WHITE PAPER

The Asset Class Standard: How Strategic Capacity Quantification Improves Private Capital Market Efficiency

Sandmann G. & Weavill A.

May 2026

Building on: Sandmann, G. & Weavill, A. (2025). Strategic Capacity as a Fundamental Driver of Business Value Creation. Growth-Drive LLC.

This white paper is sponsored by Growth-Drive, committed to helping $1Trillion of private businesses increase strategic capacity in the three dimensions of business growth.

GROWTH DRIVE
PUTTING YOU IN COMMAND OF PROFITS AND VALUE

Executive Summary

Between 70% and 90% of acquisitions in the \$2.5M–\$100M private middle market fail to achieve their intended objectives.[1] The cause is structural: capital is committed against financial narratives — CIMs, EBITDA multiples, growth projections — without independent evidence of the operational capability that determines whether those narratives hold under new ownership.[2]

A defined population of private businesses already operates at the institutional standard sophisticated capital rewards. Sandmann (2025) calls this the Asset Class: companies with Strategic Capacity scores of 85 or above, where performance runs on documented systems and proven non-founder leadership, value is independently transferable, and operations and data are themselves the asset the market is pricing. Asset Class businesses command premium M&A pricing, attract ideal-fit acquirers, and unlock the full range of private capital monetization options — platform acquisitions, annuity-stream distributions, and strategic-buyer premiums.

Strategic Capacity is the measurable construct that defines this standard. It is the primary driver of transferable equity value in private capital markets (Sandmann & Weavill, 2025[3]), quantified across twenty-four Growth-Driving Objectives organized into the Three Dimensions of Business Growth: Predictable Profits and Cash Flow, Predictable Sustainable Growth, and Predictable Transferable Value. Operational maturity exists on a continuum, and Strategic Capacity measures position on it directly. The Asset Class marks the point at which it reaches institutional standard.

---

[1] Harvard Business Review (2020). “Don’t Make This Common M&A Mistake.” Patel (2025), drawing on more than 300 practitioner interviews, identifies structural failures within the M&A process itself — rather than post-close execution alone — as the primary cause.

[2] SBA Office of Advocacy (small business: 43.5% of GDP) and U.S. Chamber of Commerce / RSM Middle Market Business Index (middle market: ~40% of GDP). The \$2.5M–\$100M band straddles both.

[3] Sandmann & Weavill *Strategic Capacity as Fundamental to Business Value Creation.* Growth-Drive 2025.

Applied to pre-LOI target evaluation, the methodology produces four compounding improvements:

1. **It identifies the highest-probability return targets.** Asset Class businesses — measured, not asserted — represent the highest-confidence acquisitions for buyers seeking predictable post-close performance without structural transformation cost.

2. **It gives buyers independent operational intelligence pre-LOI.** A quantified Strategic Capacity Score, a modeled Transferable Equity Value calculation, and an actionable Readiness Roadmap — produced in hours — convert target evaluation from narrative judgment into evidence-based qualification.

3. **It equips sellers to present defensible operational quality.** Sellers who demonstrate high Strategic Capacity with evidence command higher valuations from the buyers best suited to value what they have built.

4. **It improves outcomes across all three private capital return models** — equity value at exit, annuity distributions, and lending — because the determinant of success in each is the same: can this business deliver predictable and sustainable growth under new ownership or capital structure?

The systemic effect is informational symmetry: a market in which buyers, sellers, and their advisors operate from shared, quantified evidence of operational reality. The result is higher returns on closed deals, better-structured transactions, more accurately priced debt, and a measurable improvement in the success rate of private capital deployment. For advisory firms, Strategic Capacity quantification is not a marginal improvement over traditional target evaluation. It is the standard around which the next generation of private capital advisory will be organized.

Introduction

Private capital markets exist to deploy capital into businesses that can generate predictable returns — through equity value growth at exit, annuity generation from distributions, or interest on lending. Across all three models the determinant of success is the same: the underlying business must deliver the performance the investment thesis assumes under new ownership, independent of individual heroics.

That capability is Strategic Capacity. Defined by Sandmann (2023) and established as the primary driver of transferable equity value by Sandmann and Weavill (2025), Strategic Capacity is a business's measurable ability to predictably and sustainably grow profits, cash flows, and transferable equity value through proven non-founder leadership, documented systems, scalable processes, and disciplined financial management. It is quantified across twenty-four Growth-Driving Objectives organized equally into the Three Dimensions of Business Growth — Predictable Profits and Cash Flow (conceptually equivalent to Free Cash Flow), Predictable Sustainable Growth, and Predictable Transferable Value — and expressed as a Strategic Capacity Score benchmarked against best-in-class performance.

The Asset Class is the subset of private businesses operating at institutional standard: scores of 85 or above, where performance is structurally repeatable, value is independently transferable, and operations and data quality are themselves the asset the market is pricing.

The problem is not that Asset Class businesses are rare in absolute terms. The problem is that the market has lacked the tools to identify them systematically — and to distinguish them, at evaluation, from businesses presenting similar financial metrics that lack the underlying capability to deliver projected performance post-transaction. The metrics on which target evaluation has historically relied — EBITDA multiples, revenue growth, market position — describe what a business has achieved. They do not answer the question that determines whether the transaction will deliver: will this business continue to perform and grow per the investment thesis after the transaction closes?

The consequences are well-documented. Many failures are not dramatic; they are quiet erosions of value — returns that looked compelling in a model but never materialized, integration plans built on assumptions that did not survive operational contact, debt structured against cash flow the business could not sustain. The conventional explanation points to integration challenges. The more rigorous diagnosis, confirmed by Patel (2025), identifies the root cause as structural — embedded in an M&A process architecture that systematically suppresses the independent operational intelligence both sides require.

This paper applies Strategic Capacity quantification to that structural gap. Quantification converts operational reality from contested narrative into shared evidence — equipping buyers to identify Asset Class targets with confidence, equipping sellers to demonstrate institutional quality with evidence, and equipping the advisors on both sides to build CIMs, investment theses, and deal structures grounded in demonstrated capability.

The market context reinforces the urgency. The most capable acquirers are professionalizing M&A into a repeatable operating capability — building proactive deal theses, embedding absorptive capacity assessment into pre-deal gates, and stress-testing execution plans in live transactional environments. Yet over 80% of corporate deal flow remains externally introduced (Deloitte, 2024), meaning the majority of targets still reach buyers through sell-side advisors and intermediaries. The advisor who can demonstrate a target's Strategic Capacity objectively, against the criteria evolved buyers already apply, holds a decisive advantage over those presenting financial narrative alone.

The Structural Problem in M&A Target Evaluation

The 70–90% acquisition failure rate is not a failure of effort, intelligence, or capital. The buyers committing resources, the advisors structuring transactions, and the sellers presenting their businesses are sophisticated professionals operating in good faith. The failure rate persists because the M&A process was designed for a market that no longer exists — one in which sellers held the informational high ground, financial performance was the primary indicator of asset quality, and operational capability could reasonably be inferred from the numbers.

Sophisticated capital now demands evidence of operational capability that financial statements cannot supply, and the most disciplined acquirers have built internal frameworks to demand it. The process architecture through which targets reach those acquirers has not kept pace. The result is a structural asymmetry that suppresses the independent operational intelligence both sides need.

The Sell-Side Process Suppresses Operational Intelligence

The traditional process — from CIM creation through pre-LOI engagement — produces three consequences for the buyer's information environment. First, the evaluation framework is set before the buyer arrives: the CIM frames the opportunity, the investment thesis is shaped by it, and the timeline is established on the sell-side. Second, competitive cadence accelerates the process at precisely the point where genuine operational evaluation would be most valuable, converting speed from a tool of efficiency into a signal of commitment. Third, the data room is constructed to support the seller's thesis rather than to reveal operational reality — leaving founder dependency, undocumented processes, leadership gaps, customer concentration, and culture risk outside the explicit indicators the buyer can evaluate before commitment.

These impacts operate together. The buyer enters a process they did not design, accelerates through it under competitive pressure, and evaluates on information curated to a thesis they inherited rather than constructed. The space for independent operational discovery contracts at exactly the moment it is needed most.[4]

The Buy-Side Reaction Locks in Conviction

Three dynamics compound across the pre-LOI period and explain why sophisticated buyers proceed despite information they recognize as insufficient. The buyer adapts to the sell-side narrative rather than constructing an independent thesis. Integration considerations — the operational realities that determine whether the deal will deliver — are deferred to post-close rather than treated as deal-shaping disciplines. And as the financial model accumulates evidence supporting the inherited thesis, conviction compounds, even though financial models do not surface the operational conflicts, system incompatibilities, and absorptive-capacity constraints that determine post-close return.

By the time these dynamics resolve, the buyer is committed to a narrative shaped externally and validated insufficiently. The deal proceeds. The failure rates that follow are predictable.

The Compound Effect

The sell-side process suppresses operational intelligence. Buy-side reaction locks in conviction without it. Together they explain not only why acquisitions fail at the rates they do, but why those failure rates have persisted despite decades of sophistication in financial diligence, deal structuring, and integration management. The financial discipline of M&A has advanced. The operational discipline required to match it has not.

What the market has lacked is the systematic solution: independent quantification of Strategic Capacity, applied pre-LOI, available to both sides,

[4] The structural diagnosis is informed by Patel, K. (2025), *Buyer-Led M&A™: The Framework*, which documents these dynamics across more than 300 practitioner interviews.

grounded in evidence rather than narrative.

Strategic Capacity as the Screening Standard

Strategic Capacity is quantified through a Strategic Capacity Score (0–100), benchmarked against best-in-class performance across twenty-four Growth-Driving Objectives organized equally into the Three Dimensions of Business Growth: Predictable Profits and Cash Flow, Predictable Sustainable Growth, and Predictable Transferable Value.

Applied to pre-LOI target evaluation, the score addresses precisely what the structural mechanisms above suppress: independent, quantified assessment of whether a business can deliver predictable results as an asset, under new ownership, independent of any one leader.

The Score Band Continuum

SCORE	BAND	GUIDANCE
0–40	**Founder State**	High founder dependency. Growth creates friction. Value is non-transferable. Core focus on building Growth Capacity through Dimensions 1 and 2.
41–54	**Emerging**	Some systems are in place but execution is inconsistent. Profit unpredictable, value compressed and likely inaccessible. Core focus remains Growth Capacity.
55–69	**Maturing**	Solid foundation. Growth is possible but capacity constraints limit transferable value and threaten M&A success. Weighted toward Growth Capacity; high end begins building Dimension 3.
70–84	**Professional**	Strong execution. Predictable profits and growth. Approaching institutional-quality operations. Value increasingly transferable, as is the likelihood of M&A success.
85+	**Asset Class**	The institutional standard. Operates independent of any one leader; delivers predictable, sustainable growth through documented systems proven out by data. Commands premium M&A pricing. Unlocks the full range of private capital monetization options — platform acquisition, annuity-stream distributions, strategic-buyer premiums.

The score is the shared reference point informational symmetry requires: a single, transparent measure of operational reality buyers, sellers, and their advisors can engage on equivalent terms.

The Asset Class: Operational Substance Behind the Score

What follows is the operational substance behind the score, evaluated against each of the Three Dimensions.

Dimension 1: Predictable Profits and Cash Flow establishes operational foundations. An Asset Class business does not merely report strong EBITDA; it generates that performance through senior leadership running the business without founder involvement, a workforce with documented roles and measurable accountability, a high percentage of codified recurring revenue, margins at or above industry norms, accurate standards-compliant financial reporting, and a scalable sales process that converts pipeline without founder participation. SOPs for on-time, on-spec delivery are documented, universal, and enforced. Customer satisfaction is measured, managed, and structurally embedded in retention. Free cash flow is growing at or above market rate, and the systems producing it are transferable.

Dimension 2: Predictable Sustainable Growth confirms the business can expand, not merely maintain. At 85+, growth is not founder-driven ambition — it is the output of a clearly articulated strategic plan with leadership alignment and execution discipline, a curated culture of accountability and continuous improvement, scalable hiring and development systems, and disciplined budgeting and forecasting that translates growth goals into measurable financial commitments. The market opportunity is demonstrably large and accessible. Products and services are differentiated and defensible. Marketing generates demand repeatably. Innovation is embedded and ongoing. An Asset Class business does not grow because its owner works harder. It grows because its systems are built to grow.

Dimension 3: Predictable Transferable Value is where institutional quality is confirmed. A business can be profitable and growth-capable and still fail to transfer — because value is locked in relationships, informal knowledge, undocumented processes, or legal exposures that surface only under buyer scrutiny. At 85+, none of that is true. The business presents a clear, aligned narrative supported by audit-ready financials. IP is owned, documented, and protected. Contracts are enforceable. Market position is strong, with high growth relative to peers, a diversified customer base, defensible barriers to displacement, and a recognized brand that contributes independently to trust, retention, and pricing power. An Asset Class business does not just perform well. It presents well — to the most rigorous buyers, under the most demanding diligence.

Most private businesses do not qualify — not because their financial performance is weak, but because performance exists on a spectrum of operational maturity that ranges from ad hoc effort and founder dependency to defined processes, documented workflows, and data-driven decision-making embedded across the organization. The degree to which a business operates through structured systems independent of any one leader determines the predictability and sustainability of its free cash flow growth — and therefore the transferable value private capital can price with confidence.

For buyers, Asset Class businesses are the highest-confidence acquisition targets. For sellers, designation commands premium pricing and unlocks the full range of monetization options. For lenders, Asset Class status materially reduces the company-specific risk component in credit decisions, supporting more favorable terms and larger facilities.

Three-Dimensional Target Screening

Each dimension consists of eight Growth-Driving Objectives and addresses a fundamental question sophisticated buyers — and the sellers preparing to meet their scrutiny — ask during target evaluation. Dimension 1 surfaces the operational reality behind the financial narrative. Dimension 2 grounds the growth thesis in scalable infrastructure. Dimension 3 establishes the deal-readiness financial models alone cannot validate.

Following an Objective and Key Result (OKR) methodology,[5] each Growth-Driving Objective is supported by specific Key Results — quantifiable outcomes that demonstrate progress — and concrete initiatives that drive achievement.

DIMENSION 1 — BASELINE

Predictable Profits and Cash Flow

Every CIM presents a financial narrative. Dimension 1 tests whether that narrative is institutionally repeatable, independent of individual heroics. A business reporting $2.4M of EBITDA without a documented handover process for its three largest customer relationships is not presenting a transferable asset, regardless of what the CIM suggests.

Eight Growth-Driving Objectives define the operational and financial stability screening must assess:

1.1 **Effective Senior Leadership** — Demonstrable ability to run the business without the founder, aligned with and accountable to shareholder intent.

1.2 **People: Productive & Loyal** — An engaged workforce with clear roles, measurable contribution, and low turnover.

1.3 **High Percentage of Recurring Revenue** — Codified processes securing predictable future income that reduces revenue risk.

[5] The OKR methodology was developed by Andrew Grove at Intel in the 1970s (Grove, A. [1983], *High Output Management*) and popularized by John Doerr at Google in 1999 (Doerr, J. [2018], *Measure What Matters*). Sandmann adapted the framework to Strategic Capacity measurement in *The Growth-Driving Advisor* (2023).

1.4 **Strong Margins** — At or above industry norms, indicating pricing power and operational efficiency.

1.5 **Financial Reporting Processes** — Accurate, timely, standards-compliant.

1.6 **Scalable Sales Process** — Repeatable systems that convert leads without founder involvement.

1.7 **Strong Standard Operating Procedures** — The universal prerequisite for operational transferability. Without documented SOPs, no other capability is reliably transferable, and disciplined acquirers consistently filter out targets with undocumented processes regardless of financial performance.

1.8 **High Customer Satisfaction** — Retention rates and reputation that support stable revenue and recurring sales efficiency.

M&A SCREENING LENS

"How confident am I that this business will continue generating growing free cash flow post-transaction?"

A low Dimension 1 score is a structural disqualifier. Where the traditional CIM is opaque, the Strategic Capacity Score delivers clarity.

DIMENSION 2 — SUPPORTING ROI

Predictable Sustainable Growth

Every CIM tells a growth story. Dimension 2 tests whether that story is the output of disciplined strategy, tactical execution, innovation capability, and a culture built to sustain growth — or a projection floated on aggressive assumptions that the operational substrate cannot support. Deal velocity routinely prevents buyers from making this distinction in depth, which is precisely why it must be quantified before the model takes over.

2.1 **Strategic Vision, Planning & Execution** — A clearly articulated strategic plan with leadership alignment and execution discipline.

2.2 **Strategic Culture** — A curated growth-oriented culture supporting accountability and continuous improvement.

2.3 **People: Hiring & Training** — Scalable recruitment and development systems for expansion.

2.4 **Large Market Size** — Accessible market opportunities providing room for growth.

2.5 **Unique Products/Services** — Differentiated, defensible, difficult to replicate.

2.6 **Scalable Marketing Process** — Repeatable demand creation that contributes directly to sales success.

2.7 **Financial: Budget, Forecast, Actuals** — Disciplined practices that translate growth goals into measurable commitments, anticipate capital needs, and prevent the funding crises that derail otherwise-viable expansion.

2.8 **Innovation Creates Competitive Advantage** — Demonstrated capability to harness innovations of people and processes that accelerate competitive positioning.

M&A SCREENING LENS

"What is the true organic growth potential post-close, and how well is the growth engine systematized?"

A business with strong Dimension 1 scores and weak Dimension 2 scores is stable but stalled — it can maintain current performance, but growth is constricted. Dimension 2 identifies genuinely scalable businesses.

DIMENSION 3 — DEAL-READY CONFIRMATION

Predictable Transferable Value

Every CIM presents a business as transferable. Dimension 3 tests whether it actually is. The market rewards leadership for growing free cash flow, but market forces do not equally compel them to address the structural risks — locked-in customer relationships, undocumented processes, IP exposure, legal overhang — that can quietly erode or eliminate that value once it meets buyer scrutiny. Where the sell-side process invites buyers to accept a pre-constructed narrative validated by a financial model, Dimension 3 provides the independent deal-readiness assessment that surfaces risks the model cannot detect. Strong profits and scalable growth are necessary; surfacing transferability risk is what makes a business genuinely acquirable. By surfacing risks before LOI commitment, Dimension 3 also materially improves conditions for predictable integration — the post-close discipline where Strategic Capacity gaps most often manifest as deal underperformance.

3.1 **Strategic: Business Story** — A clear, aligned narrative about what the business does and how it wins, told in words and numbers.

3.2 **Financial: Accurate & Credible Reporting** — Clean, audit-ready financials that build buyer confidence. Sell-side Quality of Earnings reports improve valuation support, reduce diligence friction, and increase execution certainty.

3.3 **Legal: IP, Contracts, Governance & Litigation** — Clear IP ownership, enforceable contracts, no hidden liabilities.

3.4 **High Growth Compared to Market** — Performance outpacing peers, signaling competitive advantage and growing share.

3.5 **Large Market Share** — A position of strength reducing vulnerability to displacement.

3.6 **Broad Customer Base** — Diversified revenue with no overreliance on a small number of clients.

3.7 **Defensible Market** — Barriers to entry, differentiation, or proprietary capability protecting position.

3.8 **Strong Brand** — Recognized brand contributing to trust, retention, and pricing power. The outward manifestation of culture.

M&A SCREENING LENS

"Are there unseen risks to future growth and value, or existential risks to the business asset?"

A business can be financially stable and growth-capable but still fail to transfer. Dimension 3 is where that truth surfaces — and where deal failures can be prevented.

The Bonus Objective: Strength of the M&A Market

Beyond the twenty-four core GDOs, the framework recognizes a twenty-fifth Bonus Objective: the market for selling your business is strong. Where the core objectives measure capabilities that the business controls, the Bonus Objective measures conditions the business operates within. Top performance is defined as: our plans consider how the market impacts our equity value.

contracted multiples and extended processes, Asset Class businesses with documented evidence — Strategic Capacity Score, Transferable Value calculation, Readiness Roadmap — present precisely the institutional standard cautious capital seeks.

M&A SCREENING LENS

"How do current market conditions affect transaction strategy, and how is the seller positioned to capture value across cycles?"

Strategic Capacity Across the Principal Transaction Models

Strategic Capacity quantification adds the same analytical layer to every private capital transaction: independent, evidence-based assessment of whether the underlying business can deliver what the investment thesis assumes. What that layer reveals — and what it is worth to each side — depends on the transaction model.

1. Pure Investment: Build Transferable Value, Exit

Capital is deployed with explicit intent to build Strategic Capacity over a defined horizon before monetizing. The thesis depends on the acquirer's ability to identify the current gap, execute a structured value creation program, and exit at a valuation reflecting the improved capability profile.

For this model, screening serves as both acquisition filter and value creation blueprint. A target presenting identifiable, addressable gaps is precisely the right candidate. The score quantifies the transformation opportunity. The Readiness Roadmap defines the program. The gap between current Transferable Value and potential Gross Enterprise Value models the return directly.

For sellers, the same data supports proactive positioning. A seller entering the market with a quantified score and an articulated improvement plan signals the analytical discipline pure investment buyers reward — and shifts the conversation from defensive negotiation to evidence-based valuation.

2. Platform: Demonstrated Capacity Absorbing Tuck-Ins

A business with demonstrated Strategic Capacity — upper Professional or Asset Class — becomes absorptive infrastructure for tuck-in acquisitions that present strategic opportunity but typically operate with lower or inconsistent capacity.

The platform's own score is the first critical assessment. Practitioner evidence consistently identifies integration failure as originating in the acquirer's operational bandwidth, not solely the target's readiness. A platform with capacity constraints cannot reliably absorb operational complexity. Screening the platform before screening targets surfaces this risk before it becomes a post-close liability — and gives the platform's leadership a concrete development agenda where gaps exist.

For sellers contemplating a platform sale, an 85+ score is the credential that distinguishes a true platform candidate from a merely profitable one.

3. Tuck-In: Strategic Asset, Developing Capacity

Tuck-in targets typically present compelling strategic rationale — a customer base, a technology, a market position, a geography — alongside operational infrastructure insufficiently developed to function independently at institutional quality. This combination is precisely what makes them attractive tuck-in candidates: the strategic asset is real; the operational gap is addressable by the platform's absorptive capacity.

Screening provides two services in tuck-in transactions. On the sell-side, it separates the genuine strategic value — the GDOs where the business performs well — from the operational gaps, presenting both with quantified evidence rather than narrative management. On the buy-side, it confirms the strategic rationale is structurally supported and identified gaps fall within the platform's demonstrated absorptive capacity.

4. Debt: Pricing Cash Flow Durability

Lenders deploy capital against a different question: not whether the business can be transformed or grown, but whether it can reliably service obligations through the term of the facility. The answer turns on cash flow predictability, which turns on Growth Capacity — the Dimension 1 and Dimension 2 systems that determine whether current performance is structurally repeatable.

Screening directly informs credit pricing. A business with high Growth Capacity demonstrates the operational discipline supporting cash flow durability through cycles — predictable margins, codified recurring revenue, scalable sales and operational systems, disciplined budgeting and forecasting. Asset Class status materially reduces the company-specific risk component in credit decisions, supporting more favorable terms, larger facilities, and covenant structures appropriate to demonstrated stability. For lower-band borrowers, the same analysis surfaces specific operational risks lenders should price into spread, covenants, and reporting requirements.

For sellers, sponsors, and the advisors who structure debt-supported transactions, the implication is direct. Pre-financing quantification equips borrowers to negotiate from evidence of cash flow durability rather than financial statements alone — and equips lenders to deploy capital with the confidence independent operational intelligence provides.

The Common Thread

Across all four models, the methodology serves the same purpose: it converts operational reality from contested narrative into shared, quantified evidence. Buyers gain independent intelligence calibrated to their transaction model. Lenders gain operational evidence of cash flow durability. Sellers gain the means to demonstrate quality with quantified support. Advisors gain the analytical discipline that distinguishes them from transactional intermediaries.

The systemic effect is the one this paper has argued throughout. A market in which every transaction — strategic, financial, or debt — is structured around shared operational evidence is one in which capital is priced more accurately, deals are structured more durably, and the success rate of private capital deployment improves measurably.

The CLARITY Assessment Applied to Target Screening

Why Manual Operational Diligence Fails on Its Own Terms

The structural problem diagnosed earlier produces a specific failure mode: buyers reach conviction on a thesis they did not construct, validated by financial models that cannot surface the operational gaps that determine post-close return. The shorthand is bias, but the mechanism is more precise — without independent evidence, the buyer has no anchor against which to test the inherited narrative, and conviction compounds in its place.

CLARITY is the anchor. By producing quantified operational evidence the buyer did not construct, did not inherit from the sell-side, and cannot unconsciously bend to fit the thesis already half-believed, it converts pre-LOI evaluation from narrative susceptible to bias into evidence that disciplines it. Everything that follows in this section — speed, consistency, complementarity with QoE — serves that primary function. A reasonable response to the structural problem is to extend traditional operational due diligence. The instinct is correct. The manual execution fails.

Manual diligence is inconsistent across targets — depth varies by practitioner, time available, and target cooperation, making cross-target comparison unreliable. Output quality is hostage to the individual conducting the analysis. The multi-week engagements required to surface Strategic Capacity gaps cannot be applied broadly enough to filter deal flow before LOI commitment, which is why deep operational scrutiny in current practice is deferred to post-LOI — after the resource commitment pre-LOI screening exists to protect. Sellers cannot replicate buy-side operational diligence without costly external resources, and even then the output is rarely structured for buyer consumption. Narrative-form reports are difficult to compare, contest, or update.

Systematic quantification resolves these constraints. A standardized score produces consistent cross-target comparison. A structured methodology removes practitioner variance. Hour-scale assessment makes pre-LOI screening economically viable for the first time. The same methodology equips sellers to present quantified operational evidence within normal CIM preparation timelines. And the underlying GDO data can be challenged, refined, and re-run as the business changes.

Strategic Capacity Analysis and Quality of Earnings: Complementary Layers

A second objection is that buy-side Quality of Earnings analysis already addresses operational risk. It does not, and the distinction matters.

QoE validates the financial record — testing whether reported earnings are real, sustainable, and properly normalized. Strategic Capacity Analysis validates the operational and human infrastructure that produces those earnings — testing whether the business can continue to deliver and grow them under new ownership. The two are complementary layers operating on different aspects of the same business, mutually reinforcing rather than redundant. A target can pass QoE cleanly and still fail Strategic Capacity screening: the founder-dependent business with $2.4M of EBITDA and an undocumented customer handover is the canonical example. Conversely, a target with high Strategic Capacity but unresolved QoE issues is not yet investible. Each surfaces what the other cannot.

Consistent with QoE precedent, market practice would warrant the accuracy and completeness of the operational and financial data underpinning the analysis, while conclusions — which involve judgment, forward-looking assumptions, and integration considerations — remain the buyer's responsibility, addressed through diligence, structuring, and targeted indemnities.

The CLARITY Platform

The CLARITY Strategic Capacity & Business Value Analysis™ platform operationalizes systematic quantification. Applied to target screening, CLARITY measures current Strategic Capacity across all Three Dimensions and generates the independent target intelligence traditional screening cannot reliably provide.

The assessment evaluates the target against each of the twenty-four GDOs, supported by underlying Key Results that define operational performance at granular level. The analysis is independent of management narrative — drawing on direct evidence of leadership structure, system documentation, process discipline, financial reporting maturity, market position, and the other capability factors that determine whether the business can deliver predictable performance under new ownership. Assessment ranges from focused early-stage qualification through comprehensive analysis suitable for integration planning, risk assessment, and post-acquisition value creation modeling.

THE CONSENSUS ASSESSMENT

The analysis delivers its fullest value when the CEO and the senior leadership team complete it together, facilitated by the advisor, rather than relying on a single respondent. Scoring as a group does two things at once. It sharpens accuracy — multiple perspectives surface the founder dependency, undocumented process, and capability gap that a single viewpoint would miss or unconsciously smooth over — and it forces alignment, because reaching a consensus score requires the leadership team to confront, in the same room, where the business actually stands.

The advisor’s role is decisive here: drawing out divergence between the CEO’s view and the team’s, preventing the founder from anchoring the room, and converting disagreement into evidence rather than letting it be smoothed over. For sellers, the result is a score that is both defensible under diligence and one the leadership team stands behind — de-risking the very transformation work the readiness roadmap prescribes. For buyers, a consensus assessment is independent intelligence rather than the founder’s narrative re-skinned, and the team’s ability to converge on a shared, evidence-based view is itself a Dimension 1 signal: leadership that operates as a team, not a founder surrounded by staff. For lenders, the same convergence evidences the management depth and operational discipline that underpin cash flow durability through cycles.

Three Primary Outputs

1. **Strategic Capacity Score (0–100).** A quantified benchmark against best-in-class performance across all Three Dimensions. Replaces intuition with data and documented evidence, enabling data-driven qualification before LOI commitment. The score identifies the Strategic Capacity gap — the distance between current state and the level required for transaction success.

2. **Transferable Equity Value Calculation.** A modeled valuation based on current Strategic Capacity and normalized EBITDA, expressed through three reference numbers grounded in market-comparable data:

   - **Gross Enterprise Value** — revenues or EBITDA multiplied by the top multiple for financial transactions in the subject sector.
   - **Transferable Value** — the post-due-diligence M&A price, calculated net of the company-specific risk Strategic Capacity quantifies.
   - **The Value Gap** — the difference between the two: value currently inaccessible to the seller and a primary source of post-close return for the buyer.

   These calculations inform offer strategy and integration planning on the buy-side, and pricing strategy, expectation-setting, and gap-closure programs on the sell-side — equipping both sides to negotiate from quantified evidence rather than positional assertion.

3. **Actionable Readiness Roadmap.** A prioritized summary of improvement areas aligned with the subject's strategic context. For qualified targets, it informs integration planning and post-acquisition value creation. For targets that do not yet meet a given screening threshold, it becomes the foundation for systematic capability development.

Illustrative Application

Consider a $12M-revenue manufacturing business presented to the market with clean financials: consistent EBITDA growth, healthy margins, a diversified customer base. The CIM is well-produced. Multiple buyers express serious interest.

What the CIM does not surface — because it is not designed to — is that margins, though solid, trail industry benchmarks; key IP remains unsecured; the founder continues to manage several critical customer relationships personally; core operational knowledge resides with a small number of long-tenured managers rather than in documented systems; and the sales pipeline is pursued ad hoc rather than through a repeatable, institutionalized process.

The business is profitable. It is not transferable. These are fundamentally different conditions.

A CLARITY assessment would produce a Strategic Capacity Score in the low-to-mid range, quantifying founder dependency and documentation gaps as specific constraints. The Transferable Value calculation would model the gap between the financial story the CIM tells and the price the post-diligence market is prepared to pay. The Roadmap would identify the specific operational changes required to close it.

That intelligence equips the advisor with options current screening cannot provide. The sell-side advisor can decline the mandate with evidence, reset the seller's expectations using quantified data, or recommend a systematic transformation before going to market. The buy-side advisor can qualify the target appropriately — as a transformation candidate priced for the work required rather than for the financials it currently presents. All four outcomes are superior to discovering the problem in diligence after months of committed resources.

Impact on the Private Capital Markets

Strategic Capacity quantification does not add a step to the M&A process. It shifts the costliest step — months of committed advisory and buyer resources expended on targets that were never going to deliver — into hours of quantified evidence delivered before commitment.

The most direct evidence of impact comes from the foundational work itself. Sandmann and Weavill (2025), drawing on CLARITY assessment data, model a

2x–3x increase in transferable value to buyers and a **3x–10x** increase in acquisition offers for businesses that systematically develop high Strategic Capacity across all Three Dimensions. These describe a category of value creation accessible to businesses that reach the Asset Class threshold — and a category of acquisition return accessible to buyers who screen for it.

1. Risk Mitigation

Systematic analysis identifies founder dependency, operational weaknesses, leadership gaps, and integration complexity before significant resource commitment — surfacing precisely the risks the structural sell-side mechanisms obscure. On the buy-side, this converts pre-LOI evaluation from inference to evidence, allowing buyers to walk away from targets that will not deliver, structure deals around the risks that remain, and commit confidently to targets that meet the standard. On the sell-side, the same analysis identifies risks before they emerge in diligence — giving sellers the opportunity to address gaps, reset expectations, or restructure strategy before late-stage discovery costs are incurred.

For lenders, the same risk-surfacing function operates against credit decisions, converting the company-specific risk component of credit pricing from inferred adjustment to evidence-based one — supporting more accurate spread, covenant, and facility-size decisions across the credit spectrum.

2. Resource Efficiency

Months of wasted due diligence are eliminated by focusing evaluation resources exclusively on targets with quantified transferable capability. The savings to advisory firms — both direct diligence cost and the opportunity cost of deals that should never have been pursued — are substantial. For sellers, the symmetric efficiency is equal: a quantified score and Roadmap structure preparation time around the gaps that actually matter to buyers, rather than assumptions sellers and their advisors infer about buyer concerns.

3. Portfolio Returns

Screening for systematic capability rather than financial metrics alone directly improves the quality of closed deals. Because Strategic Capacity is the primary driver of transferable equity value, businesses with the highest scores are those most likely to deliver predictable post-close performance. The relationship is structural, and pre-LOI screening is where it becomes actionable. A buyer who screens for Asset Class capability acquires the businesses most likely to deliver the thesis. A seller who develops Asset Class capability commands the valuations the underlying quality warrants. A lender who prices credit against Strategic Capacity evidence funds the businesses most likely to service obligations through cycles.

4. Deal Velocity for Qualified Targets

Firms that screen more rigorously close faster on the deals they pursue. When transferable capability is quantified before commitment, resources are deployed with confidence rather than distributed across a bloated pipeline of uncertain quality. The sell-side equivalent operates with equal force: sellers entering the market with quantified evidence shorten buyer evaluation cycles, reduce diligence-driven friction that erodes valuation and timelines, and qualify themselves to buyers most prepared to transact at the standard the seller has built. Deal velocity is not the absence of discipline. It is the product of disciplined preparation on both sides.

The Systemic Effect

The four mechanisms compound. Risk is mitigated earlier. Resources flow to the right activity. Returns improve on the deals that close. Velocity accelerates for targets that warrant it. Deals that should close, close — at fair valuations, on credible timelines, with both parties operating from the same evidence base. Capital is priced more accurately. Transactions are structured more durably. The success rate of private capital deployment improves measurably across strategic, financial, and lending markets alike.

From Methodology to Practice

The adoption barrier has compressed from months to hours.

The practical starting point is a single pilot. For a buy-side advisor, the pilot is one target currently in the pipeline where there is genuine uncertainty about deal-readiness, assessed before further resource is committed. For a sell-side advisor, one client preparing for market, assessed before the CIM is finalized. For a lender, one credit decision where the company-specific risk component is material to pricing or facility structure. In each case, the assessment will either confirm transferable capability with quantified evidence — strengthening the case to proceed — or surface specific operational constraints that would otherwise emerge later, after committed effort or capital. Either outcome represents a direct return on hours of invested time.

The transition from pilot to practice follows naturally. Firms that run one assessment typically find the quality of the intelligence it produces — and the conversations it enables with buyers, sellers, lenders, and principals on both sides — makes the case for systematic adoption. The methodology does not require the advisory firm to change its deal process. It requires only that the firm add one evidence-based step before the step that currently costs it the most when it goes wrong.

Strategic Capacity as Continuous Practice

Strategic Capacity quantification is not a single-use screening instrument deployed at one moment in a transaction. It is the analytical infrastructure for a continuous engagement that begins before a target enters the pipeline and continues through to the transaction that closes the cycle. Advisory firms that adopt the methodology in this fuller form do not add a screening tool to their existing practice; they reposition their practice around the standard the methodology defines.

The buyer screens itself first.

The clearest expression of continuous practice is the buyer who applies Strategic Capacity screening to its own organization before applying it to targets. The same framework that evaluates a target evaluates the acquirer's leadership depth, system scalability, process maturity, financial reporting discipline, and cultural readiness to absorb the demands of an acquisition. Practitioner research consistently identifies integration failure as originating in the acquirer's operational bandwidth, not solely the target's readiness. Buyers who screen themselves first surface absorptive capacity constraints that would otherwise emerge post-close as integration friction. The acquirer who walks into a transaction with quantified self-knowledge is the acquirer best positioned to choose the right targets, structure the right deals, and execute the integrations that determine post-close return.

The sell-side mirror.

A seller preparing for market is not preparing for a single transaction event but for the scrutiny the evolved buyer applies before, during, and after the deal. Strategic Capacity assessment provides the structured self-knowledge that enables sellers to articulate why they are selling, what matters beyond transaction value, and what success looks like post-close. Where traditional sell-side processes manage information to protect valuation, the evolved approach recognizes that transparency, when structured and evidenced, builds buyer confidence and accelerates deal velocity. A seller who presents a quantified score signals the institutional discipline buyers reward with premium multiples.

The continuous value creation cycle.

For targets that do not yet meet a buyer's screening threshold, or sellers whose score does not yet support the valuation they seek, the Readiness Roadmap becomes the foundation for a structured transformation program — a systematic engagement that builds capability across all Three Dimensions. The advisory firm that identified the gap and guided the transformation owns the client relationship from initial screening through to successful transaction completion. Today's failed screen becomes tomorrow's Asset Class exit.

This pattern is not theoretical. Patel (2025) documents how serial acquirers — Visma (with over 300 acquisitions), Smartsheet, NVIDIA — institutionalize the lessons from each transaction and build systems that make the next deal faster, more predictable, and less risky. Buyers building this kind of repeatable M&A capability need targets that meet a consistent standard. Strategic Capacity quantification provides that standard on the sell-side and acquisition readiness on the buy-side, within a single analytical framework advisors can carry across engagements.

> The cycle: Strategic Capacity screen → capability transformation → exit at premium → advisor reputation reinforced → next deal referral. The advisory firm that operates this cycle is not a transactional intermediary but a strategic partner embedded in the client's value creation journey — and the firm best positioned to capture the share of advisory work that is migrating, predictably, toward the methodology.

CLOSING

Conclusion

Strategic Capacity quantification represents the necessary evolution of private capital target evaluation — from financial assessment to systematic capability measurement, from narrative-dependent judgment to evidence-based decision, from the structural asymmetry that has produced decades of suboptimal outcomes to the informational symmetry that produces measurably better ones.

The framework is established. Strategic Capacity is the primary driver of transferable equity value in private capital markets (Sandmann & Weavill, 2025), measured across the twenty-four Growth-Driving Objectives of the Three Dimensions, expressed through a score that positions every business on the operational maturity continuum from Founder State through Asset Class. The methodology is operationalized. CLARITY converts the framework into pre-LOI intelligence at the speed, depth, and consistency contemporary transactions require. The application is dual-sided. Buyers gain independent operational intelligence before commitment. Sellers gain the evidence to demonstrate institutional quality. Lenders gain operational grounding for credit decisions.

Advisors on both sides gain the analytical discipline that distinguishes strategic partnership from transactional intermediation.

The most capable acquirers are professionalizing M&A into a repeatable operating capability. The most disciplined lenders are pricing credit against operational evidence rather than financial inference. Sellers and their advisors face the mirror: a market in which the buyers and lenders that matter most expect quantified evidence will reward those who provide it and penalize those who do not.

The Asset Class standard exists. The methodology to identify it, to develop it, and to price it accurately is proven. The infrastructure to deliver it at transaction speed is built. The question for M&A, private equity, lending, and capital markets professionals is not whether the industry will adopt systematic Strategic Capacity quantification, but whether their firm will lead that adoption.

References

Cited Works

Deloitte (2024). *The State of the Deal: M&A Trends 2024.* Deloitte Development LLC.

Doerr, J. (2018). *Measure What Matters: How Google, Bono, and the Gates Foundation Rock the World with OKRs.* Portfolio.

Grove, A. (1983). *High Output Management.* Random House.

Harvard Business Review (2020). "Don't Make This Common M&A Mistake." Harvard Business Publishing.

Patel, K. (2025). *Buyer-Led M&ATM: The Framework.* First Edition. M&A Science Inc.

Sandmann, G. (2023). *The Growth-Driving Advisor: Proven Strategies for Leading Businesses from Stuck to Best-in-Class.* Forbes Books, Charleston SC.

Sandmann, G. & Weavill, A. (2025). *Strategic Capacity as a Fundamental Driver of Business Value Creation.* Growth Drive Holdings LLC dba Growth-Drive.

Sandmann, G. (2025). *The 85+ Strategic Capacity Asset Class.* Growth Drive Holdings LLC dba Growth-Drive.

See Also

Everett, C. R. (2025). *2025 Private Capital Markets Report.* Pepperdine Graziadio Business School.

Exit Planning Institute (2024). *2023 National State of Owner Readiness Report.*

GF Data (2025). "Why More Sellers Are Using Quality of Earnings Reports for M&A Deals." *Middle Market Growth*, Fall 2025. Association for Corporate Growth.

McKinsey & Company (2025). "Why Managing Culture Is Critical for Value Creation in M&A." February 2025.

Sandmann, G. (2025). *The Integrated Strategic Capacity Doctrine.* Growth Drive Holdings LLC dba Growth-Drive.

About the Authors

George Sandmann, Esq.

FOUNDER & CEO, GROWTH-DRIVE

George Sandmann is the Founder and CEO of Growth-Drive and the author of *The Growth-Driving Advisor* (Forbes Books, 2023), the foundational work that defines Strategic Capacity and establishes the Three Dimensions of Business Growth as the measurement framework for private business value creation.

Through Growth-Drive and Strategic Capacity, Inc., Sandmann leads the development of the CLARITY Strategic Capacity & Business Value Analysis™ platform — the technology infrastructure that operationalizes Strategic Capacity quantification for advisors, buyers, sellers, and lenders across the private capital markets. His work centers on building the analytical and operational standards that define the 85+ Strategic Capacity Asset Class.

Sandmann is a frequent speaker and workshop facilitator for professional advisory communities, exit planning audiences, CEO peer groups, and corporate conferences. He leads the Growth-Drive Academy, which delivers the C3D credential to advisors trained in the methodology, and Growth-Drive Advisors (GDA), an invitation-only consulting firm extending the methodology to mid-market private businesses.

Email: george@growth-drive.com
Web: www.growth-drive.com | www.georgesandmann.com | www.strategiccapacity.ai

Andy Weavill

CEO & M&A ADVISOR, TEN XGROWTH

Andy Weavill is a multi-sector CEO, strategist, and M&A advisor who works with mid-market companies (£2M–£50M revenue) on Strategic Capacity development, AI transformation, and exit positioning.

A former RAF commissioned officer, Andy brings military-grade systems thinking to business strategy — combining operational discipline with commercial pragmatism developed across four CEO roles in different industries. He is a ValueMax Certified Exit Planner, certified in Growth-Drive's 3D Growth methodology (C3D), and serves on the Growth-Drive Board of Advisors.

Andy founded Ten XGrowth to help mid-market leaders build businesses that are valuable to own and attractive to buy — whether they intend to sell next year or grow for the next decade.

Email: adweavill@tenxgrowth.co.uk
Web: www.tenxgrowth.co.uk