filtration and handling.

Scalability Risks and Engineering Challenges

Scaling the process from the current laboratory scale to a commercially relevant pilot plant presents several key engineering challenges:

- **Mass and Heat Transfer:** Fluid dynamics, mixing efficiencies, and heat management in large-scale reactors and SX mixers-settlers can differ significantly from bench-scale glassware.
- **Materials Compatibility:** Long-term exposure of construction materials (pumps, pipes, vessels) to the process chemistry at operating conditions needs to be validated.
- **Process Control and Automation:** Developing a robust control strategy to manage a continuous, integrated process at scale is a non-trivial engineering task.

C. Benchmarking Against Incumbent and Competing Technologies

A direct, quantitative comparison is essential to validate the claimed advantages of the technology.

Quantitative Performance Comparison

The following table benchmarks the target technology's key performance indicators (KPIs) against the current Best Available Technology (BAT) for this process.

Table 1: Technology Benchmarking Matrix

Key Performance Metric	Target Technology (Projected)	Incumbent Technology (BAT)	Competing Technology (Emerging)
Recovery Rate (NdPr, %)	>95%	~80-85%	~90%
Energy Use (kWh/kg product)	15	30	20
Reagent Cost (\$/kg product)	\$8.50	\$15.00	\$12.00
Final Product Purity (%)	99.9%	99.5%	99.8%
Waste Generated (kg waste/kg product)	0.5 (non-hazardous)	2.0 (hazardous)	1.0 (hazardous)

This comparison clearly illustrates the potential for a step-change improvement in both economic and environmental performance.



Qualitative Assessment

Beyond the numbers, the technology offers qualitative advantages. Its operational simplicity (fewer stages) suggests it will be more robust and easier to control than the incumbent process. The generation of non-hazardous waste significantly reduces long-term environmental liability and disposal costs, a factor of increasing importance to regulators and investors.

D. Process Modeling (Preliminary)

To provide a foundation for the economic analysis, a preliminary process model has been developed based on the company's data.

Process Flow Diagram (PFD)

A simplified Process Flow Diagram (PFD) is essential for visualizing the process and serves as the basis for mass and energy balance calculations.¹⁷ The PFD outlines the sequence of unit operations, major equipment, and the flow of material and utility streams through the plant.

Mass and Energy Balances

Based on the PFD and the fundamental principles of conservation of mass and energy, preliminary balances have been calculated.²⁰ These balances provide the quantitative basis for the entire technoeconomic model. They determine:

- The required flow rates of all raw materials and reagents.
- The consumption rates of utilities like steam, cooling water, and electricity.
- The flow rates and compositions of all intermediate and final product streams.
- The volume and nature of all waste streams.

These calculations, performed on the basis of producing 1,000 kg of final product, form the direct inputs for the OPEX estimation in Section IV.²³

III. Intellectual Property (IP) Diligence

This section provides an exhaustive analysis of the intellectual property landscape to determine the defensibility of the technology and the legal risks associated with its commercialization. A robust IP position is a cornerstone of a deep-tech investment, serving as the primary barrier to entry and a key driver of long-term value.

A. Analysis of Existing IP Portfolio

The company's existing IP assets form the foundation of its competitive moat.



Inventory of IP Assets

A thorough review of the company's IP schedule was conducted. The portfolio consists of the following key assets ²⁵:

- **Patents:** [Number] issued utility patents and [Number] pending patent applications across key jurisdictions, including the United States, Europe, China, and Japan. A detailed list with application numbers, filing dates, and status is included in the appendix.
- **Trademarks:** Registered trademarks for the company name and key product branding.
- **Trade Secrets:** The company has identified and documented several critical trade secrets, primarily related to. A formal trade secret protection policy is in place.

Patent Strength and Validity Assessment

A preliminary analysis of the core patents suggests they are strong and defensible. The claims are well-defined, covering both the novel chemical compositions and the key process steps. A search of prior art databases did not reveal any obvious invalidating references. The patent prosecution history shows that the company successfully navigated initial office action rejections, strengthening the presumption of validity for the issued patents.

Chain of Title and Ownership Verification

Verifying clear and unencumbered ownership of the IP is one of the most critical steps in diligence, as defects in the chain of title can be catastrophic for an investment.²⁶ The review included an examination of all relevant contracts and assignment documents.²⁶ It was confirmed that:

- All inventors, including founders and key employees, have executed IP assignment agreements, transferring all rights to the company.
 - Agreements with all consultants and third-party contractors contain appropriate work-for-hire and IP assignment clauses.²⁵
 - Where technology was spun out of a university, a clear and exclusive license or assignment agreement is in place, with no residual rights or claims from the institution.
- This meticulous verification ensures that the company, and by extension its investors, holds unambiguous title to its most valuable assets.²⁷

B. Competitive IP Landscape and Whitespace Analysis

Understanding the broader IP landscape is crucial for contextualizing the company's position and identifying future strategic opportunities.

Methodology

A patent landscape analysis was conducted using commercial patent databases.²⁸ The search methodology involved a combination of keyword searches related to the core technology and classification-based searches (e.g., CPC/IPC codes). The analysis mapped patenting activity over time, by geography, and by key assignees (competitors). This mapping allows for the visualization of



areas of intense patenting activity as well as "white spaces"—technological domains with little or no existing IP protection.²⁹

Identifying Strategic Opportunities

The whitespace analysis revealed several adjacent technological areas where patenting activity is low but which are strategically relevant to the company's long-term vision. These include [e.g., the application of the core separation technology to other critical minerals like cobalt and nickel, and the development of integrated recycling processes for end-of-life products]. This analysis provides more than just a legal assessment; it functions as a strategic roadmap for the company's future R&D efforts. By directing innovation into these validated, underserved, and less-crowded IP domains, the company can build a more comprehensive and defensible patent portfolio, accelerating its time-to-market and maximizing the value of its R&D investments.³⁰ This proactive approach transforms IP from a static, defensive asset into a dynamic tool for strategic growth.

Assessing Competitive IP Threats

The landscape map also identified the key patent portfolios of major competitors. This analysis highlights the strategic R&D focus of incumbents and emerging players, providing valuable competitive intelligence. The patents identified in this step serve as the primary input for the freedom-to-operate assessment.

C. Freedom to Operate (FTO) Assessment and Risk Mitigation

An FTO analysis is performed to assess the risk of the company's commercial activities infringing on the valid, in-force patent rights of third parties in specific jurisdictions.³²

FTO Search and Analysis

A targeted FTO search was conducted, focusing on the patent claims of third parties in the key commercial markets identified for product launch.³² The search was limited to active patents and published applications that could potentially issue with claims covering the company's specific process, equipment, or final product.³²

Risk Categorization and Mitigation Strategy

The search identified [Number] potentially relevant patents, which were analyzed and categorized based on their risk level. The following table summarizes the highest-risk findings and the proposed mitigation strategies.

Table 2: Freedom to Operate (FTO) Risk Matrix

Blocking Patent ID	Owner	Key Claim(s)	Potential Overlap with Target Tech	Risk Level	Proposed Mitigation Strategy	Estimated Cost/Impact of Mitigation
--------------------	-------	--------------	------------------------------------	------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------



US X,XXX,XXX	Competitor A	Claim 1 relates to a broad process for solvent extraction using any phosphonic acid derivative.	The target technology uses a specific, novel phosphonic acid derivative that may fall under the broad definition.	High	Invalidity Challenge: Commission a detailed prior art search to invalidate the broad claim. The claim appears overly broad and may not have been novel at the time of filing.	Legal Fees: ~\$100k. High probability of success.
EP Y,YYY,YYY	Competitor B	Claim 5 covers a specific mixer-settler design for high-viscosity organic phases.	The target technology's solvent has high viscosity, and the planned pilot plant uses a similar mixer-settler design.	Medium	Design-Around: Modify the mixer-settler design to incorporate features (e.g., different impeller geometry) that clearly fall outside the scope of Claim 5.	R&D/Engineering Cost: ~\$50k. No impact on process performance expected.
US Z,ZZZ,ZZZ	Non-Practicing Entity	Claim 3 relates to a software algorithm for process control optimization.	The planned process control system may use a similar optimization logic.	Low	Licensing: The patent holder is known to offer non-exclusive licenses on reasonable terms.	Estimated Royalty: <0.5% of revenue. Low financial impact.

This structured approach transforms an abstract legal risk into a concrete, actionable plan with quantifiable financial implications.²⁷ The potential costs associated with these mitigation strategies will be incorporated as a contingency in the financial model.

IV. Technoeconomic & Financial Analysis

This section translates the technical, market, and IP assessments into a comprehensive financial model. The goal is to determine the economic viability of the technology, project its potential financial returns, and establish a defensible valuation for the investment.

A. Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) Estimation

Estimating the capital required to build a processing facility is a foundational component of the TEA. The accuracy of the estimate is a function of the project's maturity.³⁵

Methodology Selection

Given the project's current TRL of 4, a factored estimation method is appropriate. This analysis will employ a hybrid approach, starting with the Lang Factor method for a high-level estimate (AACE



Class 5, accuracy $\pm 30\text{-}50\%$) and refining it with a more detailed module costing approach for key equipment (AACE Class 4, accuracy $\pm 20\text{-}30\%$).³⁵ This provides a balance between early-stage practicality and the need for a robust estimate for investment decisions.

ISBL (Inside Battery Limits) Costs

ISBL costs represent the core process plant itself.³⁸ The estimation process is as follows:

1. **Purchased Equipment Cost (PEC):** A detailed equipment list was generated from the PFD. Costs for major equipment (reactors, mixer-settlers, filters) were obtained through preliminary vendor quotes and cost estimation software (e.g., Aspen Capital Cost Estimator).³⁹ The total delivered PEC is estimated at [\$X Million].
2. **Factored Costs:** The PEC is then used as the basis to estimate other direct and indirect costs. Using the Lang Factor for a mixed fluids-solids processing plant (), a preliminary fixed capital cost is estimated.⁴⁰ This is further refined using detailed factors for specific components:
 - Equipment Installation: 30-60% of PEC.
 - Piping: 30-80% of PEC.
 - Instrumentation & Controls: 20-50% of PEC.
 - Electrical: 20-40% of PEC.
 - Buildings & Structures: 25-60% of PEC.

The total estimated ISBL cost, including all direct and indirect components, is.⁴⁰

OSBL (Outside Battery Limits) Costs

OSBL costs cover the necessary site infrastructure and support facilities not directly part of the process, such as utility connections, raw material storage, wastewater treatment, and administrative buildings.³⁸ For a brownfield project (i.e., construction on an existing industrial site with some available infrastructure), OSBL costs are estimated as 40% of the ISBL cost, a standard preliminary assumption.³⁶ This results in an estimated OSBL cost of [\$Z Million].

Total Fixed Capital Investment (FCI) and Total Capital Investment (TCI)

The Total Fixed Capital Investment (FCI) is the sum of all depreciable assets. Working Capital, which is the capital required to manage inventories and accounts receivable/payable, is added to the FCI to determine the Total Capital Investment (TCI).⁴¹

- **FCI = ISBL + OSBL + Engineering Costs + Contingency**
 - Engineering Costs: Estimated at 15% of (ISBL + OSBL).³⁶
 - Contingency: A 25% contingency is applied to the sum of all direct and indirect costs to account for unforeseen expenses, appropriate for this stage of design.³⁶
- **TCI = FCI + Working Capital**
 - Working Capital: Estimated as 15% of the first year's operating costs.

The resulting TCI for a [specify capacity, e.g., 1,000 tonne/year] demonstration plant is projected to be [\$AA Million].



B. Operating Expenditure (OPEX) Breakdown and Benchmarking

Long-term competitiveness is ultimately determined by the unit cost of production. Therefore, a detailed and rigorously benchmarked OPEX model is arguably the most critical output of the TEA. While CAPEX represents the initial barrier, OPEX dictates the technology's ability to survive and thrive through commodity price cycles. A project's economic moat is defined by its cost structure relative to the lowest-cost global producers, particularly state-supported entities that can operate on minimal margins.²

The annual OPEX is broken down into variable and fixed costs.

Variable Costs

These costs are directly proportional to the plant's production volume.

- **Raw Materials:** The largest single component of OPEX. Quantities are derived directly from the mass balance calculations, with an additional 15% allowance for waste and off-spec material.⁴² Prices are based on current market data from sources like the Chemical Marketing Reporter and long-term supply indications.⁴⁴
- **Utilities:** Consumption of electricity, steam, natural gas, and process water is calculated from the process energy balance.⁴⁴
- **Waste Disposal:** Costs are estimated based on the volume and classification (hazardous vs. non-hazardous) of waste streams identified in the mass balance.⁴⁵

Fixed Costs

These costs are incurred annually, regardless of the production rate.

- **Operating Labor:** Based on an estimated staffing plan of [X] operators per shift, plus supervisors and lab technicians.⁴²
- **Maintenance:** Estimated as 4% of the FCI annually, a typical figure for a chemical processing plant with moderate corrosive service.⁴⁴
- **Overhead & SG&A:** Includes plant overhead (supervision, safety supplies), insurance, local property taxes, and corporate Selling, General & Administrative (SG&A) expenses. SG&A can be significant in the specialty chemicals sector, potentially adding up to 4% of revenue.⁴⁶

Unit Cost Benchmarking

The total annual OPEX is divided by the plant's nominal annual production capacity to derive the unit production cost.

Table 3: CAPEX and OPEX Breakdown & Benchmarking (per 1,000 tonne/year plant)

Cost Category	Item	Estimated Cost (\$M)	% of Total	Industry Benchmark	Variance
---------------	------	----------------------	------------	--------------------	----------



CAPEX	Total Capital Investment (TCI)	\$AA M	100%	Varies by technology	N/A
	ISBL Costs	\$Y M			
	OSBL Costs	\$Z M			
	Contingency & Other				
Annual OPEX	Total Annual OPEX	\$BB M	100%	\$XX/kg	Favorable
	Raw Materials		~60%	60-70% ⁴⁷	In Line
	Utilities (Energy)		~15%	10-20%	In Line
	Labor		~10%	5-15%	In Line
	Maintenance		~5%	2-10% of FCI ⁴²	In Line
	SG&A & Overhead		~10%	5-15%	In Line
Unit Cost	\$/kg of Product	\$BB / 1,000,000	N/A	\$XX/kg²	-YY%

The projected unit cost of positions the technology in the [e.g., lowest quartile] of the global cost curve, making it highly competitive. For REEs, this cost is significantly below the incentive price of \$75-\$105/kg needed for most new Western projects and is competitive with the target costs of established producers like MP Materials (low-\$40s/kg).² For Li-ion materials, where raw materials can be up to 70% of COGS, achieving cost leadership is paramount.⁴⁷

C. Financial Projections and Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Valuation

A 10-year, three-statement financial model was constructed to project the company's financial performance and determine its intrinsic value.

Financial Model and Free Cash Flow

The model projects revenues based on market growth and achievable market share, with pricing assumptions tied to commodity forecasts. Costs are based on the detailed CAPEX and OPEX estimates above. From these projections, the Free Cash Flow to the Firm (FCFF) is calculated for each year of the explicit forecast period (Years 1-10).⁴⁹ FCFF represents the cash generated by the business before any debt payments, making it the appropriate measure for valuing the entire enterprise.⁵¹

Discount Rate (WACC)

The discount rate reflects the riskiness of the projected cash flows. For an early-stage deep-tech startup, this risk is high. The Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC) is calculated using the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) for the cost of equity.⁵² Given the technology and market risks, a discount rate of [e.g., 25%] is deemed appropriate for this valuation, which is consistent with rates used for high-risk, pre-revenue ventures.⁵⁴



Terminal Value (TV)

The Terminal Value represents the value of the company's cash flows beyond the 10-year explicit forecast period. The Perpetuity Growth Method is used, assuming a conservative long-term growth rate of [e.g., 3.0%], in line with long-term global GDP growth.⁵⁵ The formula used is in reference 53.

Enterprise & Equity Value

The projected FCFFs for years 1-10 and the Terminal Value are discounted back to their present value using the WACC. The sum of these discounted values yields the Enterprise Value of the company.⁵¹ To arrive at the Equity Value, the company's net debt is subtracted from the Enterprise Value. The DCF analysis yields an estimated Equity Value of [\$XX Million].

D. Key Investment Metrics

The financial model generates the following key metrics, which are standard for evaluating the profitability and attractiveness of a capital project.⁵⁷

- **Net Present Value (NPV):** [\$X Million]. A positive NPV indicates that the project is expected to generate returns in excess of its cost of capital, thereby creating value.⁵⁸
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR):**. The IRR is significantly higher than the WACC of [Z%], indicating that the project's expected return exceeds the required rate of return (hurdle rate).⁵⁷
- **Discounted Payback Period:** [N] years. This is the time required for the discounted cumulative cash flows to recover the initial investment. This timeframe is considered acceptable given the long-life nature of the asset.⁵⁹
- **Profitability Index (PI):** [M]. A PI greater than 1.0 confirms that the present value of the future cash flows is greater than the initial investment, reinforcing the positive NPV conclusion.⁵⁸

V. Risk Assessment & Sensitivity Analysis

This section quantifies the uncertainty inherent in the financial projections and identifies the most critical variables that could impact the investment outcome. The goal is to move from a single-point forecast to an understanding of the range of potential outcomes and to develop strategies to mitigate the most significant risks.

A. Identification of Key Risks

A structured risk assessment was conducted, identifying and categorizing the primary risks facing the project. These risks are summarized below:

- **Technical Risk:** The foremost risk is the failure to replicate laboratory-scale performance (yield, purity, reagent consumption) at the pilot and commercial scales. Unforeseen engineering challenges during scale-up could lead to significant delays and CAPEX overruns.
- **Market Risk:** A sharp and sustained decline in the commodity price of the final product could



render the project uneconomic. The emergence of a superior competing technology or a shift in end-user demand (e.g., away from a specific battery chemistry) also poses a long-term threat.

- **IP Risk:** The risk of litigation from a competitor claiming patent infringement (FTO risk) or a successful challenge to the validity of the company's core patents could undermine its competitive advantage.
- **Regulatory & Permitting Risk:** Significant delays in obtaining the necessary environmental and construction permits are a common and high-impact risk for all new chemical processing facilities.⁸
- **Execution Risk:** This category includes risks related to project management, such as CAPEX overruns due to poor cost control, construction delays, and the inability to attract and retain the specialized technical talent required to operate the plant.

B. Sensitivity & Scenario Analysis

To quantify the financial impact of these risks, a systematic sensitivity analysis was performed on the DCF model. This "what-if" analysis isolates the effect of changes in key input variables on the project's NPV and IRR, revealing which assumptions are most critical to the investment's success.⁶⁰

Methodology and Key Variables

The analysis involved varying one key input at a time while holding all others constant at their base-case values. The variables selected for testing were those with the highest degree of uncertainty and the largest potential impact on cash flows:

- Product Selling Price (±20%)
- Process Yield/Recovery Rate (±10%)
- Key Raw Material & Energy Costs (±15%)
- Total Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) (±20%)

Visualization and Interpretation

The results of the sensitivity analysis are best visualized using a Tornado Chart, which ranks the variables by the magnitude of their impact on the project's NPV.

The analysis reveals that the project's financial viability is most sensitive to the product selling price and the process yield. A 10% decrease in the average selling price or a 5% decrease in the process yield would be sufficient to turn the project's NPV negative. This highlights the absolute criticality of both securing favorable long-term offtake agreements and successfully de-risking the technology at the pilot scale to validate the yield assumptions.

Table 4: Sensitivity Analysis of Key Variables on NPV & IRR

Variable	Low Case Value	Base Case Value	High Case Value	Resulting NPV (\$M)	Resulting IRR (%)
Product Price	-20%	Base	+20%	-\$15.2 M	8.5%



Process Yield	-10%	Base	+10%	-\$5.8 M	14.1%
Energy Cost	+15%	Base	-15%	\$8.1 M	21.3%
CAPEX	+20%	Base	-20%	\$10.5 M	23.5%
Base Case	N/A	Base	N/A	\$25.0 M	28.0%

This quantitative approach transforms the abstract concept of risk into a measurable financial impact. For example, knowing that a 10% drop in yield reduces the NPV by nearly \$31 million provides a clear financial justification for allocating sufficient capital to a robust pilot program.⁶² It allows the investment committee to make data-driven decisions on risk mitigation spending, framing it not as a cost but as an investment in protecting the project's value.

C. Risk Mitigation Strategies

For each of the high-priority risks identified, the following mitigation strategies are proposed:

- **Market Price Risk:**
 - **Strategy:** Aggressively pursue long-term, binding offtake agreements with creditworthy customers. These agreements should ideally include price floors or be based on a cost-plus formula to protect against downside price volatility.
- **Technical Scale-up Risk (Process Yield):**
 - **Strategy:** Implement a rigorous, milestone-gated pilot plant program. The program must be designed to operate for an extended period (e.g., 3,000+ hours) to validate long-term performance, reliability, and reagent stability. Funding for the commercial plant should be contingent on achieving pre-defined yield and purity targets at the pilot scale.
- **Regulatory & Permitting Risk:**
 - **Strategy:** Engage with regulatory agencies and key community stakeholders early and transparently. Proactively commission baseline environmental studies and leverage the technology's superior ESG profile as a key differentiator in the permitting application.
- **CAPEX Overrun Risk:**
 - **Strategy:** As the project advances to the detailed engineering phase, seek a lump-sum, turnkey Engineering, Procurement, and Construction (EPC) contract from a reputable firm. This transfers a significant portion of the construction and cost overrun risk to the contractor.

VI. Investment Thesis & Allocation Framework

This final section synthesizes all preceding analysis into a clear investment recommendation, a proposed deal structure, and a post-investment framework for value creation and risk management.



A. Final Investment Recommendation and Rationale

The comprehensive diligence process confirms that presents a compelling investment opportunity. The investment thesis rests on four key pillars:

1. **Strategic Market:** The company operates in the critical materials sector, which is characterized by immense, non-cyclical demand growth and is the subject of intense geopolitical and governmental support for building domestic supply chains.
2. **Superior Technology:** The technology offers a quantifiable, step-change improvement over incumbent processes in both cost-effectiveness (OPEX) and environmental performance (ESG), creating a durable competitive advantage.
3. **Defensible IP:** A strong portfolio of issued and pending patents, coupled with a clear FTO path, provides a robust barrier to entry.
4. **Manageable Risks:** The primary risks are technical and have been clearly identified. A structured, milestone-based development and funding plan has been designed to systematically mitigate these risks.

Therefore, this report concludes with a high-conviction **INVEST** recommendation.

B. Proposed Deal Structure and Valuation

To align the investment with the company's current stage of development, the following structure is proposed:

- **Valuation:** A pre-money valuation of [\$A Million] is recommended. This valuation is supported by the DCF analysis, which indicates a significant upside from this entry point, and is in line with valuations for other TRL 4 deep-tech materials companies.
- **Investment Instrument:** A Series A priced equity round is the most appropriate structure. This provides the company with the necessary capital for its next phase of growth while establishing a clear governance framework and preference structure for investors.¹⁹
- **Key Terms:**
 - **Investment Amount:** \$15 Million.
 - **Board Composition:** The financing will include a board seat for a representative of the lead investor, ensuring strategic oversight and governance.¹⁹
 - **Pro-Rata Rights:** Investors will have the right to maintain their percentage ownership in subsequent financing rounds.¹⁹
 - **Liquidation Preference:** A standard 1x non-participating liquidation preference to protect investor capital on the downside.¹⁹

C. Framework for Staged Fund Allocation

A core principle of de-risking deep-tech investments is to tie capital deployment to the achievement of tangible, value-creating milestones.¹⁹ The \$15 million investment will be structured in tranches, with subsequent capital releases contingent on meeting pre-defined goals. This approach ensures capital efficiency and aligns the interests of both the company and its investors.



Table 5: Milestone-Based Funding Tranche Schedule

Tranche #	Investment Amount (\$M)	Key Milestone(s) for Release	Expected Timeline	Use of Funds
1	\$5 M	At Closing	Month 0	Finalize detailed engineering for pilot plant; Secure key long-lead equipment orders; Expand technical team.
2	\$7 M	Receipt of all major construction permits for the pilot plant.	Month 6-9	Complete construction and commissioning of the 1 tonne/day pilot plant.
3	\$3 M	Successful, continuous operation of the pilot plant for 1,000 hours, achieving >95% of target yield and purity specifications (TRL 7 validation).	Month 15-18	Operate pilot plant to generate product samples; Initiate offtake agreement discussions; Preliminary engineering for commercial plant.

This tranching structure directly addresses the key technical and regulatory risks identified in the diligence process, ensuring that the largest portion of the investment is deployed only after the project has been significantly de-risked.

D. Post-Investment Strategic Support Plan

Beyond providing capital, the role of an active investor is to leverage its network and expertise to accelerate the company's growth. The post-investment support plan will include:

- **Governance and Strategy:** Taking an active role on the board to provide strategic guidance on technology scale-up, market entry, and corporate development.¹⁹
- **Business Development:** Facilitating introductions to key players in the value chain, including potential offtake partners (e.g., automotive OEMs, magnet manufacturers), strategic investors, and suppliers.
- **Future Fundraising:** Providing strategic advice and introductions to support the company's next financing round (Series B) to fund the first commercial-scale facility.
- **Securing Non-Dilutive Funding:** Actively assisting the management team in identifying and applying for government grants, loans, and other forms of non-dilutive capital. Given the strategic nature of the technology, programs from agencies like the Department of Energy (DOE) and Department of Defense (DoD) represent a significant source of potential funding that can extend the company's runway and reduce shareholder dilution.¹⁹

Works cited

1. Technology Readiness Level (TRL) - Overview - AcqNotes, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://acqnotes.com/acqnote/tasks/technology-readiness-level>
2. Calculating a Cost Curve for U.S. Rare Earth ... - Rare Earth Exchanges, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://rareearthexchanges.com/news/rare-earth-exchanges-calculating-a-cost-curve-for-u-s-rare-earth-production-select-elements/>



3. Rare Earth Metals Market Size, Share & Trends Report 2035, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.researchnester.com/reports/rare-earth-metals-market/5142>
4. Lithium-ion Battery Materials Market Size, Industry Share Forecast ..., accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/lithium-ion-battery-materials-market-23313535.html>
5. Rare Earth Metals Market Size, Share, & Growth Analysis, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.stratviewresearch.com/155/rare-earth-metals-market.html>
6. Lithium-Ion Battery Market Size, Share, Trends & Forecast 2034, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.polarismarketresearch.com/industry-analysis/lithium-ion-battery-market>
7. Rare Earth Elements Market Size | Industry Report, 2030 - Grand View Research, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.grandviewresearch.com/industry-analysis/rare-earth-elements-market>
8. US Government Talks with Critical Metals: Securing Supply Chains, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://discoveryalert.com.au/news/us-government-securing-critical-minerals-2025/>
9. Specialty Chemicals Market Size Forecast Report [Latest], accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/global-specialty-chemicals-165.html>
10. Techno-Economic Analysis at ARPA-E - Department of Energy, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://arpa-e.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-06/Techno-Economics%20for%20ARPA-E%20Performers.pdf>
11. Policy Challenges for Accessing Critical Minerals to Electrify Vehicle Transport, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.rff.org/publications/reports/policy-challenges-for-accessing-critical-minerals-for-electric-vehicles/>
12. Five Steps for Solving the Rare-Earth Metals Shortage | BCG, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.bcg.com/publications/2023/five-steps-for-solving-the-rare-earth-metals-shortage>
13. ESG Factors Influencing Mining: Top 2025 Trends - Farmonaut, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://farmonaut.com/mining/esg-factors-influencing-mining-top-2025-trends>
14. ESG - why influence on the Mining sector continues to increase? - Siecap, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://siecap.com.au/blog/esg-why-influence-on-the-mining-sectors-continues-to-increase/>
15. ESG Factors Influencing Mining: Top 2025 Trends - Farmonaut, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.farmonaut.com/mining/esg-factors-influencing-mining-top-2025-trends>
16. Environment - ESG Portal - SME Guide to ESG Resources - Society for Mining, Metallurgy & Exploration, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.smenet.org/esg/portal/environmental-stewardship>
17. Techno-Economic Modeling for New Technology Development - AIChE, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.aiche.org/resources/publications/cep/2018/january/techno-economic-modeling-new-technology-development>



18. Techno-Economic Analysis - abpdu, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://abpdu.lbl.gov/capabilities/techno-economic-analysis/>
19. Deep Tech Venture Capital Firms: Key Players & Strategies, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://growthequityinterviewguide.com/venture-capital/sector-focused-venture-capital/deep-tech-venture-capital-firms>
20. Process Flow Diagram (PFD) With Mass and Energy Balance | PDF ..., accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/464941004/MASS-20-26-20ENERGY-20BALANCE>
21. 4. MATERIAL AND ENERGY BALANCE - BEE, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://beeindia.gov.in/sites/default/files/1Ch4.pdf>
22. Introduction to Material and Energy Balance - PDH Online, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://pdhonline.com/courses/m239/m239content.pdf>
23. Detailed Process - AssessCCUS, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://assessccus.globalco2initiative.org/tea/detailed-process/>
24. A Simple Founder's Guide to TEAs. Understanding cost competitiveness is... | by Planet A Ventures, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://planet-a.medium.com/a-simple-founders-guide-to-teas-b469f423a2db>
25. Intellectual Property Due Diligence Checklist by Natalia James, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://natalia-james.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Intellectual-Property-Due-Diligence-Checklist-by-Natalia-James.pdf>
26. IP Due Diligence Readiness | WIPO, accessed October 7, 2025, https://www.wipo.int/sme/en/documents/pdf/due_diligence_readiness.pdf
27. IP Due Diligence - Importance and How to Conduct (Checklist), accessed October 7, 2025, <https://abounaja.com/blog/ip-due-diligence>
28. What do you mean by White Space Analysis? - XLSCOUT, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://xlscout.ai/what-do-you-mean-by-white-space-analysis/>
29. minesoft.com, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://minesoft.com/white-space-analysis-what-it-is-why-it-matters/#:~:text=White%20space%20analysis%20is%20a%20strategic%20method%20used%20to%20identify,unmet%20need%20or%20untapped%20potential>
30. White Space Analysis: What it is & Why it Matters - Minesoft, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://minesoft.com/white-space-analysis-what-it-is-why-it-matters/>
31. White Space Analysis And Patent Landscape Analysis - IIPRD, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.iiprd.com/white-space-analysis/>
32. Freedom-to-Operate (FTO) Analysis | Puchberger & Partner ..., accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.puchberger.at/en/services/freedom-to-operate-fto-analysis/>
33. Freedom to Operate (FTO) - Westlaw, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://content.next.westlaw.com/Glossary/PracticalLaw/I66296720ef2a11e28578f7ccc38dcbee>
34. Freedom to Operate Analysis Three Strategies to Efficiently Achieve Robust Results, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.bakerbotts.com/thought-leadership/publications/2023/march/freedom-to-operate-analysis-three-strategies-to-efficiently-achieve-robust-results>
35. (PDF) Suitable method for capital cost estimation in chemical ..., accessed October



- 7, 2025,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287756017_Suitable_method_for_capital_cost_estimation_in_chemical_processes_industries
36. Chapter 7 - Capital cost estimating, accessed October 7, 2025, https://e-tarjome.com/storage/panel/fileuploads/2021-08-24/1629797579_E15570.pdf
37. Cost estimation and economic analysis | Intro to Chemical Engineering Class Notes, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://fiveable.me/introduction-chemical-engineering/unit-10/cost-estimation-economic-analysis/study-guide/oprisbMoU3OCuvGy>
38. Estimation of capital - processdesign, accessed October 7, 2025, https://processdesign.mccormick.northwestern.edu/index.php/Estimation_of_capital
39. Aspen Capital Cost Estimator | CAPEX Estimation - AspenTech, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.aspentech.com/en/products/engineering/aspen-capital-cost-estimator>
40. lang factor – Chemical Engineering Projects, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://chemicalprojects.wordpress.com/tag/lang-factor/>
41. CapEx: It matters how you slice it. - Burk TechnoEconomics, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.burktechnoeconomics.com/know-how/capex>
42. Operating Costs - Engineering.com, accessed October 7, 2025, http://files.engineering.com/download.aspx?folder=245701bc-6ca0-429f-8e97-eea06bf2306e&file=Pages_from_Rules_of_Thumb_for_ChE.pdf
43. Chapter 2 - Cost Estimation: Concepts and Methodology - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), accessed October 7, 2025, https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2017-12/documents/epacmcostestimationmethodchapter_7thedition_2017.pdf
44. ESTIMATION OF OPERATING COSTS - Chemical Engineering Projects - WordPress.com, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://chemicalprojects.wordpress.com/2014/05/11/estimation-of-operating-costs/>
45. How to Analyze Chemical Manufacturing Costs Efficiently - FinModelsLab, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://finmodelslab.com/blogs/operating-costs/chemical-manufacturing-company>
46. 3 areas the chemicals industry can trim SG&A costs - PwC, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.pwc.com/us/en/industries/industrial-products/library/chemicals-industry-can-trim-sga-costs.html>
47. What are core 5 KPIs of Ev Battery Manufacturing Business? - Startup Financial Projection, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://startupfinancialprojection.com/blogs/kpis/ev-battery-manufacturing>
48. 7 KPIs for Effective Lithium Ion Battery Production - FinModelsLab, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://finmodelslab.com/blogs/kpi-metrics/lithium-ion-battery-manufacturing>
49. Startup valuation: applying the discounted cash flow method in six easy steps | EY, accessed October 7, 2025, https://www.ey.com/en_nl/services/finance-navigator/startup-valuation-applying-the-discounted-cash-flow-method-in-six-easy-



step

50. DCF Model: Full Guide, Excel Templates, and Video Tutorial - Mergers & Inquisitions, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://mergersandinquisitions.com/dcf-model/>
51. DCF Model Training | Excel Tutorial Guide - Wall Street Prep, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.wallstreetprep.com/knowledge/dcf-model-training-6-steps-building-dcf-model-excel/>
52. Discounted Cash Flow DCF Formula - Guide to Calculation - Corporate Finance Institute, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/resources/valuation/dcf-formula-guide/>
53. DCF Analysis: How to Value Your Startup's Cash Flows - Qubit Capital, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://qubit.capital/blog/dcf-analysis-startup-valuation>
54. Discounted Cash-Flow Valuation: A Startup Owner's How-To ..., accessed October 7, 2025, <https://sprintlaw.co.uk/articles/discounted-cashflow-valuation-a-startup-owners-howto/>
55. Demystifying Discounted Cash Flow Analysis in Valuations - Citrin Cooperman, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.citrincooperman.com/In-Focus-Resource-Center/Demystifying-Discounted-Cash-Flow-Analysis-in-Valuations>
56. Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) Analysis: The Purpose, Formula, and How it Works - Visible.vc, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://visible.vc/blog/dcf-analysis/>
57. Capital Budgeting: What It Is and How It Works - Investopedia, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.investopedia.com/articles/financial-theory/11/corporate-project-valuation-methods.asp>
58. Profitability Measures: NPV, IRR, AAR, PI | CFA Level 1 - AnalystPrep, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://analystprep.com/cfa-level-1-exam/corporate-finance/measures-profitability-npv-irr-aar-pi/>
59. Payback Period vs Net Present Value: Using Financial Metrics - Stratex Online, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.stratexonline.com/blog/payback-period-vs-net-present-value-why-you-need-both/>
60. Understanding Sensitivity Analysis in Financial Modeling - Alooba, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.alooba.com/skills/concepts/financial-modeling-255/sensitivity-analysis/>
61. What Is Sensitivity Analysis? - Investopedia, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/sensitivityanalysis.asp>
62. Sensitivity Analysis in Financial Modelling: How to Measure Impact and Risk, accessed October 7, 2025, <https://privateequitybro.com/sensitivity-analysis-in-financial-modelling-impact-and-risks/>