BEIREK

SERVICE PROGRAM

Investment Readiness

Investment Readiness Program

BEIREK LLC - PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMPANY

A program that manages a company's capital requirement, investment thesis, commercial and operating evidence, approved financial-model outputs, corporate records, data room, and investor process through one readiness system.

> Investment readiness is not the production of a more impressive presentation. It establishes the evidence and management discipline required for an investor to examine the company, verify material claims, price risk, and reach an authorized decision.

PREPARED BY
BEIREK LLC
THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT COMPANY

SERVICE PROGRAM
INVESTMENT READINESS
US ENGLISH · VERSION 3.4-FINAL

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

1. An investment process becomes manageable when capital needs and verifiable company facts share one decision chain

Investment Readiness is a project-management program designed to improve decision quality and transaction readiness before an equity investment, strategic partnership, corporate venture investment, family-office investment, or comparable capital event. The service addresses “What capital can the company accept, for what purpose, at what evidence threshold, and under what conditions?” before addressing “What should we tell investors?” It therefore connects the capital requirement, growth plan, institutional capacity, and transaction schedule through one controlled decision chain.

The trigger is often a financing need, but a cash requirement alone does not establish an investable proposition. Management must explain what value-creation step the capital will fund, which commercial or operating evidence supports that step, and how the company will respond if the plan succeeds, falls short, or is delayed. Capital requested only to absorb general overhead or repair an unexplained historical gap weakens the economic thesis. BEIREK does not conceal that weakness; it separates the funding need, its root cause, and the available remediation choices.

The program covers the investment thesis; market and customer evidence; business model; technology and intellectual property; team; historical financials; approved financial model; use of proceeds; cap table; legal and governance readiness; risk register; data room; due diligence; management presentation; investor process; term sheet; and closing readiness. These are not treated as independent document packages. They are connected workstreams that must verify the same company reality from different perspectives.

BEIREK does not guarantee access to capital, investor interest, valuation, transaction timing, or closing. Securities placement, investment advice, legal opinion, tax advice, independent audit, and technical certification remain with authorized providers. The program is accepted when material claims are tied to evidence, gaps have owners and dates, the investor process can be controlled, and management can explain the consequences of its capital decision.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

2. The program creates value when the capital event is defined and evidence owners are accessible

The program is suitable for companies with a verifiable product, service, or project model; an explainable growth plan; accessible management; and a willingness to treat a capital event as an institutional readiness process. A pre-revenue company may be in scope, but it must provide stage-appropriate evidence across technology, product, customer validation, regulatory pathway, and founder capability. A more mature company is held to a higher standard for historical performance, customer contracts, delivery capacity, and management systems.

Suitability begins with five questions. Is the capital event an actual and authorized company decision? Is the use of proceeds connected to strategy? Can the team provide access to material data? Is management prepared to disclose and remediate weaknesses? Can required legal, tax, finance, and technical specialists participate? A missing condition does not always stop the program, but it becomes an explicit readiness limitation and decision risk rather than an assumption hidden inside the work.

The service is not suitable for an engagement intended to market an unverified success story, defend an unrealistic forecast, conceal deficiencies in corporate records, guarantee investor access, or justify a preselected valuation. Transaction activation does not proceed when management refuses to disclose material risk, source documents cannot be identified, or unauthorized sharing is expected. A readiness assessment may not be represented as an approval, certification, or assurance that the company is investable.

BEIREK separates this program from adjacent services. Financial Modeling & Valuation owns model assumptions and valuation outputs; Investment Readiness uses approved outputs for capital planning, the data room, and investor questions. Investor Brand Development owns the narrative, identity, and communication system; this service owns transaction evidence and readiness. Founder’s Liquidity owns founder-level primary-secondary choices, retained ownership, and personal economic consequences. Any adjacent service is separately authorized and connected through version-controlled outputs.

Suitability is accepted when the capital-event owner, decision authority, data access, specialist dependencies, service boundaries, and initial readiness risks are approved in the program charter.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

3. The investment thesis defines the capital type and evidence standard in one frame

An investment thesis is not a more assertive company description. It is a testable set of claims explaining the economic opportunity, the company's capacity to capture it, and the risk-return arrangement for new capital. The thesis connects the customer problem and market, purchasing behavior, differentiated solution, revenue and margin mechanism, management capacity, funding requirement, value-creation milestones, and future strategic options.

Four elements are required for each material claim: a precise statement, the source that supports it, the validity date of the evidence, and the evidence boundary. “Strong customer demand,” for example, is not accepted without distinguishing signed contracts, collections, usage, repeat orders, qualified opportunities, or independent market evidence. A letter of intent is not treated as a binding order, a pilot as commercial repetition, or a total market estimate as the company's accessible market.

The evidence chain leads back to actual operating sources. Financial claims connect to accounting or management records; customer claims to contracts and commercial systems; technology claims to tests and intellectual-property records; and team claims to roles and performance systems. When sources conflict, the most attractive number is not selected. The variance, cause, owner, and remediation decision are recorded. Management estimates, external information, and realized results remain visibly separate.

BEIREK builds the thesis tree and claim-evidence register, manages contradictions, and aligns investor materials with data room sources. The client provides source data, management interpretation, and authorized approval. Acceptance requires every main branch of the thesis to connect to evidence or an explicit assumption, unsupported language to be moderated or removed, and management to explain the thesis in both operating and quantitative terms.

3.1 Capital type determines investor expectations and process design

The company determines which type of capital fits its growth model before determining how much it wants to raise. Minority equity, a strategic investment, corporate venture capital, an asset- or project-level investment, and a convertible instrument carry different return, control, duration, information, and closing expectations. Choosing the wrong capital simply because it is accessible can bind the company to an unsuitable governance or financing structure.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

3. The investment thesis defines the capital type and evidence standard in one frame

CONTINUED · 02

Capital fit is assessed against development stage, cash generation, asset base, CAPEX requirement, growth rate, risk profile, regulatory environment, future-round needs, and owner preferences regarding control. An investor's fund life, minimum and maximum check size, geography and sector mandate, ownership target, board expectations, follow-on capacity, and exit approach are compared with company requirements. This is a process-fit assessment, not investment advice.

The investor process is designed around actual readiness. Opening broad outreach before preparation is complete can produce inconsistent numbers, consume management capacity, and leave a negative market record. The program therefore defines separate decision gates for the readiness wave, limited test conversations, controlled process launch, initial offer review, and closing preparation. Each gate has required evidence, management capacity, open-risk conditions, and an authorized decision to move forward.

Process design does not attempt to manufacture artificial competition among investors. It coordinates information timing, management access, follow-up questions, specialist capacity, and decision dates on a realistic basis. BEIREK manages process scenarios and the decision calendar; investor contact is conducted by the client or an authorized intermediary. Acceptance requires approval of the target capital profile, disqualifying investor criteria, process waves, information levels, and stop conditions.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

4. Market and commercial evidence make the growth narrative testable

The investment thesis defines the customer's economic problem before presenting the solution. It identifies who experiences the problem, how often, at what cost or risk, why current alternatives are insufficient, and which event triggers a purchase decision. Broad trends, social benefit, and technological interest are not confused with willingness to pay. Evidence may differ across B2B, consumer, public-sector, infrastructure, and regulated markets, but a market claim disconnected from customer behavior cannot complete an investment decision.

Category definition determines the budget, comparison set, and decision process through which investors evaluate the company. A company cannot create value merely by placing itself in a category associated with higher valuation multiples. Product function, budget owner, purchase cycle, contract type, delivery model, and competitive alternative are reviewed together. If the business spans multiple categories, the primary and supporting elements are distinguished by their revenue and cost mechanisms.

The market analysis separates the broad addressable universe, the serviceable segment, and the customer population the company can realistically reach. Top-down reports are tested against bottom-up customer lists, channel capacity, sales cycles, production or delivery limits, and geographic permissions. Source date, method, and relevance to the company are recorded. A percentage taken from a single industry report is not used as the company's revenue forecast.

Deliverables include the problem-evidence file, category comparison, market-source register, and accessible-market bridge. If customer interviews are used, the selection method and potential bias are disclosed. Acceptance requires market size to reconcile with company capacity and the commercial model, the customer problem to be supported by observable behavior, and the competitor analysis to address actual alternatives rather than provide a list of names.

4.1 Business model, revenue quality, and commercial validation are explained together

The business model explains how the company creates, delivers, prices, and converts value into cash. The revenue model defines the unit, price, duration, repeat behavior, and contractual structure. Subscription, project, license, product sale, service, commission, and hybrid structures create different gross-margin, working-capital, acquisition, and delivery risks. A single aggregate revenue line can hide these economic differences.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

4. Market and commercial evidence make the growth narrative testable

CONTINUED · 02

Commercial validation extends beyond customer logos or total pipeline value. Contract status, realized price, discount, delivered scope, acceptance, billing, collection, renewal, churn, sales cycle, channel share, and customer concentration are followed at the appropriate customer or cohort level. The opportunity pipeline uses qualified, evidenced, and time-bound stages; a management optimism percentage is not treated as forecast revenue.

A company can lose economic quality while growing rapidly. Contribution margin, customer-acquisition cost, payback, service burden, warranty or returns, project variance, and collection delay are considered with growth. If revenue per customer rises while custom development and support cost rise faster, the scale thesis must be reassessed. Commercial data and the financial model must use the same definitions and periods.

BEIREK establishes the commercial-evidence table, revenue bridge, and pipeline-quality controls. The client provides CRM, contract, invoice, collection, and delivery evidence. Acceptance requires revenue types to reconcile to sources, qualified opportunities to have defined entry and exit criteria, concentration to remain visible, and the identified growth drivers to support approved model assumptions.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

5. Product, technology, and management capacity demonstrate whether the thesis can be executed

Technology readiness is broader than a successful demonstration. It covers repeatable production or deployment, performance and reliability, integration dependencies, cybersecurity and data obligations, technical debt, scale limits, quality control, and the product roadmap. The depth of investor review changes with stage and sector; an early product and an industrial system are not evaluated against the same evidence threshold.

The intellectual-property review is not a patent count. It considers code, designs, brands, data, trade secrets, employee and contractor contributions, licenses, open-source components, university or joint-development rights, and ownership provisions in customer agreements. A technical asset located in the company may not legally belong to it. Legal ownership and infringement conclusions depend on authorized counsel.

A defensible advantage is tested through the time, cost, access, and risk required for an alternative provider to reach the same outcome. Technology, proprietary data, distribution, embedded customer workflow, regulatory permission, cost curve, supply access, and operating learning may contribute individually or in combination. Claims such as “unique,” “unrivaled,” or “difficult to copy” are removed unless evidence and a credible counterfactual support them.

Deliverables include the technology-readiness view, intellectual-property source chain, technical-risk register, and defensibility evidence table. BEIREK manages the review workflow and dependencies; technical specialists own tests, counsel owns rights interpretation, and the client owns the roadmap and actual performance data. Acceptance requires material technology claims to connect to tests or sources, ownership gaps to enter remediation, and the roadmap to align with use of proceeds.

5.1 Team capacity and founder dependency make execution risk visible

Investors examine the management system that will execute the post-investment plan as well as the experience of individual executives. Decision ownership across strategy, sales, product, technology, operations, finance, and people is shown with current capacity, open roles, and hiring timing. Management strengths and incomplete capabilities are both disclosed. Listing every weakness as a future hire is not credible without considering recruitment time, cost, and integration.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

5. Product, technology, and management capacity demonstrate whether the thesis can be executed

CONTINUED · 02

Founder dependency is measured across customer relationships, technical knowledge, product decisions, bank and supplier access, pricing, approvals, and company representation. A founder may create a meaningful commercial or technical advantage; the risk arises when no process, secondary owner, or reliable record supports that advantage. A dependency-reduction plan does not remove the founder. It institutionalizes critical knowledge, authority, and relationships in a controlled manner.

Management capacity is tested through how decisions are prepared, authorized, implemented, and monitored rather than by the number of meetings held. The review examines data, recommendation, approval, and variance handling for budget, hiring, product priority, pricing, major customers, CAPEX, and risk. Post-investment board governance is added to the existing management rhythm; additional reporting alone will not repair an operating system that does not work.

BEIREK develops the role and dependency map, management-capacity gaps, and transition plan. The client provides actual responsibilities, decision authority, performance information, and hiring plans. Acceptance requires critical processes not to depend on one person without control, open roles to have a capital and timing plan, and management to explain the investment thesis using consistent numbers and accountabilities.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

6. The financial model connects funding needs to value-creation milestones

Investors examine the reliability of historical results before forecasts. Revenue, gross profit, operating expenses, CAPEX, debt, working capital, and cash flow are reconciled across accounting records, management reporting, and the financial model. Nonrecurring items, related-party transactions, deferred expenses, project accruals, foreign-exchange effects, and revenue-recognition practices remain visible. An independent audit does not automatically make data transaction-ready; its scope and period must fit the process.

The financial model is not rebuilt within this program. A driver-based model approved through Financial Modeling & Valuation becomes the quantitative engine for the investment thesis. Commercial assumptions connect to customer and sales data; capacity assumptions to the operating plan; people costs to the organization plan; CAPEX to the technical plan; and financing assumptions to the capital process. Model changes remain version controlled. Numbers sent to investors cannot differ from numbers used by the board without a documented reconciliation.

The funding requirement is not simply the total of projected expenses. Opening cash, operating cash flow, working capital, CAPEX, debt service, transaction cost, contingency, and time to the target milestone are evaluated together. Base, downside, and delay cases show when the company reaches each decision gate. An undersized round may create a failed bridge requirement; an oversized round may cause unnecessary dilution and loss of capital discipline.

Deliverables include the historical-financial reconciliation, approved model-reference register, runway analysis, and funding bridge. Acceptance requires historical results to trace to source, operating evidence to support model assumptions, the funding amount to connect to value-creation milestones, and management actions to be defined in downside conditions. BEIREK provides neither an audit opinion nor a valuation guarantee.

6.1 The use of proceeds defines the capability and milestone purchased by capital

Use of proceeds is not a cost list. It is an implementation plan showing which capacity and verifiable outcome investor capital is intended to purchase. Product and technology, sales and market development, operations, organization, CAPEX, working capital, debt repayment, and reserves are defined separately. Each item records amount, timing, accountable owner, dependency, expected output, and success measure.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

6. The financial model connects funding needs to value-creation milestones

CONTINUED · 02

Milestones are not broad goals such as “grow,” “develop the product,” or “build the team.” They use verifiable outcomes such as a defined product release, manufacturing qualification, regulatory permission, customer acceptance, capacity, gross margin, collections, a management role, or readiness for a new country. The economic consequence appears in the approved model, but no milestone guarantees a higher valuation or subsequent financing.

Capital deployment may be linked to decision gates. If later spending depends on prior evidence, that dependency and the consequence of delay are explicit. Management-controlled delay is separated from external permissions, supplier events, or customer decisions. The downside plan identifies which spending can be deferred, which capabilities must be protected, and which thresholds require a board decision.

BEIREK builds the use-of-proceeds matrix and milestone governance. The client approves technical, commercial, and organization plans; the model owner verifies cash impact. Acceptance requires all sources to reconcile to use categories, each material use to have an owner and evidence measure, reserves to have a stated rationale, and the reporting system to remain operable after closing.

6.2 Valuation and ownership effects are presented through scenarios and explicit boundaries

Valuation is not the only decision measure in a capital process. Method, company stage, growth quality, margin, risk, capital intensity, investor rights, and market conditions all affect the outcome. BEIREK connects the basis of the approved valuation work to the investment thesis and transaction terms; it does not select comparables to defend a predetermined number. Method and opinion come from the authorized Financial Modeling & Valuation workstream.

Scenarios place pre-money value, investment amount, primary capital, any secondary sale, option pool, convertible instruments, share classes, transaction expenses, and fully diluted ownership in one view. Headline value is separated from net company proceeds, founder ownership, and investor economics. A higher valuation combined with restrictive economic or governance rights may produce a weaker result for existing shareholders.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

6. The financial model connects funding needs to value-creation milestones

CONTINUED · 03

The cap table reconciles corporate records, share ledger, agreements, options, convertible instruments, and promised rights. Percentages totaling one hundred is not a sufficient control. Share count, class, voting, vesting, conversion, and potential issuance must remain visible. If the legal record and economic model conflict, the discrepancy is resolved or stated as a limitation before investor materials are released.

Deliverables include the valuation-basis summary, scenario table, and version-controlled cap table. Acceptance requires each scenario to use one information date, share and funding movements to reconcile, legal interpretations to connect to authorized sources, and management to explain dilution, control, and future-financing effects as clearly as valuation.

6.3 Legal, tax, governance, and sector requirements remain with authorized specialists

Corporate readiness covers formation and share records, board and shareholder resolutions, signing authority, material agreements, employee and contractor relationships, intellectual property, permits, disputes, data protection, sanctions, and compliance. The purpose is not to replace legal diligence. BEIREK controls which decision depends on which specialist opinion, the facts and document version supporting that opinion, and how its conclusion enters the transaction plan.

Tax readiness routes material historical compliance matters, instrument consequences, incentives, employee equity, cross-border structures, transfer pricing, and closing payments to the appropriate specialist. An estimated tax result is not represented as certainty. The tax advisor's work is registered with scope, date, assumptions, and change triggers. BEIREK does not provide tax advice or guarantee a tax-authority outcome.

Governance design addresses the post-investment board, observers, reserved matters, delegation, budget, reporting, audit, information access, and conflicts. It is tested against management capacity and founder objectives before a term sheet arrives. This reduces the risk that late acceptance of broad rights slows operations, opens technical or customer information without authority, or impairs a future financing.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

6. The financial model connects funding needs to value-creation milestones

CONTINUED · 04

Sector readiness covers licenses, quality and technical standards, foreign-investment rules, export controls, security, environment, data, and customer approvals with the proper specialists. Acceptance requires material corporate and sector matters to follow a source-specialist-conclusion-action chain, the closing impact of open matters to remain visible, and BEIREK's responsibility to remain separate from professional opinions.

6.4 The risk register defines disclosure boundaries and management responses

Investor confidence is not built by hiding risk. The source, probability, company impact, current control, residual exposure, remediation owner, and disclosure timing must be managed accurately. Risks are classified as potential deal breakers, valuation diluters, closing dependencies, and post-investment operating risks. One issue may occupy more than one category.

The register is more than red-amber-green scoring. Each item connects to evidence, material effect, a decision threshold, and a remediation plan. Uncontracted revenue, an intellectual-property assignment gap, customer concentration, regulatory permission, an employment dispute, or a liquidity gap in the model require different specialists and timelines. A plan to fix an issue does not automatically remove the obligation to disclose it.

Disclosure follows staged access. The company does not distribute unnecessary sensitive information early, but it does not hide or minimize facts that materially affect an investment decision. Customer names, personal data, technical secrets, and regulated information are shared through required permissions, confidentiality, and data minimization. BEIREK does not make a legal disclosure decision alone; management and authorized counsel approve it.

Acceptance requires management ownership of material risk, documented disclosure and remediation decisions, consistency between investor materials and the data room, and visibility of risk effects on the model, process calendar, or transaction terms. The program does not promise zero risk. It makes risk decision-ready.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

7. The data room and investor process convert claims into reviewable evidence

A data room is not a cloud folder containing uploaded files. It is a controlled information environment in which investors can examine the company systematically, verify source and currency, receive access according to authority, and manage questions through one record. Folder volume is not readiness. Access to valid evidence supporting material claims is the relevant measure.

The architecture covers corporate, ownership, commercial, financial, tax, people, technology and intellectual property, operations, risk, compliance, and transaction sections. Each document records owner, source, date, version, confidentiality class, validity, related claim, and sharing permission. Draft, unsigned, or expired documents are visibly identified. Multiple versions of an agreement are not left without explanation; the effective version and amendment chain are shown.

Access is staged. General company information, detailed information after confidentiality, restricted personal or customer data, and highly sensitive technical content use different rooms or permission layers. Viewing, downloading, and sharing follow client policy and specialist input. BEIREK manages architecture, indexing, and quality control; the client approves accuracy and authority; legal and information-security specialists address their own areas.

Acceptance requires the index to reconcile to actual files, critical documents to show ownership and validity, permissions to be tested, sensitive data to remain protected, and the data room to answer investor questions at source level.

7.1 Due diligence and Q&A management control the explanation burden

Due diligence is not a defensive activity that begins when an investor submits questions. It is the company's controlled review of its own claims, risks, agreements, financials, and management capacity before a transaction. The objective is not to avoid every question. It is to know material matters before investors do and connect them to the correct specialist, disclosure, and remediation plan.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

7. The data room and investor process convert claims into reviewable evidence

CONTINUED · 02

Every incoming question is recorded by topic, materiality, information owner, response owner, specialist dependency, source document, confidentiality, due date, and approver. Answers do not disappear in email threads. Finance, sales, and management do not provide different numbers for the same question. Estimates, opinions, and realized results are distinguished, and an unknown is not closed with invented certainty. A delayed response carries a reason and a credible delivery date.

Findings use four outcomes: closed and evidenced; remediation in progress; carried into transaction conditions or contractual protection; or accepted residual risk. BEIREK manages the question log, workflow, and consistency controls. Legal, tax, finance, technical, and commercial specialists remain responsible for their professional answers. The client authorizes final disclosure and sharing.

Acceptance requires material questions to be answered with source and approval, open findings to connect to transaction effect, responses to align with materials and the data room, and management to explain residual exposure. BEIREK does not guarantee investor satisfaction or the absence of further questions.

7.2 The management presentation retains the same economics as the model, data room, and risk register

A management presentation is not a meeting in which the founder repeats a memorized story. It should demonstrate that the leadership team manages the market, customer, operations, financial model, capital deployment, and risk through a shared operating logic. The presentation may use the Investor Brand system, but every statement must align with evidence and version controls in this program.

Preparation covers role allocation, core message, number sources, difficult questions, unknowns, specialist referrals, and follow-up documents. The CEO does not need to answer every question. Finance questions go to the financial owner, technology questions to an authorized technical lead, and legal interpretation to approved counsel. A clear division of responsibility offers stronger evidence of management maturity than one individual controlling every answer.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

7. The data room and investor process convert claims into reviewable evidence

CONTINUED · 03

Rehearsals identify inconsistencies rather than manufacture theatrical performance. Revenue definition, customer count, market size, gross margin, runway, use of proceeds, headcount, and roadmap must use one information date across speakers. A difficult question is answered through source, limitation, and follow-up discipline rather than excessive certainty or defensiveness.

BEIREK manages session design, question banks, consistency review, and follow-up. Where Investor Brand Development is engaged, narrative and visual communication are coordinated without transferring evidence ownership. Acceptance requires management to explain thesis and risk together, numbers to reconcile to source, response ownership to be clear, and meeting commitments to be completed through the controlled log.

7.3 Targeting and contact management direct management time toward suitable investors

An investor list is not a long directory of accessible names. It is an evidence-based selection of counterparties whose capital mandate, check size, stage, sector, geography, ownership, governance approach, follow-on capacity, strategic contribution, conflicts, and process behavior fit the company. A well-known investor is not automatically a suitable investor.

For each target, the register captures the fit rationale, likely concern, contact channel, existing relationship, confidentiality risk, information level, and next decision. Competing investments, customer or supplier relationships, country restrictions, and technical-information sensitivity are reviewed before outreach. A strategic investor is evaluated across commercial contribution, information access, exclusivity, and effects on future buyer or financing options.

Contact management uses one record. It shows the material version sent, meeting participants, questions, follow-up commitments, status, reason for decline, next action, and information access. Unauthorized parallel contact cannot circulate different numbers or conditions. BEIREK manages targeting criteria and process control but does not provide securities placement or a fundraising guarantee. Outreach is conducted by the client or an authorized intermediary.

Acceptance requires targets to follow explicit fit criteria, conflict and information risks to be assessed, every contact to appear in the version and commitment record, and management time to be prioritized by investment potential and strategic fit.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

7. The data room and investor process convert claims into reviewable evidence

CONTINUED · 04

7.4 Term sheet and closing readiness advance commercial decisions through specialist review

A term sheet covers economic, governance, and transaction provisions beyond investment amount and valuation. Share class, liquidation preference, anti-dilution protection, option pool, board, reserved matters, information rights, transfer, founder vesting, exclusivity, expenses, conditions, and timing affect the company's future decision space. Authorized counsel owns legal meaning and drafting.

BEIREK places offers into one comparison structure. Headline valuation, net company proceeds, dilution, control, investor rights, closing conditions, specialist risks, and timing are evaluated together. A higher valuation or larger check is not automatically superior. The client defines decision thresholds and negotiation authority before the offer arrives; each change is recorded with source version and approval.

Closing readiness combines corporate approvals, documents, specialist opinions, third-party consents, bank requirements, regulatory permissions, share and funds flow, data and technology conditions, and post-closing actions in one dependency plan. A condition is ready only when its evidence, authority, effectiveness, counterparty acceptance, and any required payment are verified. A bank or permission item left to the last day can make an otherwise signed transaction impossible to implement.

Acceptance requires offer terms to connect to economic and governance consequences, open issues to be routed to legal and tax specialists, the closing critical path to be tracked through accountable evidence, and signature authority to sit with the proper corporate bodies. BEIREK does not draft terms, issue legal conclusions, or guarantee closing.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

8. A five-phase program moves from readiness diagnosis to post-investment transition

Phase	Primary activity	Decision gate and exit evidence
1. Readiness diagnosis	Define the capital event, suitability, source authority, and critical evidence gaps	Approve scope, sponsor, evidence owners, and open dependencies
2. Thesis and evidence structure	Reconcile the investment thesis with market, commercial, product, team, model, and risk evidence	Make every principal claim visible with its owner, source, boundary, and approval status
3. Material and data room readiness	Establish the use of proceeds, management presentation, data room index, and Q&A system	Confirm that numbers, claims, and documents contain no material conflict
4. Investor process and transaction readiness	Manage targeting, access, follow-up, term sheet decisions, and closing dependencies	Enable management to make commercial decisions using authorized specialist input
5. Post-closing transition	Transfer commitments, governance, reporting, and the first 12 weeks of execution	Operate owners, dates, acceptance evidence, and open risks through one record

Phase timing depends on data quality, financial-model readiness, specialist reviews, and management decision speed. A phase does not close because files exist. It closes when evidence and an authorized client decision support the next investment decision.

8.1 The first 12 weeks after investment convert the thesis into accountable execution

Closing may end the transaction workstream, but it begins operation of the new capital and governance arrangement. The first 12 weeks reconcile investment proceeds to bank and accounting records, update the cap table, activate board and reporting cadence, establish use-of-proceeds controls, and assign the first milestones. Transaction commitments do not remain isolated in signed documents; they become operating responsibilities.

The initial board calendar, decision authority, information rights, budget, and reporting definitions are approved. Model use-of-proceeds categories connect to accounting codes and management reporting. Hiring, product, sales, operations, and CAPEX work packages carry start conditions, dependencies, output, and acceptance evidence. Investor reporting is not a separate performance file; it is a controlled summary from the same internal decision system.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

8. A five-phase program moves from readiness diagnosis to post-investment transition

CONTINUED · 02

Early variance is not concealed. A delayed permit, weak sales conversion, higher cost, hiring gap, or technical problem is addressed through effect, corrective choice, and board decision. Spending outside the approved plan follows thresholds and authorization. BEIREK manages transition and implementation control but does not decide on behalf of the investor or board.

Acceptance requires closing records to reconcile with funds and ownership, new governance cadence to operate, initial capital deployment to be evidenced, milestone owners to be active, and open transaction commitments to remain tracked with accountable dates.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

9. Clear roles, deliverables, and acceptance evidence protect the control boundaries of the investment process

BEIREK establishes program architecture, manages workstreams and decision gates, controls claim-evidence relationships, coordinates data room and diligence records, places specialist outputs into the correct decisions, and follows the transition from closing through the first 12 weeks. BEIREK does not accept capital for the client, make an investment decision, promise outcomes to investors, or issue regulated professional opinions.

The client is responsible for accurate and complete data, appointment of information owners, disclosure of material risk, timely management decisions, sharing authority, and investor communication through authorized channels. The CEO sponsors the program; the finance owner manages historical results and model linkage; the commercial owner provides customer and pipeline evidence; the technical owner provides product, technology, and intellectual-property sources; and legal and tax advisers own their professional conclusions.

Core deliverables are the program charter and suitability decision; readiness scorecard; investment thesis and claim-evidence register; capital-fit and process design; market, commercial, technology, team, and financial readiness views; use-of-proceeds and milestone plan; cap table and scenario records; risk and disclosure register; data room index; diligence-question register; management-presentation control; investor-process tracker; term sheet comparison; and closing and first-12-week plan.

Deliverables are accepted through use tests, not file existence. Source traceability, version, ownership, approval, number reconciliation, scope, and limitations are verified. The client team must explain the thesis, open risks, funding requirement, and transaction plan without relying on BEIREK. Sample data room access and the Q&A workflow are tested. External dependencies such as an approved model or legal opinion must use the current, applicable version.

Out of scope are securities placement, investment advice, investor-interest or closing guarantees, independent audit, production of a valuation opinion, legal and tax advice, contract drafting, regulatory approval, bank acceptance, technical certification, and marketing campaigns. Authorized specialists may be separately engaged. BEIREK coordinates their timing, input, and decision dependencies without assuming professional responsibility.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

9. Clear roles, deliverables, and acceptance evidence protect the control boundaries of the investment process

CONTINUED · 02

Program governance consists of a weekly workstream meeting, scheduled management decisions, issue and change registers, document version controls, and decision-gate approvals. A critical delay, data contradiction, scope change, or material new risk triggers impact review. Final acceptance requires approved deliverables, visible ownership of critical open items, one controlled investor-process record, and client understanding of professional boundaries.

PROGRAM FRAMEWORK

10. The initial readiness gate validates the capital event and evidence gaps before production begins

The first engagement does not begin by producing a presentation or data room. The client provides the capital-event type, target timing window, approved financial model, capitalization table, board decisions, current investor materials, risk register, and evidence owners. BEIREK uses those inputs to prepare a suitability and scope note, evidence-gap map, source-authority register, and prioritized remediation list.

At the first decision gate, management launches the readiness program with an approved scope, proceeds conditionally while critical model or evidence dependencies are completed, or defers the capital event. The gate does not commit to a production volume or financing outcome. It establishes the evidence, responsibilities, and specialist dependencies under which the program can proceed.

The gate record also identifies materials that may remain in use, claims that must pause, remediation owners, and the next management decision. The team therefore does not accelerate investor communication while material number or authority conflicts remain unresolved. Acceptance requires the authorized sponsor to approve the starting scope and open conditions.

BEIREK

INVESTMENT READINESS

Technical Appendix

TECHNICAL MODULE

A1. Technical appendix — investment readiness scorecard

The scorecard measures the ability to complete an investment decision, not the number of documents. Each area may be scored from 0 to 4: 0 means no evidence or a material contradiction; 1 means fragmented evidence with weak sourcing; 2 means basic evidence with important gaps; 3 means controlled evidence suitable for transaction use; and 4 means a current system embedded in management decisions. A total score never overrides a deal-breaking deficiency.

Area	Evidence reviewed	Readiness measure	Critical warning
Investment thesis	Claims, sources, counterfactuals	Main claims have sources and boundaries	Unsupported superiority or conflicting numbers
Market and customer	Interviews, agreements, use, collection	Problem and payment behavior are verified	A logo or intention treated as revenue
Business model	Pricing, margin, delivery, cash	Growth and economic quality work together	Structural loss increasing with scale
Technology and IP	Tests, roadmap, chain of title	Performance and ownership are evidenced	A core asset not owned by the company
Team	Roles, authority, capacity, dependency	Owners capable of executing the plan are defined	Uncontrolled founder dependency
Finance	Historical reconciliation, model, cash	Numbers connect to source and operations	Unexplained historical variance
Corporate readiness	Records, agreements, permits, compliance	Material matters have specialists and actions	Unclear authority or ownership
Transaction system	Data room, Q&A, process	Information and decisions progress under control	Unauthorized access or version conflict

The score records owner, source date, target level, deficiency, remediation owner, and retest date. A score cannot improve without evidence. Acceptance requires every critical area to be assessed, potential deal breakers to remain separately visible, and management to document the process-launch decision.

The scorecard is rerun at three decision moments. The initial measurement defines the baseline and scope. The second determines whether the company can enter limited investor testing after remediation. The final measurement records what is closed, what remains under controlled disclosure, and what must become a transaction condition before broad launch. A prior score is not preserved if the underlying evidence has become stale; pipeline, cash, ownership, people, and regulatory status receive particular attention.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A1. Technical appendix — investment readiness scorecard

CONTINUED · 02

The average is not a marketing claim. Scores are internal readiness controls and may be shared only with method, scope, and limitations. BEIREK maintains scoring discipline and evidence linkage; area owners provide data, specialists own their opinions, and management authorizes the process gate. A red issue accepted by management remains open until it has an accountable owner, effect assessment, and review date.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A2. Technical appendix — claim and evidence register

The claim register is not a list of sentences approved for investor use. It is a control system for the source and limits of the company's material narrative.

Field	Operating rule
Claim ID	The same identity is used in materials, model, data room, and Q&A
Precise statement	Testable language replaces broad superiority claims
Source	System, contract, report, test, or authorized opinion is identified
Information date	The represented period is stated
Evidence level	Realized, binding, verified estimate, and management assumption are separated
Limitation	Sample, scope, geography, product, and time limits are disclosed
Owner and approver	Data production and release authority remain separate
Place of use	Material, data room, model, and response links are recorded
Gap and action	Effect, remediation work, and date are stated

Claims affecting company value, market size, customer demand, revenue visibility, technology ownership, regulatory standing, runway, or management capacity are material and require second-level approval. Explanatory language may receive a lighter workflow, but the accuracy standard remains unchanged. The distinction focuses control resources on the statements most likely to affect an investment decision.

Source conflicts follow a defined hierarchy. An effective signed agreement, authorized system record, and current specialist opinion generally take priority over presentation drafts and personal notes. A formal record is not blindly accepted if there is evidence that it is wrong or incomplete. Corrections are applied first to the authoritative source, followed by the model, materials, data room, and response log. Silent number changes across files are prohibited.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A2. Technical appendix — claim and evidence register

CONTINUED · 02

A weekly or monthly change report identifies new, amended, withdrawn, and expired claims. BEIREK operates the register; client owners validate sources; release authority remains with management. The appendix is accepted when a sample material claim can be traced within minutes to source, approval, every place of use, and its stated limitation. That test is repeated after every material release.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A3. Technical appendix — data room index

The data room index carries more control information than a folder tree.

Control	Required information
Document identity	Unique code and relevant section
Name and type	Clear title and agreement, report, or record class
Source owner	Producing and validating person or system
Date and version	Effectiveness, signature, amendment, and validity status
Confidentiality	General, confidential, restricted, or specialist-only class
Sharing authority	Approving party and any legal or technical condition
Related claim and risk	Thesis supported or exposure disclosed
Status	Ready, in remediation, specialist pending, or expired
Question linkage	Diligence question and response identity

Before launch, the complete critical-document set passes the quality gate. Signature pages, schedules, amendments, and referenced exhibits are reviewed with the principal agreement. Financial periods reconcile with the model and management reporting; share counts and rights reconcile with the cap table; customer names, values, and dates reconcile with commercial records. Personal or sensitive information is minimized for transaction use, with originals maintained under restricted access.

Access groups are defined by role and review purpose. General, legal, tax, finance, and technical teams see only the areas required for their assignment. A new investor-team member triggers a check of confidentiality and conflicts. Access removal is dated and authorized. Platform logs do not by themselves establish legal compliance; client policy and specialist conclusions continue to apply.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A3. Technical appendix — data room index

CONTINUED · 02

The index and actual room are reconciled regularly. Weekly controls identify missing files marked ready, unindexed files, expired opinions, and responses referring to superseded versions. BEIREK manages architecture and quality; document owners approve accuracy; the client approves sharing. Acceptance includes a two-way test from an investor question to its document and from that document back to the claim it supports. Failed traces reopen the relevant document and claim controls. The correction record identifies the affected recipients, replacement version, and renewed access decision.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A4. Technical appendix — diligence question register

The question register manages response quality as well as speed. Each entry contains the question, topic, materiality, investor, receipt date, response owner, information owner, specialist need, source, confidentiality, draft answer, approver, delivery date, released version, and open follow-up. Similar questions may be consolidated, but the exact answer and version delivered to each investor remain available.

The quality gate asks whether the question was answered directly; the number matches an approved source; legal or tax interpretation comes from the proper specialist; the answer conflicts with another claim or document; excess sensitive information is included; unknowns are disclosed; and follow-up promises are logged. A response that fails these tests is not released.

Questions use four priority levels. A potential deal breaker or material misstatement is escalated to the program sponsor on the same day. A question affecting value, control, permissions, or the closing calendar is routed to the appropriate specialist and model owner. Standard document requests are handled by the data room owner. Explanatory questions are consolidated after review by the information owner. Priority reflects transaction effect rather than investor persistence.

Responses use a concise but complete structure: direct answer, information date, principal source, limitation where relevant, and follow-up. They do not add unsolicited promotion or unauthorized legal interpretation. A referenced document includes its index identity. Any material oral answer given in a meeting enters the register afterward and is verified against source.

Weekly analysis identifies repeated questions, delays, new risks, specialist bottlenecks, and claims that may need withdrawal. A question repeated by several investors can indicate an actual evidence or business-model weakness, not just a communication problem. Acceptance requires a selected question to trace completely from receipt through source, approval, delivery, and any resulting risk or remediation decision. Closed questions remain searchable through the transaction record. Their sources remain subject to later version and validity controls.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A5. Technical appendix — investor process tracker

The tracker measures fit and decision progress rather than contact volume.

Field	Control purpose
Investor profile	Mandate, check size, stage, sector, geography, and ownership fit
Strategic and governance effect	Contribution, board approach, information, and future options
Conflict and confidentiality	Competing investment, customer link, technical or data risk
Contact owner	Authorized channel and current relationship
Released version	Material version and access level provided
Process status	Screen, initial contact, meeting, diligence, offer, closing, or closed
Question and commitment	Follow-up owner, date, and completion evidence
Decision reason	Basis for progress, hold, or decline
Next action	Authorized step and target date

Stage entry and exit criteria are defined before outreach. Initial contact requires basic capital fit and conflict clearance; a management meeting requires credible interest and suitable material; detailed diligence requires confidentiality, team capacity, and an access decision; offer stage requires financing authority and principal commercial parameters. Positive conversation alone does not move a counterparty forward. Access to decision makers, investment-committee timing, fund capacity, and transaction experience are verified where possible.

Decline and hold reasons use standard categories: sector or stage mandate, check size, timing, risk, valuation, management, strategic fit, fund capacity, or undisclosed reason. These observations do not automatically rewrite the thesis. A consistent pattern triggers review of evidence, process, or targeting assumptions. Investor comments are contextual decision inputs, not independent facts.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A5. Technical appendix — investor process tracker

CONTINUED · 02

The weekly process meeting reviews active targets, management time, commitments, information access, and the next two weeks of capacity. The number of parallel diligence processes is limited by management and specialist capacity. A change in contact channel is recorded as a handoff. Acceptance requires any active counterparty's targeting rationale, materials received, open question, and next authorized decision to be visible in one view. Inactive parties retain their last authorized access status and closure reason. Reactivation requires a fresh fit, conflict, and information-access review.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A6. Technical appendix — closing and post-investment action matrix

The matrix keeps pre-closing conditions and first-12-week post-investment execution in one dependency chain.

Work package	Example control	Completion evidence	Post-investment link
Corporate authority	Board, shareholder, signature	Valid resolution and authority review	New board and delegation
Agreements	Investment and share documents	Signed effective version	Rights and obligation calendar
Condition	Permission, consent, remediation	Acceptance by the authorized party	Continuing commitment tracking
Shares and ownership	Issue, transfer, conversion	Updated record and reconciliation	Vote, information, and reporting rights
Funds flow	Account, amount, deduction, date	Bank and accounting reconciliation	Use-of-proceeds control
Specialist opinion	Legal, tax, technical	Current opinion within scope	Change trigger
Management system	Budget, KPI, reporting	Approved initial-period package	Board cadence and variance control
Milestone	Product, sales, team, CAPEX	Source and acceptance measure	Capital-allocation decision

The critical path is more than a date sequence. It shows which corporate decision, specialist opinion, bank control, third-party consent, or regulatory approval depends on which evidence and fact. If an underlying fact changes, the relevant opinion and closing condition are reassessed. A waived condition is not marked completed; waiver authority, residual exposure, and post-investment obligation remain explicit.

Funds flow is rehearsed before closing. Paying and receiving accounts, currency, amount, deduction, fee, timing, bank record, accounting entry, and failure response are reconciled. Share issuance or transfer and payment evidence follow the sequence approved by counsel and the bank. BEIREK does not hold funds or issue payment instructions; it coordinates the approved dependency and evidence plan.

TECHNICAL MODULE

A6. Technical appendix — closing and post-investment action matrix

CONTINUED · 02

The first-12-week workstream is derived from closing. Continuing commitments, reporting, board decisions, hiring, product, sales, CAPEX, and capital deployment are handed to operating owners with definition, source, budget, authority, and initial acceptance date. The appendix is accepted when any closing obligation can be traced to its post-investment owner and evidence, and any post-investment expenditure can be traced back to approved use of proceeds.

BEIREK

PROGRAM CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

Investment Readiness

Investment Readiness is not a communications exercise intended to make the company appear flawless. It places the capital thesis, commercial and operating reality, financial model, corporate records, risk, and management capacity in one evidence system. That system cannot guarantee a positive investor decision. It allows management to explain what capital it requires, why it requires it, what outcomes it can produce, and what risks remain. BEIREK's role is not to amplify claims. It strengthens the decision system. The outcome is not a larger volume of files, but source-traceable information, explicit accountability, controlled access, manageable due diligence, comparable transaction terms, and an executable post-investment capital plan.