Corporate Venturing and IP Commercialization: Structural Analysis of Derivative and Non-Equity Consideration Models

Executive Summary

The capitalization of intellectual property (IP) within corporate venturing is undergoing a profound structural shift. For decades, the standard model for transferring IP from a parent enterprise (whether a multinational corporation, research university, or government entity) to a new venture involved a simple, often cumbersome exchange: the assignment of patents in return for a controlling or significant minority equity stake. While this model secured ownership for the originator, it frequently rendered the new venture ("SpinCo") uninvestable by downstream institutional capital due to "dead equity" on the capitalization table and misaligned commercial incentives.

This report provides an exhaustive analysis of alternative venturing models where enterprises contribute IP—preferably via full assignment—in exchange for **deferred, derivative, or performance-based consideration**. Specifically, it examines the deployment of **warrants**, **options**, and **non-equity instruments** (such as revenue/profit shares and phantom stock) as mechanisms to bridge valuation gaps, preserve liquidity, and align long-term strategic interests.

The analysis synthesizes data from global high-tech carve-outs (Intel/Mobileye, eBay/PayPal), industrial spin-offs (Siemens Energy, Daimler Truck), and the evolving UK university spin-out landscape (TenU USIT Guide, Imperial College). It identifies a bifurcated market evolution:

1. **Commercial Warrants:** In the technology and logistics sectors, exemplified by Amazon and Shopify, warrants have emerged as the dominant instrument to align commercial volume with equity upside. Here, the "IP" is often market access or platform integration, and vesting is strictly performance-linked.
2. **Regulatory & Deep Tech Standardization:** In the UK and Europe, the friction of IP negotiation is being addressed through standardized frameworks (USIT) that trade immediate equity for "clean title" assignments, utilizing warrants or anti-dilution rights only to protect value up to a specific funding threshold.

For investors, the report identifies that the "show-stoppers" have migrated from pure valuation concerns to **governance and freedom to operate (FTO)**. Investors now rigorously

scrutinize "warrant overhang" and "royalty stacking," rejecting deal structures where the combined weight of passive instruments depresses management incentives below the critical 50% threshold at Series A.

---

1. The Structural Evolution of IP Transfer: From Equity to Derivatives

1.1 The Liquidity Dilemma in Corporate Venturing

The fundamental economic tension in corporate venturing lies in the valuation of dormant or early-stage intellectual property. Established enterprises ("ParentCos") and universities possess vast repositories of R&D outputs—patents, code, and know-how—that are essentially "dark assets" on their balance sheets. These assets have high potential value but zero current liquidity. To commercialize them, they must be transferred to a vehicle capable of rapid execution ("SpinCo").

However, pricing this transfer is fraught with information asymmetry. The ParentCo views the IP as the foundational asset, justifying a 30–50% equity stake. The SpinCo management and future Venture Capital (VC) investors view the execution capability as the primary driver of value, regarding the IP as merely a "ticket to the game." When a ParentCo takes a massive upfront equity stake, it creates a "broken cap table" where the founding team lacks sufficient equity to stay motivated through multiple rounds of dilution.[1]

1.2 The Shift to Derivative Instruments

To resolve this impasse, sophisticated dealmakers are increasingly decoupling the *legal transfer* of the asset from the *economic realization* of its value. This is achieved through derivative instruments—specifically **warrants** and **options**—which grant the right to equity rather than the immediate possession of it.

1.2.1 Warrants Defined in the Venturing Context

In the context of IP transfer, a **warrant** is a contractual financial instrument issued by the SpinCo to the ParentCo. It grants the ParentCo the right to purchase a specific number of shares of the SpinCo's stock at a specific price (the "strike price" or "exercise price") within a defined time period.[2]

Unlike employee stock options (ESOs), which are compensatory and governed by labor and

tax laws (such as EMI in the UK or ISO rules in the US), venturing warrants are commercial instruments. They are characterized by:

- **Asset-Backed Issuance:** They are issued in exchange for assets (IP), commercial agreements, or guarantees, rather than labor.
- **Customizable Vesting:** Vesting can be tied to commercial milestones (e.g., "Warrant vests when SpinCo achieves $10M revenue using Patent X") rather than time.[5]
- **Cap Table Hygiene:** Because warrants are often not exercised until a liquidity event (Exit/IPO), the ParentCo does not sit on the shareholder register with voting rights during the early, chaotic phases of the startup. This grants the SpinCo management greater autonomy, a key requirement for attracting high-quality founders.[6]

1.2.2 Full Assignment vs. Licensing: The Investor Preference

A critical distinction in these models is the legal status of the IP. The research overwhelmingly indicates that investors prefer **Full Assignment** over Licensing.[7]

- **Assignment:** The SpinCo receives the full legal title to the patent. The ParentCo receives warrants as consideration. This creates a distinct asset within the SpinCo that can be secured against venture debt or sold in an acquisition. It is the "cleanest" model.
- **Licensing:** The ParentCo retains ownership and grants the SpinCo the right to use the IP. Investors view this as a systemic risk; if the license is revocable or non-exclusive, the SpinCo has no "moat." Consequently, if licensing is used, investors demand terms that mimic assignment: "exclusive, worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, and royalty-free" (often with a sub-licensing right).[9]

1.3 Non-Equity Consideration Models

In scenarios where equity is undesirable—for instance, where a university has a conflict of interest or a corporate wants to avoid consolidating the SpinCo's losses—deal structures utilize cash-flow diversions or synthetic equity:

- **Revenue-Based Financing (RBF) / Royalties:** The ParentCo receives a percentage of top-line revenue. While non-dilutive, this acts as a tax on gross margins, which can deter growth investors.[11]
- **Phantom Stock:** A contractual agreement to pay a cash bonus upon a liquidity event equal to the value of a certain number of shares. This mirrors the economic upside of warrants without the complexity of actual securities issuance.[12]

---

2. The Warrant-for-IP Model: Mechanics and Deal Terms

The use of warrants allows the ParentCo to participate in the upside of the venture ("equity kicker") while the SpinCo preserves cash and voting control. The mechanics of these deals are highly specific.

2.1 Warrant Coverage and Valuation

Warrant Coverage is the primary metric for sizing the deal. It refers to the percentage of the fully diluted equity (or sometimes the transaction value) that the warrants represent.

- **Standard Coverage Ranges:** In corporate carve-outs or commercial partnerships, warrant coverage typically ranges from **5% to 20%** of the fully diluted equity at the time of issuance.[4]
- **The "Penny Warrant" Mechanism:** To avoid the ParentCo having to pay cash to exercise the warrant later (which would be circular if they already "paid" with IP), these instruments are often structured as **"Penny Warrants"** (exercise price of $0.01 or nominal par value). This provides the ParentCo with the economic equivalent of "free" stock, but allows them to defer the issuance until an exit, avoiding interim tax liabilities and shareholder administrative burdens.[14]

2.2 Vesting Structures and Commercial Milestones

A major innovation in this space is **performance-based vesting**. Rather than handing over 10% equity for IP that might never be commercialized, the SpinCo issues warrants that vest only upon success.

- **The "Amazon Model":** Amazon has normalized the use of commercial warrants where vesting is tied to **Gross Merchandise Value (GMV)** or procurement spend. For example, in its deal with **Shopify**, Amazon received warrants that vested in tranches as "Buy with Prime" adoption grew across Shopify merchants.[5]
- **Application to IP Spinouts:** A corporate spinning out a manufacturing technology could use this structure. The SpinCo grants warrants to the ParentCo. The warrants vest *only if* the SpinCo successfully produces X units using the IP, or if the ParentCo continues to supply necessary raw materials at a preferred rate. This ensures the ParentCo remains "on the hook" to support the SpinCo, addressing the "orphan risk" that plagues many corporate spin-outs.[15]

2.3 Anti-Dilution and "Overhang"

Investors scrutinize **Overhang**—the total potential dilution from all unexercised options and warrants.

- **The 20-30% Threshold:** Generally, if the total option/warrant pool (Employee Pool + ParentCo Warrants + Advisor Warrants) exceeds 20–30% of the fully diluted equity, it signals a "broken" cap table to Series A investors. The founders and new investors will be diluted too heavily upon exercise.[16]
- **Price Protection and Ratchets:** ParentCos often request "Anti-Dilution" clauses.
    - **Full Ratchet:** If the SpinCo raises money at a lower valuation than the warrant's strike price, the strike price is lowered to the new price *and* the number of shares increases to maintain value. This is considered **"toxic"** by VCs and is almost always renegotiated or washed out in subsequent financing rounds.[3]
    - **Weighted Average:** A more moderate approach that adjusts the price based on the amount of new capital raised. This is standard in the NVCA (National Venture Capital Association) model documents.[19]

---

3. Global Corporate Venturing Examples and Case Studies

The following case studies illustrate how major enterprises structure IP and asset transfers using warrants and retained stakes rather than simple cash sales.

3.1 Tech & Commercial Ecosystems: Amazon, Shopify, and Fabrinet

Model: Commercial Warrants for Ecosystem Integration.
Amazon acts as a massive corporate venturer, often using warrants to secure upside in partners that utilize its infrastructure or supply chain.

- **Fabrinet (2025):** Amazon entered a transaction agreement where it received warrants to acquire up to **381,922 ordinary shares** of Fabrinet.
    - **Terms:** The strike price was set at ~$208 per share. Crucially, a portion (approx. 10%) vested immediately, while the remainder vests in **multiple tranches** over the term, contingent on commercial continuity. The warrant expires in 2032 (7-year term), providing a long runway for value creation.[20]
- **Shopify:** Amazon received warrants for Class A shares. The vesting was tied to the operational integration of the "Buy with Prime" initiative into the Shopify ecosystem.
    - **Insight:** This treats *commercial access* as the IP. Amazon contributes access to its logistics IP/Network, and Shopify pays in equity derivatives. This aligns the strategic success of the integration directly with the equity reward.[5]

3.2 Deep Tech Spin-Offs: Intel & Mobileye

Model: Retained Stake with Governance Control (The "Partial Spin").
Intel acquired Mobileye and subsequently spun it out as a public entity, utilizing a structure that retained control while accessing public capital.

- **Structure:** Intel did not simply sell the IP. It retained a massive majority stake through **Class B shares** (carrying 10x voting rights), effectively controlling the board and strategic direction, while listing Class A shares for public investors.[22]
- **IP Interplay:** The "Master Transaction Agreement" strictly governed IP flows. Intel ensured Mobileye had the necessary IP rights to operate (Freedom to Operate), but the retained stake acted as the ultimate "royalty"—Intel consolidated Mobileye's financials and benefited from the asset's appreciation.
- **Investor Considerations:** High retained stakes create "overhang" risks where the parent might dump shares, depressing price. Intel agreed to **lock-up periods** and disposal agreements (e.g., agreeing not to sell for 2 years to preserve tax-free status) to assuage investor fears.[24]

3.3 Industrial Carve-Outs: Siemens Energy & Daimler Truck

Model: Spin-off with Minority Retained Interest and IP Hives-Down.
European industrial giants often use "Spin-offs" where the ParentCo retains a minority stake, effectively a large block warrant on the future success of the carved-out unit.

- **Siemens Energy:** Spun off from Siemens AG. Siemens AG retained a **35.1% stake** (partially held via a pension trust to distance control). The deal involved complex "Spin-off and Transfer Agreements" covering brand royalties (Siemens Energy pays to use the 'Siemens' name) and technology transfer.[26]
- **Daimler Truck:** Spun off from Daimler (now Mercedes-Benz). Daimler retained a **35% stake**. The separation required a "Hive-down" of assets, ensuring the Truck division had distinct IP ownership for its powertrains, separate from the Passenger Car division. The retained stake allows the parent to benefit from the "pure-play" valuation uplift.[28]

3.4 Corporate Venture Building: BP Launchpad & Rainmaking

Model: Venture Studio with Call Options.

- **BP Launchpad:** BP's internal scale-up factory. BP takes a majority stake (or 100% ownership) initially but structures the venture with founder-like equity for the management team to simulate a startup environment. As the venture scales, BP acts as the "Series A" investor.[30]
- **Rainmaking (Venture Studio):** Partners with corporates (e.g., Jaguar Land Rover). The Corporate contributes IP/Domain knowledge; Rainmaking contributes talent.
    - **The "Call Option":** The Corporate often retains a **Call Option** to buy the venture back at a pre-agreed formula (e.g., Fair Market Value) at Series A. This protects

the corporate's strategic interest—if the IP becomes core to the parent's future, they can re-acquire it; if not, they let it spin out fully.[32]

---

4. The UK Landscape: University & Corporate Models

The UK market is currently pioneering the reform of IP spin-out terms, driven by the "TenU" coalition and government reviews (The Independent Review of University Spin-out Companies).

4.1 The TenU USIT Guide Framework

The **University Spin-out Investment Terms (USIT) Guide** represents a consensus between top UK universities (Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial, UCL) and investors to standardize deals and reduce friction.[34]

- **Historical Context:** Historically, UK universities demanded 40–50% equity *plus* royalties for IP assignment, rendering spin-outs uninvestable by global VCs.
- **The New Standard:**
  - **Life Sciences:** 10–25% University equity (fully diluted at Series A) with *no* royalties, or very low royalties (1-2%).
  - **Software/Tech:** Lower equity (5–10%) because value is driven more by execution and rapid iteration than by the foundational IP.[36]
  - **Recommendation:** The guide explicitly recommends minimizing royalties to avoid "stacking" and focusing on equity upside.

4.2 Imperial College "Founders Choice"

Imperial College London offers a bifurcated model that allows the market to price the support services.[36]

- **Option A (Founder Driven):** Founder takes **95% equity**, University takes **5%**. The University provides the IP but limited support. The 5% stake is often "non-dilutable" up to a certain funding threshold (e.g., £20M raised). This effectively acts as a warrant with anti-dilution protection.
- **Option B (Joint Venture):** University takes a higher stake (e.g., 20-50%) in exchange for providing management, incubation, and funding.
- **Impact:** This model forces the IP to compete on value. Most high-growth tech ventures opt for the 95/5 split to maintain investability.

4.3 UCLB Portico Ventures

University College London (UCLB) utilizes the "Portico Ventures" model specifically for non-patentable IP (e.g., software code, know-how, algorithms).[39]

- **Structure:** UCLB takes a fixed **5% equity** stake.
- **The Asset:** In exchange, the SpinCo receives an **exclusive, royalty-free license** (effectively an assignment) to the IP.
- **Efficiency:** Standardized terms allow deals to close in weeks rather than months. The 5% equity functions as a "warrant" for the IP contribution, exercised at incorporation.

---

5. Non-Equity Consideration: Revenue and Profit Share

In sectors with long development timelines or where the IP is a component rather than the business itself, non-equity models are viable.

5.1 Revenue-Based Financing (RBF) as IP Compensation

While RBF is typically "Cash for Revenue Share," it can be structured as "IP for Revenue Share."

- **Mechanism:** The ParentCo assigns IP to the SpinCo. In return, the SpinCo agrees to pay **X% of Gross Revenues** generated by products utilizing that IP.
- **The Cap:** To prevent this from becoming a permanent drag on the business, payments are usually capped at a multiple of the deemed value (e.g., 1.5x to 3x the principal value of the IP).[11]
- **Pros/Cons:** It is non-dilutive to founders, but it depresses EBITDA. VCs generally dislike uncapped revenue shares (royalties) in tech companies as they reduce the attractiveness of the company for acquisition.

5.2 The Pharma Royalty Model

In biotechnology, royalty monetization is standard practice.

- **Deal Structure:** A university or small biotech assigns a molecule/patent to a SpinCo or Pharma partner.
- **Consideration Stack:**
    - **Upfront:** Cash payment (often small or waived in spin-outs).
    - **Milestones:** Significant cash payments upon regulatory achievements (e.g., FDA Phase I, Phase II, Approval).
    - **Royalties:** A running percentage (typically **5–15%**) on net sales.[41]

- **Synthetic Royalties:** Investors (e.g., Royalty Pharma) create a secondary market by buying the *right* to receive these future royalties for upfront cash, validating royalties as a tangible asset class.[42]

5.3 Phantom Stock

Phantom Stock (or Shadow Equity) is a contractual bonus plan that mimics the value of shares without actual issuance.

- **Use Case:** When a ParentCo cannot legally hold shares (e.g., due to regulatory conflict, non-profit status, or desire to avoid consolidation).
- **Structure:** The SpinCo agrees: "Upon a Liquidity Event (Exit/IPO), we will pay ParentCo a cash bonus equal to the value of 5% of the outstanding shares."
- **Implication:** It keeps the cap table clean and avoids voting rights issues. However, it appears as a liability on the balance sheet, which can complicate acquisitions (the acquirer sees a debt obligation rather than a shareholder to be paid out).[12]

---

6. Investor Analysis: Criteria, Expectations, and Show-Stoppers

Understanding the investor mindset is crucial. Institutional investors (VCs) view the cap table and IP agreement as a map of incentives and risks.

6.1 Critical Investor Criteria

1. **Clean Chain of Title:** This is the non-negotiable prerequisite. The SpinCo must own the IP (Assignment) or hold an exclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license. Any ambiguity—such as the ParentCo retaining the right to use the IP for "commercial purposes in the same field"—is a deal-killer.[9]
2. **Cap Table Efficiency:** The founding team and the employee option pool must hold enough equity (typically **>50%** at Series A) to remain motivated. If the ParentCo holds 40% passive equity plus warrants, the "investable" slice is too small, and the management team is effectively working for the ParentCo.[1]
3. **Freedom to Operate (FTO):** Does the IP assignment cover *everything* needed? If the SpinCo gets the patent but not the underlying "background IP" or data rights owned by the ParentCo, it is vulnerable. Investors demand a bundled "Covenant Not to Sue" or "Background IP License".[44]

6.2 Show-Stoppers (Red Flags)

- **Royalty Stacking:** If the ParentCo demands a 5% royalty, the University demands 2%, and a Founder has a revenue share, the gross margin collapses. Investors generally reject permanent royalties >1–2% for platform technologies in software/tech.[17]
- **Toxic Warrants:** Warrants with "Full Ratchet Anti-Dilution" (if you sell shares cheaper later, I get more shares for free to maintain my value) are often rejected by new money. They make financing rounds mathematically difficult to close and are viewed as predatory.[3]
- **Clawback/Reversion Rights:** Clauses stating "If SpinCo doesn't hit $1M revenue by Year 2, IP reverts to ParentCo." While reasonable for the Parent, VCs see this as an existential risk. They prefer "use it or lose it" provisions where exclusivity is lost, rather than the asset itself.[45]
- **Indefinite Warrant Terms:** Warrants that hang over the company for 10 years without a forcing function to exercise create "Overhang" that depresses valuation. Investors prefer warrants with specific expiration dates (e.g., 5-7 years) or "Automatic Exercise" upon IPO.[2]

6.3 Types of Investors Involved

- **Corporate Venture Capital (CVC):** These investors are more tolerant of strategic rights (e.g., "Right of First Refusal" on acquisition). They value the *relationship* and *market insight* as much as financial return. They are often the counterparty holding the warrants.[18]
- **Financial VCs:** Intolerant of messy terms. They prioritize "Standard" terms (NVCA/BVCA models). They will often force the "cleaning up" of warrants or royalties as a condition of investment (Condition Precedent).[17]
- **Venture Debt Providers:** Often *require* warrants (equity kickers) as part of their lending model. They are comfortable with the instrument and often set the market standard for warrant coverage (typically 10-20% of the loan value).[46]

---

7. Comparative Analysis: Deal Terms & Structures

Table 1: Consideration Models for IP Assignment

Mechanism	Description	Typical	Investor	Key Risk	Key Risk

		Range/Coverage	Sentiment	(Originator)	(Investor)
Immediate Equity	Shares issued at incorporation.	5% – 25% (Life Sci) 2% – 10% (Tech)	**Negative** if >20% (Dead equity).	Dilution in future rounds without anti-dilution.	Founder disincentivization due to small equity pool.
Warrants (Options)	Right to buy shares later at strike price.	5% – 20% coverage.	**Neutral/Positive** if priced correctly.	Warrants may expire out of the money.	"Overhang" affects valuation; anti-dilution terms can be toxic.
Commercial Warrants	Warrants vesting based on commercial milestones.	Variable (based on GMV/Spend).	**Positive.** Aligns value with equity.	Vesting targets may be missed.	Strategic partner gains too much control/ownership.
Revenue Share (Royalty)	% of Gross/Net Revenue paid to originator.	1% – 5% (Pharma) 2% – 8% (RBF)	**Negative** for tech (margin compression).	Revenue may never materialize.	Reduces profitability/attractiveness for exit.
Phantom Equity	Cash bonus linked to exit value.	1% – 5% equivalent.	**Neutral.** Seen as a debt/liability.	Reliability of payment at exit.	Cash drain at exit; acts as a liability on balance sheet.

Table 2: US vs. UK Structural Nuances

Feature	US Model (e.g., Silicon Valley/Stanford)	UK Model (e.g., TenU/Imperial/UCL)
University Equity	Low (2% – 5%). Focus on volume of spinouts.[47]	Historically High (20%–50%). Moving to 10–25% via USIT Guide.[37]
Warrant Usage	Common in Venture Debt & Commercial partnerships (Amazon).	Less common in spinouts; preference for "Golden Shares" or simple equity.
IP Transfer	Exclusive License often	Assignment increasingly

	preferred over Assignment.	preferred to create "clean" companies.[48]
Anti-Dilution	Aggressive VCs wash out anti-dilution quickly.	"Non-dilutable" equity up to a threshold (e.g., £20M raised) is common.[36]

---

8. Conclusion and Strategic Recommendations

The era of corporations and universities demanding massive upfront equity for IP is fading. The market is converging on **risk-adjusted models** where consideration is earned through performance or deferred via derivatives.

Warrants are the flexible bridge. They allow ParentCos to lock in a price for their IP while deferring the equity decision, effectively creating an option on the venture's success. The **Amazon model** of commercial warrants is a powerful template for corporates: assign the IP, but vest the equity only if the ParentCo supports the venture's commercial growth.

Assignment is King. To attract Tier-1 VCs, IP must be fully assigned. The consideration for this assignment (warrants/equity) is secondary to the legal certainty of ownership.

The "Clean Cap Table" Imperative. Any model chosen must pass the "Series A Test." If the combined weight of ParentCo warrants, royalties, and retained equity leaves the founding team with less than 50%, the venture will likely fail to raise external capital.

Recommendation for Originators:

When structuring an IP-for-value transaction, prioritize **Commercial Warrants** or **Milestone-Based Equity** over heavy upfront stakes or royalties. This aligns the originator's reward with the venture's actual market success and ensures the vehicle remains attractive to the growth capital required to scale. Specifically, adopt the **TenU USIT Guide** principles regarding "clean" IP assignment and diluted equity thresholds to align with global best practices.

Works cited

1. 4 red flags that make startup investors think twice - SeedBlink, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://seedblink.com/blog/2024-02-01-4-red-flags-that-make-startup-investors-think-twice
2. Equity Warrants in Startups: How They Work, Valuation & Investor Rights | Esinli Capital, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://esinli.com/knowledge-base/startup-finance/equity-warrants/
3. Sweetening the Deal: Using Warrants to Get the Deal Done - American Bar Association, accessed on November 30, 2025,

https://www.americanbar.org/groups/business_law/resources/business-law-today/2021-october/sweetening-the-deal/
4. An Introduction to Warrants | Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.bipc.com/an-introduction-to-warrants
5. Warrant Agreement by and between Klaviyo, Inc, and Shopify Commerce Singapore PTE. LTD., dated July 28, 2022. - SEC.gov, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1835830/000162828023030618/exhibit45-sx1.htm
6. The Venture Builder Strategy for Principal Investors | BCG, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.bcg.com/publications/2022/the-venture-builders-strategy-for-principal-investors
7. accessed on November 30, 2025, https://patentpc.com/blog/licensing-vs-assignment-of-ip-in-joint-ventures-and-spinouts#:~:text=It%20is%20a%20deep%20strategic.risks%20losing%20strategic%20assets%20permanently.
8. Licensing vs Assignment of IP in Joint Ventures and Spinouts | PatentPC, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://patentpc.com/blog/licensing-vs-assignment-of-ip-in-joint-ventures-and-spinouts
9. Considerations When Contracting with Academic Spinouts | Insights - Ropes & Gray LLP, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.ropesgray.com/en/insights/alerts/2025/02/considerations-when-contracting-with-academic-spinouts
10. UK Founder Series: Top Tips for University Spin-Outs (Part 1 – Raising Funds) - Orrick, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.orrick.com/en/Insights/2024/03/Founder-Series-Top-Tips-for-University-Spin-Outs-Part-1-Raising-Funds
11. Build, Don't Dilute: Legal Strategies to Scale Your Startup Without Selling Equity, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.startsmartcounsel.com/resource-center/build-dont-dilute-legal-strategies-to-scale-your-startup-without-selling-equity
12. CLASS B SHARES (STOCK OPTIONS) v. WARRANTS (AKA PHANTOM STOCK): - The Private Firm, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://thefirm.net/class-b-shares-stock-options-v-warrants-aka-phantom-stock/
13. Unlocking the Potential of Phantom Equity: Incentive and Compensation Strategies to Attract and Retain Top Talent - PilieroMazza PLLC, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.pilieromazza.com/unlocking-the-potential-of-phantom-equity-incentive-and-compensation-strategies-to-attract-and-retain-top-talent/
14. Warrant Certificate Agreement between TG Venture Acquisition Corp. and Holder - Business Contracts | Justia, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://contracts.justia.com/companies/tg-venture-acquisition-corp-13687/contra

ct/194469/
15. Kornit Digital: The Amazon Warrants (C) - Supplement - Faculty & Research, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=61849
16. Overhang: What it is, How it Works, Calculations and FAQ - Investopedia, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/o/overhang.asp
17. Red Flags in VC Term Sheets: What Entrepreneurs Need to Know Before Signing, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.startuplawreview.co/index/red-flags-in-vc-term-sheets-what-entrepreneurs-need-to-know-before-signing
18. Key IP Considerations in Corporate Venture Capital Transactions - Fenwick, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.fenwick.com/insights/publications/key-ip-considerations-in-corporate-venture-capital-transactions
19. Model Legal Documents - National Venture Capital Association - NVCA, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://nvca.org/model-legal-documents/
20. Form 8-K for Fabrinet filed 03/13/2025, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://investor.fabrinet.com/static-files/67e7152c-6e54-439f-aa77-509131d53a88
21. EX-10.10 - SEC.gov, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1835963/000119312521146626/d190716dex1010.htm
22. Form DRS for Mobileye Global INC filed 03/09/2023, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://ir.mobileye.com/static-files/9414b6d9-c2f1-44cb-8b7d-fbed29e05910
23. tm227410-23_424b4 - none - 55.0627553s - SEC.gov, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1910139/000110465922112004/tm227410-23_424b4.htm
24. tm227410-15_s1 - none - 129.7349335s - SEC.gov, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1910139/000110465922104640/tm227410-15_s1.htm
25. Form 8-K for Mobileye Global INC filed 07/11/2025, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://ir.mobileye.com/static-files/3d1c6565-c51f-4018-8fcf-b61fbf825b68
26. SPIN-OFF AND TRANSFER AGREEMENT between Siemens Aktiengesellschaft and Siemens Energy AG - Digital Asset Management, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://assets.new.siemens.com/siemens/assets/api/uuid:b61ccb9d-e01d-4fa2-a5c5-2ddc320ae648/Spin-off-and-Transfer-Agreement-22-May-2020.PDF
27. Joint Spin-off Report - Digital Asset Management - Siemens, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://assets.new.siemens.com/siemens/assets/api/uuid:7f7157d6-3d30-4e40-b6d3-60122892d7c9/Joint-Spin-off-Report-Convenience-Translation-22-May-2020.pdf

28. Research Update: Truck OEM Daimler Truck Holding | S&P Global Ratings, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.spglobal.com/ratings/en/regulatory/article/-/view/sourceId/12222706
29. What Triggered Daimler's (DDAIF) Truck Division Spin-Off Decision? - Nasdaq, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/what-triggered-daimlers-ddaif-truck-division-spin-off-decision-2021-10-14
30. bp Ventures | What we do | Home, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.bp.com/en/global/corporate/what-we-do/bp-ventures.html
31. bp acquires majority stake in largest US forest carbon offset developer Finite Carbon, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/business-sites/en/global/corporate/pdfs/news-and-insights/press-releases/bp-acquires-majority-stake-in-largest-us-forest-carbon-offset-developer-finite-carbon.pdf
32. Venture Studio Profile: Rainmaking - InnoLead, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.innovationleader.com/uncategorized/venture-studio-profile-rainmaking/
33. Venture Building - Rainmaking Innovation, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://rainmaking.io/venture-building/
34. University Spin-Out Investment Terms (USIT) - TenU, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.ten-u.org/usit
35. University Spin-out Investment Terms - BioIndustry Association | BIA, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.bioindustry.org/static/70bc6769-bd9f-41cc-9a6711d8357dc66d/USIT-Guide-2023.pdf
36. Independent Review of University Spin-out Companies - GOV.UK, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6549fcb23ff5770013a88131/independent_review_of_university_spin-out_companies.pdf
37. UK spinouts A status update - Royal Academy of Engineering, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://raeng.org.uk/media/pdmguaxs/uk-spinouts-a-status-update-2025-final.pdf
38. Founders Choice | Administration and support services | Imperial College London, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.imperial.ac.uk/enterprise/staff/creating-a-spinout-company/founders-choice/
39. Non-patentable IP: Portico Ventures - Commercialise your research - Our services - UCLB, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.uclb.com/our-services/commercialise-your-research/non-patentable-ip/
40. The Growing Trend of Revenue-Based Financing and its Legal Implications - K&L Gates, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.klgates.com/The-Growing-Trend-of-Revenue-Based-Financing-and-its-Legal-Implications-9-22-2022

41. Spinout Playbook - Fifty Years, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.fiftyyears.com/spinout
42. An Overview of Debt and Royalty Financing Structures for Life Sciences Businesses, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.cov.com/-/media/files/corporate/publications/2025/05/an-overview-of-debt-and-royalty-financing-structures-for-life-sciences-businesses.pdf
43. Royalty Financings and Similar Revenue Monetizations Surge in Difficult Life Sciences Fundraising Environment - WilmerHale, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.wilmerhale.com/en/insights/client-alerts/20240904-royalty-financings-and-similar-revenue-monetizations-surge-in-difficult-life-sciences-fundraising-environment
44. EX-10.5 - SEC.gov, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1633917/000119312515257108/d31081dex105.htm
45. Licensing Deals 101: Terms, Royalties, and Red Flags | by Brian Fried, The Inventor Coach, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://medium.com/@inventor_coach/licensing-deals-101-terms-royalties-and-red-flags-9d5c31043a8e
46. Negotiating Warrant Terms in Venture Financings - Vela Wood, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://velawood.com/negotiating-warrant-terms-in-venture-financings/
47. VC-friendly terms grease the wheels of US university spinout investing -, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://globalventuring.com/university/us-and-canada/us-university-spinouts-investing/
48. spin-out transactions, accessed on November 30, 2025, https://ke.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/7-Spinout-Transactions_1.pdf