I Am Not Looking for Funding.

I Believe Investors May Be the Customer.

When capital is released in stages, investors need to know whether the software evidence supports the technical milestone being claimed.

THE CUSTOMER HYPOTHESIS

Capital allocators releasing funds against technical milestones.

Possible triggers

- Pre-investment
- Product milestone
- Follow-on
- Next tranche

Customer discovery, not fundraising.

Mohan Iyer | Auckland, New Zealand

The investor problem

Technical milestones can trigger capital release before they are independently evidenced.

WHAT THE INVESTOR SEES

Visible progress

A working demonstration may show that a happy path exists. It does not by itself establish that the identified build supports the milestone being claimed.

WHAT MAY REMAIN UNKNOWN

Technical uncertainty

Important obligations may have failed, remained untested, or fallen outside the supplied scope.

THE LIVE DECISION

Capital decision

The investor still has to decide whether to release, condition, pause, or withhold further capital.

The question is not simply “does the demo work?”

It is “what does the supplied software evidence establish about the claimed milestone?”

Customer hypothesis: the capital allocator

The founder may be the subject of the review. The buyer may be the person releasing the funds.

WHO MAY COMMISSION IT

Possible buyers

Angel investors
Venture funds
Accelerators and incubators
Venture studios
Other capital providers

WHEN THE NEED BECOMES URGENT

Buying triggers

Pre-investment technical baseline
Claimed product milestone
Customer-readiness checkpoint
Follow-on investment
Live tranche decision

WHAT WE ARE VALIDATING

The commercial question

Would a capital allocator commission, require, or refer a bounded technical stage-gate review - and who would pay?

Zero investor engagements today. The buyer, trigger, evidence threshold, payer and repeat-use case remain hypotheses.

Investor Technical Assurance

The Vibe Code Forensic Audit applied to investment stage-gate decisions.

Claimed milestone → Technical obligations → Bounded examination → Evidence record → Capital decision

They sell findings. We sell a decision-ready evidence record.

The advantage is a different decision - not a claim of better detection than scanners, code reviewers, or specialist penetration testers.

Investor Technical Assurance applies the Vibe Code Forensic Audit to investment stage-gate decisions.

Proposed Capital-Gate model

A proposed investor-assurance model pending validation. It has not yet been used in an investment engagement.

GATE 01

Initial investment

Is there an identifiable software asset and a bounded technical baseline?

GATE 02

Product milestone

What does the supplied evidence establish about the claimed milestone?

GATE 03

Customer readiness

What technical conditions remain before wider commercial exposure?

GATE 04

Further tranche

Were named technical conditions addressed before more capital is released?

The review does not make the investment decision. It supplies bounded technical evidence that can inform the investor's own decision process.

Four possible technical decision positions

A service that can say Release is a service whose Hold means something.

Release

The examined evidence supports the claimed milestone within the stated scope.

Release with conditions

Evidence substantially supports the milestone, with named gaps that should become tranche conditions.

Hold

The evidence contradicts the claimed milestone in a material way.

Insufficient evidence to decide

The evidence available does not permit a conclusion either way.

“Release” is not a clean bill of health or a prediction of startup success. It means only that the examined evidence supports the stated milestone within the declared scope and limitations.

And when the evidence does not support the milestone, the brief says so - including “insufficient evidence to decide.”

What the investor receives

A concise Capital Release Technical Brief supported by a deeper technical evidence register.

Milestone status

What the identified build and supplied evidence establish within the declared scope.

Critical obligations

Failed, gap, unverified, and bounded positive evidence where defensible.

Risk concentration

Where material security, reliability, maintainability, and business-logic findings appear.

Indicative remediation exposure

A bounded range for investigation, repair, and retesting effort.

Unknowns and exclusions

What was not supplied, could not be examined, or remains outside the assurance claim.

Decision conditions

Technical conditions the investor may consider before the next stage or tranche.

We report located, reproducible findings. Absence of a finding is not evidence of absence; areas outside the stated scope are marked unverified, never passed.

Honest current position

Technical evidence exists. Investor demand does not - yet.

TECHNICAL EVIDENCE

Demonstrated

Working technical method
Five anonymised codebases examined
Classified findings dataset
Repeatable bounded workflow
OpenAI Build Week submission completed; result pending

CUSTOMER EVIDENCE

Not yet validated

Zero investor engagements today
Strongest purchase trigger remains unknown
Investor evidence threshold remains untested
Who pays remains a hypothesis
Portfolio-wide or repeated use is unproven

Trust Before Ship does not perform or quote for the remediation work it identifies. That preserves independence - we have nothing to gain from the length of the list - and it deliberately gives up repair revenue.

What we want to learn from AngelHQ

This is customer discovery, not fundraising.

01	Current practice	**How do investors currently verify technical milestones before releasing further capital?**
02	Buying trigger	**At which checkpoint does technical uncertainty become important enough to act?**
03	Buyer and payer	**Who would commission and pay for the review?**
04	Decision usefulness	**Would a Capital Release Technical Brief help an investment committee or lead angel?**
05	Introduction	**Who should Mohan speak to next?**

WHAT A SUCCESSFUL CONVERSATION PRODUCES

A clearer path to an investor customer - not a funding conversation.

Buyer correction

Are capital allocators the right customer?

Trigger correction

Where is the highest-value checkpoint?

Evidence expectation

What minimum evidence would support action?

Named next conversation

One warm introduction to a relevant buyer or live case.

Praise, encouragement, and general interest are not validation outcomes.

The ask: one relevant introduction to an investor, fund, accelerator, venture studio, or portfolio company approaching a live technical milestone.

mohan@pixels.net.nz | trustbeforeship.com/angel-hq/