4IP Group Background Notes Series

4IP Group Background Note No. 18

AI-Native vs AI-Enabled: An Investor and Incubator Due Diligence Framework for Distinguishing Structural AI Advantage from AI Hype

Implications for impact investing, venture building and the transformation of 4IP Group into an AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform

Publication Date: July 2026

Executive Summary

Artificial intelligence has rapidly become one of the defining themes of venture capital, private equity, corporate innovation and entrepreneurship. Yet the growing tendency of companies to describe themselves as "AI-powered" or "AI-native" has created a new challenge for investors, incubators and policymakers: distinguishing organisations whose competitive advantage genuinely depends on artificial intelligence from those that merely use AI as another productivity tool or marketing feature. This paper argues that the most meaningful distinction is **not whether a company uses AI, but whether AI is embedded in the architecture through which the company creates, delivers, improves and captures value.**

An **AI-enabled** company typically incorporates artificial intelligence to improve efficiency, automate selected tasks or enhance customer experience while its core business model remains fundamentally unchanged. Such businesses could generally continue operating if AI were removed, albeit less efficiently. By contrast, an **AI-native** company is designed around AI. Its products, workflows, decision-making processes, learning systems and competitive advantage depend on intelligence that is deeply integrated into the organisation's operating model. Removing AI from such a business would fundamentally undermine its ability to create value. The distinction is therefore structural rather than technological and should be viewed as a continuum of organisational maturity rather than a simple binary classification.

The distinction is becoming increasingly important because investors are no longer rewarding AI adoption alone. As foundation models become widely available and AI capabilities become progressively commoditised, sustainable value creation depends less on access to AI models and more on the ownership of proprietary data, domain expertise, embedded workflows, continuous learning, trusted customer relationships and responsible governance. Investors therefore require new due diligence approaches capable of separating durable competitive advantage from temporary technological

enthusiasm. AI can create substantial valuation premiums only when it generates defensible economics, scalable workflows and proprietary intelligence that competitors cannot easily replicate.

To support this evolving investment landscape, this Background Note proposes the **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework**, comprising twelve complementary dimensions:

- Problem–Solution Fit
- AI Centrality
- Proprietary Data Advantage
- Model and Technical Architecture
- Workflow Integration
- Learning and Compounding Effects
- Commercial Model and Unit Economics
- Defensibility and Competitive Replicability
- Human Capital and Organisational Design
- Responsible AI and Governance
- Impact and SDG Integrity
- Transaction and Investment Readiness

Together, these dimensions provide investors with a practical framework for evaluating whether AI represents the core engine of enterprise value creation or merely an incremental enhancement to an otherwise conventional business. The accompanying AI-Native Investment Scorecard introduces a standardised maturity assessment that complements—rather than replaces—traditional commercial, financial and governance due diligence.

The paper also highlights the significant risks associated with **misclassifying AI businesses**. Overestimating AI maturity may lead investors to assign unwarranted valuation premiums to companies whose competitive advantage can be replicated rapidly using publicly available models or APIs. Conversely, genuinely AI-native companies may be undervalued if traditional due diligence overlooks proprietary workflows, institutional knowledge, continuous learning mechanisms or embedded customer processes that create long-term competitive moats. Distinguishing between

AI adoption and AI dependence therefore becomes an increasingly important component of investment decision-making.

Beyond mainstream venture capital, the framework has particular relevance for **impact investing, emerging markets and frontier economies**. In these environments, sustainable AI advantage frequently arises not from access to the largest foundation models but from local datasets, contextual knowledge, trusted institutional relationships, multilingual capabilities and AI systems designed around local operating constraints. Human-centred AI, responsible governance and inclusive data practices become especially important where data scarcity, infrastructure limitations and regulatory uncertainty remain significant. Properly designed AI can help reduce information asymmetries, lower due diligence costs, improve capital allocation and unlock investment opportunities that have historically remained inaccessible.

For **incubators and founders**, the paper proposes a shift in emphasis away from technology demonstrations towards evidence of investment readiness. Successful AI ventures must demonstrate that AI solves a meaningful customer problem, is embedded within operational workflows, learns continuously from proprietary data, generates measurable commercial value and operates under robust governance. Founders should therefore focus less on claiming to be "AI-powered" and more on demonstrating why their business would fundamentally cease to function without AI and why competitors cannot easily replicate the resulting value proposition. Incubators likewise should help entrepreneurs progress systematically through problem validation, architecture validation, data validation, workflow validation, commercial validation and governance validation before seeking institutional investment.

The Background Note concludes by applying the framework to **4IP Group's own organisational transformation**. Historically, 4IP Group operated as a specialist impact investment advisory firm whose competitive advantage depended primarily on professional expertise, trusted relationships and transaction experience. Today, the firm is progressively redesigning its operating model into an **AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform** in which AI supports enterprise sourcing, due diligence, investor intelligence, ESG and SDG analysis, knowledge management, fundraising, portfolio monitoring and client engagement through integrated AI Brains operating on the CoOwn platform. Rather than replacing professional judgement, AI is intended to augment it by strengthening institutional learning, improving decision quality and enabling more scalable impact finance services. The paper concludes that 4IP Group is currently **transitioning from an AI-enabled advisory firm toward an AI-native organisation**, illustrating how established professional services firms can progressively embed AI into the architecture of value creation while preserving human accountability and governance.

Ultimately, this Background Note argues that **AI-native status is not itself a source of investment value**. The valuation premium arises only when AI creates proprietary learning, superior workflows, defensible economics, trusted governance and measurable customer outcomes. Companies that merely incorporate AI into existing products may improve efficiency, but those that redesign their entire operating architecture around continuously learning intelligence are more likely to achieve durable competitive advantage. For investors, incubators and founders alike, the challenge is therefore no longer to identify whether AI is present, but whether AI has become indispensable to how the enterprise creates, scales and sustains value.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: Beyond the “AI Company” Label

1.1 The proliferation of AI claims

Generative AI has dramatically lowered the technical barrier to adding **AI functionality** to digital products. Almost any technology company can now **integrate** an LLM-based interface, automated content generation, recommendation engines, AI-assisted analytics, or third-party copilots and APIs without developing proprietary AI capabilities.

As a result, the term **“AI company”** has become increasingly broad and less informative. The mere presence of **an AI feature** no longer signals technological depth, defensibility, or long-term investment value. **Investors** must therefore look beyond branding and determine whether AI is genuinely central to the company’s product, operating model and competitive advantage.

1.2 Why investors are becoming more selective

Investors increasingly **distinguish** between AI that merely adds a temporary feature, delivers an easily replicable enhancement, or improves operational efficiency, and AI that forms the core source of enterprise value. **The key question** is whether AI creates durable competitive advantage, scalable economics, proprietary learning, and long-term defensibility—or simply strengthens the company’s marketing narrative.

1.3 Relevance to incubators

Incubators must determine whether founders are building **a genuinely AI-centred venture**, applying AI to solve a meaningful market problem, or simply rebranding a conventional business to align with current investor interest. **Their role** is to help startups move beyond AI hype toward scalable, defensible and investment-ready business models.

1.4 The impact-finance dimension

For impact investors, the question extends beyond whether AI creates commercial value. They must also assess **whether AI enhances the company's ability** to generate, measure and scale **positive social and environmental outcomes**, or merely reinforces a technology narrative without improving real-world impact or impact integrity.

2. Defining AI-Native and AI-Enabled Companies

2.1 AI-enabled company

An **AI-enabled company** uses artificial intelligence to enhance existing products, services or business processes without fundamentally changing its core business model. **AI is typically applied to** automate specific tasks, improve efficiency or personalise customer experiences, while relying largely on third-party models, APIs or cloud platforms.

Typical characteristics include:

- AI enhances rather than defines the product or service;
- dependence on external AI models or APIs;
- limited proprietary data or learning capabilities;
- minimal or no continuous feedback loop;
- the business could continue operating if AI were removed, albeit less efficiently; and
- competitive differentiation remains driven primarily by brand, distribution, customer relationships or operational execution rather than proprietary AI capabilities.

2.2 AI-native company

An **AI-native company** is one in which **artificial intelligence is fundamental** to the creation, delivery and capture of value. **AI is embedded** in the product architecture, customer value proposition, decision-making, operational workflows, continuous learning processes, scaling model and long-term competitive advantage.

Typical characteristics include:

- **the product or service** would not function meaningfully without AI;
- **proprietary data and user interactions** continuously improve system performance;
- **AI outputs** are integrated into core business workflows and decision-making;
- **intelligence** compounds as the company grows, creating increasing value and defensibility;
- organisational structures and processes are designed around AI capabilities; and

- responsible AI governance, monitoring and human oversight are built into the operating model from inception.

2.3 A continuum rather than a binary distinction

Rather than treating companies as simply **AI-enabled** or **AI-native**, investors should view **AI adoption as a continuum** of organisational maturity. At one end are **AI-adjacent** companies, where AI is largely limited to branding or experimentation. **AI-assisted** companies use AI to improve specific tasks or processes, while **AI-integrated** companies embed AI across multiple critical workflows and functions. At the highest level, **AI-native** companies place AI at the core of their value creation, continuous learning, scalability and competitive advantage. This maturity spectrum provides a **more nuanced framework** for assessing AI capabilities and avoids rewarding companies solely for adopting fashionable AI terminology.

3. Why the Distinction Matters to Investors

3.1 Valuation

Investors may assign **a valuation premium** to companies where AI demonstrably strengthens long-term value creation. This is particularly the case when **AI** enables scalable gross margins, generates network and learning effects, reduces marginal delivery costs, creates proprietary intelligence and data assets, accelerates product improvement, and increases customer acquisition, engagement and retention. However, these advantages must be supported by **evidence of sustainable competitive differentiation** rather than assumptions based solely on AI adoption.

3.2 Defensibility

The key question for investors is not whether a company uses AI, but **whether its AI-driven capabilities** can be replicated quickly and inexpensively by competitors. **Sustainable competitive advantage** is more likely to arise from proprietary datasets, differentiated data rights, unique workflows, domain-specific models, continuous learning and feedback loops, privileged distribution channels, deeply embedded customer processes, regulatory approvals or trust, and specialised human expertise. Together, **these assets create barriers to entry** that are far more difficult to replicate than AI functionality alone.

3.3 Capital efficiency

AI-native businesses have the potential to scale revenue and customer reach without proportional growth in headcount, resulting in attractive operating leverage. However, these advantages may be offset by significant investments in computing infrastructure, model inference, data acquisition, specialised AI talent, cybersecurity, regulatory

compliance and continuous model monitoring. **Investors should therefore assess actual**—not assumed—capital efficiency by evaluating whether the long-term economic benefits of AI outweigh its total cost of ownership and support a sustainable path to profitability.

3.4 Risk profile

While AI-native companies may offer significant growth potential, they also introduce **risks that are not always captured** by conventional due diligence frameworks. Investors should assess **technical, operational and governance risks** alongside traditional **commercial and financial** considerations.

Key AI-specific risks include model failure, hallucinations, algorithmic bias, data-rights and intellectual property violations, dependence on concentrated cloud or foundation-model providers, evolving regulatory requirements, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, and limited explainability of AI-generated outputs. In addition, **many AI startups face key-person risk** due to their reliance on a small number of technical founders, while the rapid commoditisation of AI models may quickly erode competitive advantage and lower barriers to entry.

Accordingly, **AI due diligence** should extend beyond evaluating technological capability to assess the robustness of governance, risk management, human oversight, data stewardship and the long-term sustainability of the company's competitive position.

4. The 4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework

Dimension 1 — Problem–Solution Fit

The starting point for evaluating any AI venture is not the sophistication of its technology, but **the importance of the problem it seeks to solve**. Investors should first determine **whether the company addresses a significant customer pain point or market inefficiency**, and whether AI delivers a meaningful improvement over existing alternatives. **A critical question** is whether the proposed solution genuinely depends on AI or whether a simpler, **non-AI approach** could achieve comparable outcomes. AI should therefore be viewed as **an enabling means to solve a real problem** rather than an end in itself. Companies that deploy AI merely as a decorative feature or marketing differentiator are unlikely to build sustainable competitive advantage or justify an AI-related valuation premium.

Dimension 2 — AI Centrality

The second dimension assesses **the extent to which AI is fundamental to the company's business model and value creation**. Investors should evaluate whether AI is essential to the core functionality of the product or service, materially improves customer outcomes, underpins critical operational processes, drives revenue generation, and enables scalable growth. The more deeply AI is embedded across these dimensions, the more likely the company is to possess the characteristics of a genuinely AI-native business rather than one that simply incorporates AI as an ancillary feature.

Dimension 3 — Proprietary Data Advantage

For many AI-native companies, **proprietary data constitute the primary source of long-term competitive advantage**. Investors should therefore assess the ownership, legality and exclusivity of the company's data assets, as well as their quality, accuracy, labelling and representativeness. Equally important is **the company's ability to continuously generate new data** and create feedback loops that improve model performance over time. **Sustainable value** is more likely to arise where proprietary data and continuous learning become increasingly difficult for competitors to replicate, creating a durable competitive moat.

Dimension 4 — Model and Technical Architecture

A robust technical architecture is essential to the long-term viability of an AI-native company. **Investors should evaluate** whether the company relies primarily on proprietary models or third-party foundation models, and whether this choice is aligned with its strategic objectives, technical requirements and cost structure. Due diligence should also assess the overall system architecture, model reliability, performance monitoring processes, portability across AI platforms, infrastructure resilience, and the cost of model inference at scale. A well-designed architecture should balance performance, scalability, flexibility and resilience while avoiding excessive dependence on any single technology provider or platform.

Dimension 5 — Workflow Integration

A defining characteristic of an AI-native company is that **AI is embedded within core business workflows** rather than functioning as a standalone user-interface feature. Investors should assess whether AI actively supports or automates decision-making, integrates seamlessly with enterprise systems such as CRM, ERP, transaction management, compliance or production platforms, and enables users to act directly on its outputs. **AI creates the greatest strategic value** when it forms part of an end-to-end

operational process that improves efficiency, consistency and decision quality across the organisation.

Dimension 6 — Learning and Compounding Effects

A defining feature of AI-native companies is their ability to improve continuously as they grow. Investors should assess whether increased usage generates better-performing models, more accurate recommendations, richer proprietary datasets and deeper integration into customer workflows. These learning effects can strengthen customer loyalty, increase switching costs and create self-reinforcing competitive advantages that become increasingly difficult for competitors to replicate. **Companies capable of compounding intelligence over time** are generally better positioned to sustain long-term value creation and market leadership.

Dimension 7 — Commercial Model and Unit Economics

A compelling AI solution does not automatically translate into a viable business. Investors should **evaluate whether customers are willing to pay** for the value created, whether the pricing model is sustainable, and whether customer acquisition costs are justified by retention and lifetime value. Due diligence should also assess gross margins, the cost of AI compute and model inference, dependence on subsidised cloud or infrastructure providers, and the company's path to profitability. Ultimately, **a truly investable AI-native company** combines technological innovation with sound unit economics and a scalable, financially sustainable commercial model.

Dimension 8 — Defensibility and Competitive Replicability

A critical determinant of long-term investment value is **whether the company's competitive advantage can be sustained** as AI technologies become more widely accessible. Investors should identify what prevents competitors from rapidly replicating the solution and assess whether **the company's competitive moat** is built on proprietary data, unique workflows, trusted customer relationships, distribution networks, intellectual property, regulatory positioning or specialised domain expertise. They should also consider whether advances by general-purpose AI model providers could commoditise the company's offering or disintermediate its role in the value chain. **Sustainable AI-native businesses** are those whose competitive advantage extends well beyond access to AI models themselves.

Dimension 9 — Human Capital and Organisational Design

While AI is a powerful enabler, **long-term success** ultimately depends on **the quality of the people and organisation behind it**. Investors should assess whether the founding team combines strong AI capabilities with deep domain expertise, and whether responsibilities are appropriately allocated between AI systems and human decision-

makers. Due diligence should also **evaluate the company's** product development, engineering, compliance and commercial capabilities, as well as the extent to which institutional knowledge is embedded across the organisation rather than concentrated in a single founder or technical expert. **Mature AI-native companies build resilient organisations** where human expertise and artificial intelligence complement each other to create sustainable value.

Dimension 10 — Responsible AI and Governance

Responsible AI governance is becoming a key determinant of investment quality and regulatory resilience. Investors should assess whether the company has implemented appropriate human-in-the-loop controls, auditability and explainability mechanisms, procedures to identify and mitigate bias, robust privacy and cybersecurity safeguards, and effective model-risk management. They should also evaluate whether clear escalation procedures exist for high-risk AI decisions and whether the board exercises appropriate oversight of AI strategy, ethics and governance. Strong AI governance not only reduces operational and regulatory risks but also enhances stakeholder trust and long-term enterprise value.

Dimension 11 — Impact and SDG Integrity

For impact-oriented ventures, AI should be evaluated not only for its commercial potential but also for its **ability to generate measurable and sustainable positive outcomes**. Investors should assess the **company's intentionality** in pursuing social and environmental impact, the additionality of its AI-enabled solution, and the extent to which it delivers **meaningful benefits** to customers, communities and other stakeholders. Particular attention should be given to **inclusion and accessibility**, ensuring that AI expands opportunities rather than reinforcing existing inequalities.

At the same time, due diligence should **identify potential negative externalities**, including job displacement, algorithmic bias, excessive energy consumption and environmental impacts associated with AI infrastructure. Companies should demonstrate **how these risks** are recognised, monitored and mitigated. Finally, investors should evaluate the extent to which the company's activities contribute to relevant **UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** and whether impact is supported by a credible theory of change, measurable key performance indicators and robust impact measurement and management practices. Companies that integrate **responsible AI with genuine impact intentionality** are more likely to create long-term value for both investors and society.

Dimension 12 — Transaction and Investment Readiness

Regardless of its technological sophistication, an AI-native company must demonstrate that it is **ready to attract and deploy external capital effectively**. Investors should assess whether the company has coherent investment documentation, a validated financial model, a transparent and well-structured capitalisation table, clear ownership of intellectual property, and appropriate legal and commercial agreements. Due diligence should also **evaluate** the completeness of the virtual data room, the credibility of the proposed use of proceeds, the definition of measurable operational and commercial milestones, and the realism of the company's valuation expectations. Ultimately, **investment readiness** reflects the company's ability not only to innovate but also to withstand rigorous institutional due diligence and execute a successful fundraising process.

5. Proposed AI-Native Investment Scorecard

To support consistent and evidence-based investment decisions, 4IP Group proposes an **AI-Native Investment Scorecard** that assesses each of the twelve dimensions using a standardised **0–5 maturity scale**.

- A score of **0** indicates no evidence supporting the criterion, while
- **1** reflects AI used primarily for promotional or marketing purposes.
- A score of **2** denotes limited AI-assisted functionality that improves specific tasks without fundamentally changing the business model.
- A score of **3** represents meaningful AI integration across key business processes but with limited competitive defensibility.
- Companies scoring **4** have AI structurally embedded within their products, operations and value proposition, supported by credible competitive advantages.
- The highest score of **5** is reserved for companies that are demonstrably **AI-native**, combining proprietary intelligence, sustainable competitive moats, robust governance, commercial validation and proven scalability.

By applying **a common scoring methodology across all assessment dimensions**, the framework enables investors to compare AI ventures objectively, identify strengths and weaknesses, and distinguish genuine long-term value creation from superficial AI adoption.

Suggested weighting

Dimension	Weight
Problem–solution fit	10%
AI centrality	10%
Proprietary data	10%
Technical architecture	10%
Workflow integration	10%
Learning effects	8%
Commercial model	10%
Defensibility	10%
Team and organisation	7%
Responsible AI	5%
Impact and SDG integrity	5%
Transaction readiness	5%

Suggested Score Classifications

The overall score provides an indication of a company's **AI maturity and investment readiness**. Companies scoring **80–100** demonstrate the characteristics of a genuinely **AI-native** business and may be considered potentially investable, subject to satisfactory due diligence. Scores between **65 and 79** indicate **AI-integrated** companies, where AI is embedded across important business functions but additional validation is required to confirm long-term defensibility and scalability. Companies scoring **45–64** are classified as **AI-enabled**, with AI providing operational or product enhancements while the investment case continues to **rely primarily on conventional business strengths** such as management quality, market position and execution capabilities. Scores **below 45** suggest an **AI-adjacent** business or one whose AI claims remain insufficiently substantiated.

It is important to emphasise that **the AI-Native Investment Scorecard** is intended to **complement**—not replace—traditional investment due diligence. A high AI maturity score should never compensate for fundamental weaknesses in market demand, management integrity, financial performance, legal and regulatory compliance, corporate governance or overall investment quality. Ultimately, **AI readiness** represents one important dimension of investment attractiveness rather than a substitute for sound business fundamentals.

6. Proprietary Intelligence: What Actually Constitutes a Moat?

6.1 Data volume is not enough

While data are often described as **the "new oil,"** the quantity of data alone does not create a sustainable competitive advantage. Investors should look beyond dataset size and assess whether **the company's data assets** are strategically valuable and capable of supporting long-term differentiation. In particular, they should evaluate whether the data are relevant to the problem being solved, exclusive or difficult for competitors to obtain, lawfully acquired and used, of high quality and properly curated, continuously refreshed through ongoing customer interactions, and capable of generating measurable commercial value.

Ultimately, competitive advantage stems not from possessing the largest datasets, but from owning or accessing **high-quality, proprietary data that continuously improve AI performance and deliver superior customer outcomes**. Companies that combine unique data assets with effective governance and continuous learning are far more likely to develop **durable competitive moats** than those relying solely on publicly available or easily replicable information.

6.2 Fine-tuning is not always proprietary intelligence

Many AI startups highlight **the use of fine-tuned foundation models** as evidence of technological differentiation. However, fine-tuning a commercially available large language model does not, by itself, create proprietary intelligence or a sustainable competitive advantage. Companies that **rely primarily on standard third-party models** with limited customisation often remain highly dependent on upstream AI providers for model performance, pricing, functionality and future innovation.

Investors should therefore distinguish between **model customisation** and **proprietary intelligence**. **True defensibility** is more likely to arise from unique datasets, domain-specific expertise, proprietary workflows, continuous learning mechanisms and seamless integration into customer operations than from incremental modifications to publicly available foundation models. **The key question** is not how much a model has been fine-tuned, but whether the company has created **intellectual assets** that competitors cannot easily replicate, regardless of the underlying AI model.

6.3 Workflow ownership may be more defensible than model ownership

As foundation AI models become increasingly commoditised, sustainable competitive advantage is likely to depend less on model ownership and more on **workflow ownership**. In many businesses, **the strongest competitive moat** arises from being deeply embedded in customers' day-to-day decision-making processes, integrating fragmented data from multiple sources, coordinating interactions among diverse stakeholders, capturing institutional knowledge, and continuously improving outcomes through repeated use. These capabilities create high switching costs and generate value that is difficult for competitors to replicate, even when they have access to similar AI models.

This perspective aligns closely with **4IP Group's AI-first, human-centred strategy**, which views AI not as a standalone product but as **shared organisational infrastructure** that augments human expertise across the entire investment lifecycle. Rather than competing on proprietary models alone, 4IP Group seeks to embed AI into deal sourcing, due diligence, investor matchmaking, knowledge management and portfolio support, thereby creating a continuously learning platform where intelligence, workflows and human judgment reinforce one another. In this context, long-term value stems not from owning the most advanced model, but from **owning the processes, relationships and institutional knowledge** that enable better and more scalable investment decisions.

7. Infrastructure Dependency and Platform Risk

AI-native companies often rely on a complex ecosystem of external technology providers, including foundation-model developers, cloud computing platforms, external APIs, data vendors, open-source software communities and specialised hardware manufacturers. While these **dependencies** can accelerate innovation and reduce development costs, they also create **strategic risks** that may affect long-term competitiveness, resilience and profitability.

Investors should therefore **evaluate the company's exposure** to infrastructure and platform risk by assessing pricing sensitivity, portability across alternative providers, vendor lock-in, business continuity if access to key platforms changes, the feasibility of substituting AI models, and compliance with regulatory requirements across different jurisdictions. **Excessive dependence on a single provider** may expose the company to changes in pricing, licensing conditions, service availability or geopolitical restrictions that are largely beyond management's control.

A practical question for founders is therefore:

"What remains uniquely yours if your current foundation-model provider makes its underlying capability widely available at one-tenth of today's cost?"

The answer reveals whether **the company's long-term value** resides primarily in rented AI infrastructure or in proprietary assets such as data, workflows, customer relationships, domain expertise and institutional knowledge. Companies whose competitive advantage extends beyond the underlying AI model are generally better **positioned to sustain value creation** as AI technologies become increasingly commoditised.

8. Human-Centred AI as an Investment-Quality Indicator

One of the distinguishing features of the **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework** is its emphasis on **human-centred AI**. While AI can significantly enhance productivity, analytical capability and decision support, responsibility for investment decisions, client relationships, ethical judgement and accountability should always remain with humans. The objective is not simply to automate processes or accelerate execution, but to enable better-informed decisions, improve investment outcomes and strengthen long-term value creation.

From an investor's perspective, **human-centred AI** should therefore be viewed as a source of **competitive advantage** rather than a constraint on innovation. Companies that **design AI to augment human expertise**, rather than replace it, are more likely to achieve higher user adoption, greater stakeholder trust, improved decision quality, stronger regulatory resilience, enhanced explainability and broader stakeholder

participation. These characteristics contribute to **the long-term legitimacy and sustainability** of both the technology and the business model.

Accordingly, **AI due diligence** should extend beyond technical performance to evaluate how humans and AI interact throughout the organisation. Investors should examine which decisions remain under **human responsibility**, the circumstances under which AI systems must escalate **decisions to human experts**, whether users can understand and challenge AI-generated outputs, and **who ultimately remains accountable** when AI systems fail or produce unintended consequences. Equally important is assessing whether AI empowers users to make better decisions or manipulates behaviour, whether affected stakeholders have been meaningfully involved in product design, and whether the company creates reciprocal value for those whose data contribute to training and improving its AI systems.

For 4IP Group, **human-centred AI is not simply an ethical principle but an investment-quality indicator**. Companies that successfully combine advanced AI capabilities with strong governance, transparency and human accountability are likely to be more resilient, trusted and investable over the long term than those pursuing automation without adequate oversight or stakeholder consideration.

9. Implications for Emerging and Frontier Markets

9.1 Data scarcity

The assessment of AI-native companies in Africa requires **an appreciation of the continent's unique data environment**. Unlike many developed markets, AI ventures often operate with fragmented datasets, limited digitisation, significant linguistic diversity, large informal economies and relatively weak public data infrastructure. These **constraints** should not necessarily be viewed as weaknesses, but rather as opportunities for innovation. Companies that successfully generate, verify and curate high-quality local data, while developing AI solutions adapted to African contexts, can create valuable proprietary data assets and sustainable competitive advantages. Consequently, **investors should evaluate not only the quantity of available data but also the company's capability to overcome data scarcity** through innovative data collection, partnerships, human validation and continuous learning.

9.2 Infrastructure constraints

Beyond data availability, investors should assess whether **the operating environment** can support the sustainable deployment and scaling of AI solutions. In many African markets, **infrastructure constraints** — including unreliable internet connectivity, intermittent electricity supply, high cloud computing costs, limited local hosting and data localisation capabilities, device affordability and performance limitations, and

uneven cybersecurity capacity—can significantly affect business performance and customer adoption. **Due diligence should therefore evaluate** how effectively a company has designed its technology and business model **to operate within these constraints**, including its resilience to infrastructure disruptions, optimisation of computing resources, cybersecurity preparedness, and ability to deliver reliable AI services across diverse operating environments. Companies that successfully address these challenges are more likely to build scalable and sustainable AI businesses in frontier markets.

9.3 The importance of domain and local knowledge

In frontier and emerging markets, **sustainable competitive advantage** often depends less on access to cutting-edge AI models than on deep domain expertise and local contextual knowledge. Companies can build defensible positions by developing AI solutions based on local language models, verified local datasets, trusted community and business networks, strong institutional relationships, and a nuanced understanding of local regulatory, cultural and market dynamics. Combined with effective last-mile delivery capabilities, **these assets enable AI systems** to generate more relevant, accurate and trusted outcomes that are difficult for global competitors to replicate. Investors should therefore recognise that, in many African contexts, local knowledge and trusted relationships may represent more durable sources of competitive advantage than technological sophistication alone.

9.4 Leapfrogging potential

Artificial intelligence has **the potential to accelerate economic development** in emerging and frontier markets by reducing due diligence costs, narrowing information asymmetries, lowering barriers to finance and investment, and bridging the fragmentation that often exists between entrepreneurs, investors and financial institutions. By improving the quality, accessibility and transparency of information, **AI can help unlock investment opportunities** that might otherwise remain invisible to domestic and international capital providers. However, these benefits are not automatic. If **AI systems are trained** on unrepresentative datasets, fail to reflect local contexts or lack appropriate human oversight, they risk reinforcing existing inequalities, excluding underserved populations and introducing new forms of bias. **Realising AI's transformative potential** therefore requires a human-centred approach that combines technological innovation with inclusive data, responsible governance and active stakeholder participation.

10. What Incubators Should Evaluate

As AI entrepreneurship continues to accelerate, **incubators have a critical role in distinguishing ventures** with genuine long-term potential from those driven primarily

by market hype. Rather than focusing on whether a startup describes itself as "AI-powered," incubators should **evaluate whether AI creates** demonstrable value, sustainable competitive advantage and a credible path to investment readiness. To support this process, 4IP Group proposes a **six-stage AI venture incubation framework** that aligns technical validation with commercial viability and investor expectations.

Stage 1 – Problem Validation assesses whether the startup is solving a sufficiently important customer problem and **whether AI provides a meaningful improvement** over existing alternatives. The emphasis should be on validating the problem before validating the technology.

Stage 2 – Architecture Validation evaluates whether the proposed AI architecture is technically feasible, secure, scalable and cost-effective, taking into account infrastructure requirements, model selection and operational resilience.

Stage 3 – Data Validation examines whether the startup has lawful access to high-quality data, appropriate governance over its data assets and the ability to generate continuous learning through new data and feedback loops.

Stage 4 – Workflow Validation determines **whether AI is embedded** within real customer workflows and operational processes rather than functioning as an isolated feature. Solutions that become **integral** to users' daily activities are more likely to generate lasting value and defensibility.

Stage 5 – Commercial Validation focuses on market traction and business viability by assessing customer willingness to pay, pricing, unit economics, scalability and evidence that AI creates measurable commercial outcomes.

Finally, **Stage 6 – Governance Validation** evaluates whether the company has established the governance, risk management, human oversight and regulatory compliance necessary to scale responsibly and satisfy institutional investors.

Incubators should therefore **avoid rewarding founders** simply for incorporating AI terminology into their pitch decks. Instead, they should **help entrepreneurs build robust evidence across these six stages**, enabling them to progress from promising AI concepts to scalable, investable and responsible AI-native businesses. This structured approach not only **improves startup quality** but also increases the likelihood of successful fundraising, sustainable growth and long-term impact.

11. What Founders Should Demonstrate to Investors

Founders seeking institutional investment must demonstrate far more than technical innovation or the adoption of AI technologies. They should clearly articulate **why AI is**

essential to solving the targeted customer problem, **which parts of the value chain are fundamentally transformed by AI**, and **what proprietary intelligence or competitive advantages** the company has developed. Investors will also expect evidence that the AI system improves through continuous use, that the company has lawful ownership or access to the data underpinning its models, and that it has a sustainable strategy for managing compute and infrastructure costs.

Equally important is demonstrating commercial traction and organisational maturity. Founders should provide evidence of customer value, recurring demand, and a scalable business model supported by appropriate technical and organisational safeguards. They should explain how high-impact AI decisions remain subject to meaningful human oversight, how the solution can scale without compromising performance or governance, and why competitors cannot easily replicate the company's capabilities. Ultimately, successful fundraising depends not on convincing investors that the company uses AI, but on demonstrating that AI creates durable, defensible and commercially validated value within a well-governed and investment-ready enterprise.

12. Applying the Framework to 4IP Group

12.1 Is 4IP Group currently AI-native or AI-enabled?

Applying the proposed **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework** to itself suggests that **4IP Group is currently transitioning from an AI-enabled advisory firm to an AI-native, human-centred impact finance platform**. Historically, the firm's **competitive advantage** has been built on the experience, networks and judgment of its senior professionals in impact investing, development finance and capital raising. While these human capabilities remain central to the firm's identity, **AI is increasingly being embedded into the organisation's core operating model** rather than simply being used as a productivity tool.

This transformation is reflected in the implementation plans of the firm's new team members, the revised Business Plan, and the AI-first strategy articulated in the 4IP Group White Paper. Rather than deploying isolated AI applications, **the firm is redesigning its investment lifecycle** around interconnected AI-supported workflows. AI is progressively becoming **integral** to enterprise sourcing, investment screening, due diligence, investor intelligence, CRM management, capital matchmaking, ESG and SDG analysis, impact measurement, proposal development, knowledge management, portfolio monitoring and client engagement. **These capabilities are designed to reinforce one another** through continuous learning, creating organisational

intelligence that improves with every transaction, investor interaction and completed mandate.

The transformation is **also organisational** rather than purely technological. New roles within 4IP Group are no longer defined solely by traditional functional responsibilities but increasingly by the design, supervision and continuous improvement of specialised AI Brains and AI-enabled workflows. Consultants, analysts and investment professionals are expected not only to deliver **advisory services** but also to curate institutional knowledge, train AI agents, validate AI-generated outputs and continuously enhance the firm's collective intelligence. In this model, **AI becomes a force multiplier** that allows experienced professionals to focus on higher-value activities such as strategic judgement, relationship management, negotiation and investment decision-making.

At the centre of this transformation is the **CoOwn platform**, which provides the shared **AI infrastructure** upon which specialised AI Brains are being developed for portfolio companies, investment opportunities, investors, strategic partners and internal knowledge domains. These AI Brains are **complemented** by structured prompt libraries, due diligence methodologies, investor relationship management systems and knowledge repositories that **enable institutional learning** across the organisation. Rather than operating as isolated digital assistants, they form an integrated ecosystem designed to support every stage of the investment process while preserving full human oversight and accountability.

Consequently, **4IP Group should not yet be classified as a fully AI-native organisation**. Its transformation remains a work in progress as the implementation roadmap is executed and AI capabilities are progressively embedded across all business functions. However, **the strategic direction is clear**: the firm's objective is not simply to use AI more extensively, but to redesign its organisational architecture so that AI becomes foundational to how knowledge is created, shared and applied. This positions 4IP Group as an emerging **AI-native investment intermediary**, where proprietary workflows, institutional knowledge, responsible AI governance and human expertise combine to create a scalable, defensible and differentiated platform for mobilising impact capital, particularly across emerging and frontier markets.

12.2 AI-native elements under development

The transition towards **an AI-native operating model** is being implemented through a series of interconnected initiatives outlined in the revised 4IP Group Business Plan and reflected in the implementation plans of newly recruited team members. Central to this transformation is the development of specialised **AI Brains** for portfolio companies, investment opportunities, investors and strategic partners, **supported by** a unified

investor CRM, AI-assisted investor–enterprise matchmaking, AI-enabled due diligence workflows, ESG and impact modelling agents, proposal and knowledge management agents, and multi-agent monitoring systems. Together, these components are designed to create **an integrated investment intelligence platform** that continuously captures, shares and applies institutional knowledge across the entire investment lifecycle, while ensuring that **all material decisions remain subject to** human validation, professional judgement and accountability.

The implementation roadmap for the second half of **2026** establishes ambitious but measurable objectives to operationalise this vision. These include the deployment of **25–30 AI Brains**, the development of a unified database containing **1,500–2,000 qualified investor profiles**, the facilitation of at least **50 AI-supported investor–company matches**, the active management of **ten fundraising mandates**, and support for the successful completion of **three capital raises**. These targets are intended not only to increase organisational productivity but also to demonstrate that AI, when embedded within a human-centred operating model, can materially **improve the efficiency, quality and scalability** of impact investment advisory services. Collectively, these initiatives represent **the practical building blocks** through which 4IP Group is evolving from a traditional advisory boutique into an **AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform** capable of mobilising greater volumes of private capital towards sustainable development in emerging and frontier markets.

12.3 Why 4IP Group is not simply adding AI tools

The transformation of 4IP Group goes far beyond the adoption of individual AI applications. It represents a fundamental redesign of the firm's operating model, in which AI becomes an integral component of how the organisation creates, captures and delivers value. Rather than treating AI as a collection of productivity tools, 4IP Group is embedding AI across its organisational structure, redefining staff responsibilities, redesigning service delivery processes and institutionalising knowledge through shared AI Brains. This transformation affects every stage of the investment lifecycle—from enterprise sourcing and due diligence to investor engagement, fundraising and post-investment support.

The revised Business Plan and implementation plans for new team members illustrate this shift. Employees are no longer responsible solely for executing tasks; they are increasingly expected to develop, train, supervise and continuously improve specialised AI Brains that augment their expertise. Knowledge is progressively moving from individual consultants to a shared organisational asset that can be reused, updated and scaled across projects. Similarly, transaction workflows are being redesigned to integrate AI-assisted screening, due diligence, investor intelligence, proposal

development and portfolio monitoring, while maintaining mandatory human oversight at all critical decision points.

This transformation also reshapes client engagement and the firm's commercial model. Instead of delivering primarily project-based advisory services, 4IP Group is evolving towards recurring AI-enabled services, including AI Brain subscriptions, investor intelligence platforms, due diligence-as-a-service, portfolio monitoring, knowledge management and retainer-based advisory solutions. At the same time, institutional memory is no longer dependent on individual professionals but is progressively embedded within the firm's AI infrastructure, enabling continuous learning across transactions, clients and investment mandates. In this sense, 4IP Group is not simply **using AI**; it is **re-engineering itself into an AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform**, where AI amplifies human expertise, preserves organisational knowledge and enhances the firm's long-term scalability, resilience and competitive advantage.

12.4 The human-centred safeguard

The defining characteristic of 4IP Group's transformation is not the pursuit of maximum automation, but the creation of an **AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform** in which artificial intelligence augments—rather than replaces—human expertise. The **firm's long-term competitive advantage** lies in combining AI-generated intelligence with senior investment judgement, trusted client relationships, deep contextual knowledge of emerging and frontier markets, rigorous ESG and impact assessment, and clear human accountability. AI is used to enhance the speed, quality and consistency of analysis, while experienced professionals remain responsible for interpreting results, exercising judgement, building partnerships, negotiating transactions and making final investment recommendations.

This human-centred philosophy reflects 4IP Group's conviction that the future of impact investing belongs neither to purely human nor purely AI-driven organisations, but **to those capable of integrating the complementary strengths of both**. AI provides scale, analytical capacity and institutional memory; humans contribute ethical judgement, contextual understanding, creativity, empathy and accountability. By **embedding human oversight** throughout every critical stage of the investment lifecycle, 4IP Group seeks to build greater trust among entrepreneurs, investors, development finance institutions and other stakeholders, while ensuring that technology serves the broader objectives of responsible investment, sustainable development and measurable impact. This combination of **AI intelligence and human wisdom** constitutes the firm's principal differentiator and the foundation of its long-term value proposition.

13. Illustrative Use Case: The AI-Native Due Diligence and Capital-Raising Journey

The transformation of 4IP Group into an **AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform** is best illustrated through **the journey** of a company progressing from initial engagement to a successful capital raise. Rather than replacing investment professionals, AI orchestrates and augments each stage of the transaction lifecycle while ensuring that all material decisions remain subject to human judgement, accountability and client relationship management.

The process begins when an enterprise enters the **4IP Group investment pipeline** through one of the firm's sourcing channels, strategic partners or referrals. **Initial screening information** is collected using the 4IP Group Due Diligence Questionnaire to assess strategic fit, investment readiness and alignment with the firm's sectoral and impact priorities. **Companies that pass this initial assessment** are invited to establish a structured virtual **data room**, ensuring that corporate, financial, legal, technical, ESG and impact documentation is organised according to the 4IP Group Due Diligence Toolkit.

Once the documentation has been validated, a dedicated **AI Brain** is created for the company. This **AI Brain indexes** all approved documentation, continuously organises institutional knowledge and provides authorised users with rapid access to information throughout the transaction. **AI-assisted due diligence then reviews** the available evidence, identifies missing documentation, inconsistencies, potential risks and follow-up questions across commercial, financial, legal, technical, ESG and impact dimensions.

The AI-generated findings are subsequently reviewed by 4IP Group's investment professionals, who validate management quality, commercial assumptions, financial projections, legal compliance, ESG performance and impact integrity. Rather than replacing expert judgement, **AI enables specialists to focus** their attention on the issues that matter most while improving the consistency, speed and completeness of the due diligence process.

Following completion of the review, the **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Scorecard** automatically assesses both the company's AI maturity and its overall investment readiness across the twelve dimensions proposed in this Background Paper. The resulting assessment informs the preparation of the Investment Committee Memorandum and highlights priority actions required before investor engagement.

For companies progressing to fundraising, the AI Brain evolves into an **Investor Q&A Brain**, capable of providing structured responses to investor questions based

exclusively on validated due diligence information. At the same time, **the firm's unified investor CRM and AI-supported matchmaking agents** analyse investor preferences, mandates, sector interests, geographic focus, ticket sizes and impact objectives to identify the most suitable funding partners.

While AI identifies and prioritises potential investor matches, **human advisers remain responsible for validating strategic fit, managing relationships, conducting negotiations and guiding the capital-raising process**. AI supports decision-making, but trust, judgement and relationship management remain fundamentally human activities.

Throughout the fundraising process, investor interactions, due diligence requests, **follow-up actions and transaction milestones** are continuously monitored through the AI platform. As new information becomes available, both the AI Brain and the underlying due diligence record are updated, allowing institutional knowledge to accumulate and improving future fundraising activities, portfolio support and investment decision-making.

This illustrative workflow demonstrates that **4IP Group is not developing isolated AI applications but an integrated investment operating system**. By combining AI-assisted due diligence, knowledge management, investor intelligence and capital matchmaking within a human-centred governance framework, the firm creates a continuously learning platform that improves the quality, efficiency and scalability of impact investment transactions. In doing so, the proposed model directly connects the themes of **AI-native versus AI-enabled investing** with 4IP Group's commercial strategy and its next-generation **AI-powered Due Diligence Toolkit**, illustrating how AI can transform not only products, but the entire investment lifecycle.

14. Recommendations for Investors

As artificial intelligence becomes increasingly pervasive across industries, investors should move beyond simplistic distinctions between "AI companies" and non-AI companies. Instead, investment decisions should be grounded in a structured assessment of how AI contributes to long-term value creation, competitive advantage and responsible business performance. Based on the analysis presented in this Background Paper, 4IP Group proposes the following recommendations for investors evaluating AI-enabled and AI-native enterprises.

First, investors should **replace binary AI classifications with an AI maturity spectrum**, recognising that companies evolve from AI-adjacent to AI-assisted, AI-integrated and ultimately AI-native operating models. Second, they should **test whether AI is genuinely necessary** to solving the underlying customer problem rather than accepting AI branding or marketing claims at face value. Third, due diligence

should focus on **proprietary intelligence and sustainable competitive advantage**, rather than solely on the sophistication of the underlying AI models or algorithms.

Fourth, investors should carefully **evaluate workflow integration and customer dependence**, recognising that companies embedded within customers' operational processes often possess stronger competitive moats than those offering standalone AI features. Fifth, they should **quantify the true cost of AI**, including compute, inference, infrastructure, data acquisition and ongoing model maintenance, rather than assuming that AI automatically improves capital efficiency. Sixth, AI due diligence should **stress-test dependence on third-party platforms**, assessing exposure to foundation-model providers, cloud infrastructure, external APIs and other critical technology dependencies that may affect long-term resilience.

Seventh, investors should **assess human capital and organisational capability** alongside technical innovation, recognising that successful AI-native companies combine strong engineering with domain expertise, governance and commercial execution. Eighth, companies should be expected to demonstrate **responsible AI governance proportionate to the risks associated with their technology**, including appropriate human oversight, transparency, cybersecurity, bias management and regulatory compliance.

Ninth, investors should evaluate **measurable customer value and, where relevant, measurable social and environmental impact**, ensuring that AI contributes to demonstrable outcomes rather than technological novelty alone. Finally, AI readiness should **be fully integrated into the broader investment due diligence process**, complementing traditional assessments of management quality, commercial viability, financial performance, legal compliance, ESG performance and corporate governance.

By adopting these recommendations, investors will be better positioned to distinguish genuine AI-native businesses capable of creating sustainable long-term value from companies that merely incorporate AI as a supplementary feature. In doing so, they can improve investment decision-making, strengthen portfolio resilience and allocate capital more effectively towards innovative enterprises that combine technological excellence with commercial discipline, responsible governance and measurable impact.

15. Recommendations for Incubators

Incubators play a pivotal role in shaping the next generation of AI-native enterprises and should therefore adopt evaluation frameworks that extend well beyond technological novelty. From the earliest stages of engagement, they should introduce **AI-native diagnostic assessments** to distinguish ventures with genuine AI-driven competitive potential from those merely incorporating AI features. Founders should be required to

document their data rights, infrastructure dependencies and technical architecture, ensuring that critical issues relating to data governance, platform risk and scalability are addressed before significant resources are committed.

Rather than relying solely on pitch presentations, incubators should implement **milestone-based validation** covering problem–solution fit, technical feasibility, data readiness, workflow integration, commercial traction and governance maturity. Responsible AI principles—including human oversight, transparency, privacy, cybersecurity and risk management—should be embedded from the outset rather than retrofitted as regulatory requirements evolve. At the same time, startups should be encouraged to design AI solutions that become integral to genuine customer workflows and deliver measurable business outcomes, rather than developing isolated AI features with limited practical value.

Finally, incubators should prepare founders for the expectations of institutional investors by exposing them early to investment-grade due diligence standards, including financial planning, legal documentation, data room preparation, governance structures and impact measurement where relevant. Throughout the incubation process, mentors should actively discourage superficial **"AI washing"**—the practice of using AI terminology primarily as a marketing tool—and instead help entrepreneurs build robust evidence that AI creates sustainable competitive advantage, responsible innovation and long-term commercial value. By doing so, incubators can significantly improve the quality, investability and resilience of the AI ventures emerging from their programmes.

16. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence is reshaping how companies are built, how investors evaluate opportunities, and how value is created across industries. Yet the distinction between **AI-enabled** and **AI-native** enterprises cannot be reduced to the presence of advanced algorithms or sophisticated models. The true differentiator lies in whether AI has become fundamental to the organisation's ability to create, capture and sustain value over time.

The next generation of investment winners will not necessarily be the companies deploying the largest foundation models or making the boldest AI claims. Rather, they will be those that successfully combine **proprietary intelligence, deeply embedded customer workflows, sustainable unit economics, responsible governance, continuous organisational learning and demonstrable customer value**. As AI capabilities become increasingly commoditised, durable competitive advantage will depend less on access to technology itself and more on how effectively organisations integrate AI with data, people, processes and institutional knowledge.

For investors, this shift requires a new generation of due diligence frameworks that evaluate AI not as a standalone technology, but as an integral component of commercial strategy, organisational capability and long-term resilience. The **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework** seeks to contribute to this evolving discipline by providing a structured, evidence-based methodology that complements traditional financial, commercial, legal and ESG due diligence with a systematic assessment of AI maturity, defensibility, governance and investment readiness.

For incubators and founders, the challenge is equally significant. Success will increasingly depend not on demonstrating that a company *uses* AI, but on proving that AI solves meaningful problems, creates measurable customer value, strengthens organisational capability and withstands rigorous institutional due diligence. Building investment-ready AI-native companies therefore requires technical excellence, commercial discipline, responsible governance and continuous validation throughout the entrepreneurial journey.

For **impact investors**, however, the standard should be even higher. AI should not merely increase enterprise value or operational efficiency; it should enhance **human agency, inclusion, transparency, accountability and measurable sustainable development outcomes**. Responsible AI should expand opportunities rather than deepen inequalities, strengthen trust rather than undermine it, and support better human decision-making rather than replace it indiscriminately.

This philosophy lies at the heart of **4IP Group's transformation into an AI-first, human-centred impact finance platform**. Rather than viewing AI as an end in itself, 4IP Group sees it as shared organisational infrastructure that amplifies human expertise, institutionalises knowledge, strengthens due diligence, improves capital allocation and accelerates the mobilisation of private capital towards sustainable development. By combining **artificial intelligence with human judgement, trusted relationships, impact integrity and responsible governance**, the firm seeks to demonstrate that the future of investment is neither AI-driven nor human-driven alone—it is **human-centred and AI-augmented**.

Ultimately, the question for investors is no longer **whether** a company uses AI. The more important question is **whether AI makes the company fundamentally better**—better for customers, better for investors, better governed, more resilient, and ultimately, better equipped to create lasting economic, social and environmental value. That is the standard against which the next generation of AI-native enterprises should be judged.

Annex 1 — Glossary of Key AI Investment Terms

AI-Adjacent

A company that references or experiments with AI but where artificial intelligence plays little or no meaningful role in its products, operations or competitive advantage. AI is primarily used for branding, marketing or limited experimentation.

AI-Enabled

A company that uses AI to enhance existing products, services or internal processes without fundamentally changing its core business model. AI improves efficiency, automation or user experience but is not central to value creation.

AI-Integrated

A company in which AI is embedded across multiple core business functions and operational workflows. AI materially improves decision-making and performance but remains one important capability rather than the foundation of the enterprise.

AI-Native

A company whose products, operations, business model and competitive advantage are fundamentally built around AI. The business could not function meaningfully without AI, and its intelligence, data and performance continuously improve through learning and user interactions.

Foundation Model

A large, general-purpose AI model trained on vast amounts of data that serves as the basis for multiple downstream applications through prompting, fine-tuning or adaptation. Examples include large language models (LLMs), multimodal models and foundation vision models.

Proprietary Model

An AI model developed, owned or substantially customised by an organisation using proprietary algorithms, architectures or datasets to create capabilities that are not readily available through public or commercial foundation models.

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)

An AI architecture that combines large language models with external knowledge sources by retrieving relevant information before generating responses. RAG enables AI systems to produce more accurate, current and context-specific outputs while reducing hallucinations.

AI Agent

An autonomous or semi-autonomous software system that can perceive information, reason, make decisions and perform tasks on behalf of users or organisations. AI agents may collaborate with other agents and humans to execute complex workflows.

Workflow Automation

The use of AI and digital technologies to automate repetitive tasks, coordinate business processes and support operational decision-making across end-to-end organisational workflows while maintaining appropriate human oversight.

Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)

A governance approach in which humans supervise, validate, override or approve AI-generated outputs, particularly for high-impact or high-risk decisions. Human-in-the-loop ensures accountability, improves decision quality and supports regulatory compliance.

Model Risk

The risk that an AI model produces inaccurate, biased, unreliable or unintended outcomes due to flawed data, model design, changing operating conditions, misuse or insufficient oversight. Effective model risk management includes validation, monitoring, testing, explainability and human governance throughout the model lifecycle.

Annex 2 — 4IP Group AI-Native Investment Scorecard

The **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Scorecard** provides a structured methodology for assessing the AI maturity, investment readiness and long-term competitiveness of AI-enabled and AI-native enterprises. Each of the **12 assessment dimensions** is scored on a **0–5 scale**, where:

Score	Interpretation
0	No evidence
1	AI primarily promotional ("AI washing")
2	Limited AI-assisted functionality
3	Meaningful AI integration but weak defensibility
4	AI structurally embedded with credible competitive advantages
5	Fully AI-native, commercially validated, well governed and highly defensible

Maximum score: 60 points (or 100% after normalisation).

4IP Group AI-Native Investment Scorecard

Dimension	Score (0–5)	Key Assessment Criteria	Evidence Required	Comments
1. Problem–Solution Fit		Importance of customer problem; necessity of AI; superiority over non-AI alternatives	Customer interviews; product demonstrations; case studies	
2. AI Centrality		AI embedded in product, operations, customer value and scalability	Product architecture; workflow diagrams	
3. Proprietary Data Advantage		Ownership, legality, exclusivity, quality and continuous data generation	Data inventory; governance policy; licences	
4. Model & Technical Architecture		Architecture robustness; proprietary vs third-party models; reliability; inference costs	Technical documentation; architecture diagrams	
5. Workflow Integration		AI embedded in operational workflows and decision-making	CRM/ERP integration; process maps; demonstrations	
6. Learning & Compounding Effects		Continuous model improvement; feedback loops; increasing switching costs	Product analytics; retraining processes; usage metrics	
7. Commercial Model & Unit Economics		Pricing; margins; CAC/LTV; compute costs; scalability	Financial model; KPIs; customer contracts	
8. Defensibility & Competitive Replicability		Proprietary intelligence; workflow ownership; barriers to entry	Competitive analysis; IP portfolio; customer dependence	

Dimension	Score (0–5)	Key Assessment Criteria	Evidence Required	Comments
9. Human Capital & Organisational Design		AI expertise; domain knowledge; governance; organisational resilience	CVs; organisation chart; governance documents	
10. Responsible AI & Governance		Human oversight; explainability; cybersecurity; model risk management	AI governance policy; risk register; compliance documentation	
11. Impact & SDG Integrity		Intentionality; additionality; measurable outcomes; responsible AI	Theory of Change; ESG reports; SDG mapping	
12. Transaction & Investment Readiness		Data room; financial model; legal readiness; valuation; fundraising preparedness	Investment deck; cap table; data room; legal documentation	

Overall Assessmen

Item	Score
Total Score (Maximum = 60)	
Normalised Score (%)	
AI Maturity Classification	
Investment Recommendation	

AI Maturity Classification

Score (%)	Classification	Interpretation
80–100%	**AI-Native**	AI is foundational to value creation, commercially validated and supported by strong governance. Potentially investment-ready.
65–79%	**AI-Integrated**	AI is embedded across core workflows but further validation is required regarding defensibility, governance or scalability.
45–64%	**AI-Enabled**	AI enhances products or operations but the investment case relies primarily on conventional business strengths.
Below 45%	**AI-Adjacent**	AI remains largely promotional, experimental or insufficiently substantiated.

Critical Investment Gatekeepers

Regardless of the AI maturity score, an investment **should not proceed** if significant deficiencies exist in any of the following areas:

☐ Management integrity
☐ Legal and regulatory compliance
☐ Financial viability
☐ Corporate governance
☐ Market demand and commercial validation
☐ ESG and impact integrity (where applicable)

☐ Responsible AI governance
☐ Cybersecurity and data protection

Investment Committee Recommendation

Recommendation	☐
Proceed to next stage of due diligence	
Request additional information	
Improve AI readiness before fundraising	
Improve commercial validation	
Improve governance and responsible AI controls	
Not currently investment ready	

Summary Assessment

Key strengths:

- _____
- _____
- _____

Key risks:

- _____
- _____
- _____

Priority actions before investment:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Note: The AI-Native Investment Scorecard is intended to complement—not replace—4IP Group's comprehensive Due Diligence Framework. A high AI maturity score should never compensate for weaknesses in commercial viability, financial performance, management quality, legal compliance, governance or measurable impact. AI readiness is one important component of overall investment quality and should always be interpreted alongside the full investment due diligence process.

Annex 3 — Investor Due Diligence Questions for AI-Native and AI-Enabled Companies

The following questions are designed to complement the **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework** and assist investors in evaluating AI ventures across commercial, technical, organisational, governance and impact dimensions. They are intended to guide management interviews and supplement conventional financial, legal and commercial due diligence.

A. Problem & Customer Value Proposition

Problem Validation

1. What customer problem does your company solve?
2. How significant is this problem economically?
3. Who experiences this problem most acutely?
4. Why is AI necessary to solve it?
5. Could the problem be solved almost as effectively without AI?
6. How do customers currently solve this problem?
7. What measurable value does your solution create?

B. Product & AI Strategy

AI Centrality

8. Is AI central to your product or merely an enhancement?
9. Which parts of the product depend on AI?
10. Could your business continue operating if AI were removed?
11. Which business processes are AI-driven?
12. How does AI improve customer outcomes?
13. What differentiates your AI capabilities from competitors?

C. Data Strategy

Proprietary Intelligence

14. What data are used to train or improve your models?
15. Who owns these data?

16. Are all data lawfully acquired?
17. Are any data exclusive to your company?
18. How are data quality and accuracy maintained?
19. How frequently are data refreshed?
20. Does customer usage continuously generate new data?
21. What data governance policies are in place?

D. AI Models & Technical Architecture

Technology

22. Which AI models do you currently use?
23. Which models are proprietary?
24. Which models rely on third-party providers?
25. Why were these models selected?
26. How are models evaluated?
27. How are hallucinations monitored?
28. How are model updates managed?
29. Can your solution migrate to another model provider?

E. Infrastructure & Platform Risk

Dependencies

30. Which cloud provider hosts your solution?
31. Which external APIs are critical?
32. What would happen if pricing doubled?
33. What would happen if your preferred model became unavailable?
34. Can infrastructure be substituted easily?
35. How do you manage cybersecurity risks?

F. Workflow Integration

Customer Processes

36. Where does AI fit within the customer's workflow?

37. Which business decisions does AI influence?
38. Can users act directly on AI recommendations?
39. How deeply is your product integrated into customer operations?
40. What switching costs exist for customers?

G. Commercial Model

Business Economics

41. What is your pricing model?
42. Why are customers willing to pay?
43. What are your gross margins?
44. What proportion of revenue is recurring?
45. What are your customer acquisition costs?
46. What are your customer retention rates?
47. How significant are compute costs?
48. What is your path to profitability?

H. Competitive Advantage

Defensibility

49. What prevents competitors from replicating your solution?
50. What constitutes your competitive moat?
51. Is your advantage based on data, workflows or technology?
52. Could foundation model providers disintermediate your business?
53. Which intellectual property do you own?

I. Organisation & Human Capital

Team

54. Does the founding team combine AI and domain expertise?
55. Which key capabilities remain difficult to recruit?
56. How is institutional knowledge shared?
57. Which decisions remain entirely human?

58. How are AI responsibilities governed internally?

J. Responsible AI & Governance

Governance

59. How are high-risk AI outputs reviewed?
60. When must AI escalate to humans?
61. How do users challenge AI decisions?
62. How do you manage algorithmic bias?
63. How is explainability achieved?
64. How do you comply with privacy regulations?
65. Who ultimately remains accountable for AI-generated decisions?

K. Impact & ESG

Responsible Innovation

66. How does AI improve customer welfare?
67. What measurable social or environmental outcomes are generated?
68. Have you identified any negative externalities?
69. How do you mitigate unintended consequences?
70. Which Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) does your solution support?

L. Investment Readiness

Capital Raising

71. Is your virtual data room complete?
72. Is your financial model independently validated?
73. Is intellectual property ownership fully documented?
74. What milestones will this investment finance?
75. Why should investors believe your competitive advantage will still exist five years from now?

Suggested Interview Closing Questions

The following open-ended questions often generate the most insightful responses:

- If your current AI model provider offered your competitors identical capabilities tomorrow at one-tenth of today's cost, what would remain uniquely yours?
- Which part of your business becomes stronger every time a customer uses your product?
- What assumptions in your business model concern you the most?
- What evidence would convince an investor that your AI creates genuine long-term competitive advantage?
- If you had to remove one element of your current technology stack, what would create the greatest disruption?
- How do you ensure AI augments rather than replaces human judgement?
- Looking ahead five years, what do you expect to be your company's strongest competitive moat?

These **75 due diligence questions** are designed to integrate seamlessly with the **4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework**, **AI-Native Investment Scorecard**, and **Due Diligence Toolkit**, providing investors with a structured, practical framework for evaluating both AI-enabled and AI-native enterprises through the lens of technology, commercial viability, governance, responsible AI, and long-term investment potential.

Annex 4 — Incubator Admission and Graduation Checklist

Admission criteria, milestones and graduation tests.

Annex 5 — Responsible AI Red Flags

The following **Responsible AI Red Flags** are intended to help investors, incubators and due diligence professionals identify technical, commercial, governance and ethical weaknesses that may materially increase investment risk. The presence of one or more red flags does not necessarily preclude investment, but should trigger enhanced due diligence and management discussion.

Red Flag	Why It Matters	Suggested Follow-up
1. Undisclosed dependence on third-party foundation models	Business continuity and competitive advantage depend on external providers.	Assess portability, vendor lock-in and contingency plans.
2. No lawful basis for training or inference data	Creates legal, regulatory and reputational risks.	Review data licences, consent mechanisms and governance policies.
3. Unsupported claims of "proprietary AI"	Marketing claims exceed actual technical differentiation.	Request evidence of proprietary models, datasets, IP or algorithms.
4. No analysis of compute or inference costs	Business economics may deteriorate rapidly as usage grows.	Review infrastructure costs and sensitivity analyses.
5. Absence of human oversight for high-risk decisions	Increases operational, ethical and regulatory risks.	Evaluate human-in-the-loop controls and escalation procedures.
6. Unsupported accuracy or performance claims	Product performance may not be reproducible in real-world settings.	Request independent benchmarks, validation studies and customer evidence.
7. Weak cybersecurity controls	AI systems often process sensitive commercial and personal data.	Review cybersecurity framework, penetration testing and incident response plans.

Red Flag	Why It Matters	Suggested Follow-up
8. No documented customer outcomes	AI capabilities are not linked to measurable business value.	Request customer references, KPIs and case studies.
9. No explainability for critical outputs	Users cannot understand or challenge important AI decisions.	Assess explainability tools and governance documentation.
10. No model-risk management framework	Models may degrade or behave unpredictably over time.	Review monitoring, validation and retraining procedures.
11. Poor data governance	Data quality issues undermine model reliability and legal compliance.	Assess data quality controls, lineage and stewardship processes.
12. Excessive dependence on a single founder or AI engineer	Creates significant key-person risk.	Evaluate organisational resilience and knowledge transfer mechanisms.
13. No evidence of continuous learning or feedback loops	AI performance is unlikely to improve or create defensible advantages.	Review mechanisms for data collection and model improvement.
14. AI not integrated into operational workflows	AI remains a demonstration feature rather than a business capability.	Examine customer workflows and product usage patterns.
15. Unrealistic scalability assumptions	Growth projections ignore infrastructure or operational constraints.	Stress-test technical architecture and scaling economics.
16. Lack of regulatory awareness	Company may face future compliance challenges.	Assess readiness for AI, privacy and sector-specific regulations.
17. Unclear ownership of intellectual property	Creates uncertainty regarding competitive advantage and valuation.	Review IP assignments, licences and ownership agreements.

Red Flag	Why It Matters	Suggested Follow-up
18. No documented Responsible AI policy	Governance has not kept pace with technology deployment.	Request Responsible AI framework and governance documentation.
19. AI solution reinforces bias or exclusion	May create legal, reputational and impact risks.	Assess bias testing, fairness controls and stakeholder inclusion.
20. AI replaces human judgement without accountability	High-risk decisions lack clear responsibility and oversight.	Review governance, escalation protocols and accountability framework.

Overall Assessment

During due diligence, investors should consider not only the **number** of red flags identified but also their **materiality**, **interdependencies** and **management's ability to mitigate them**. Particular attention should be given to risks affecting legal compliance, customer trust, cybersecurity, AI governance and commercial sustainability.

As a general guideline:

- **0–3 red flags:** Low Responsible AI risk; proceed with standard due diligence.
- **4–7 red flags:** Moderate risk; require mitigation plans before investment.
- **8–12 red flags:** High risk; enhanced due diligence and governance improvements required.
- **More than 12 red flags:** Very high risk; investment should normally be deferred until material weaknesses have been addressed.

For **4IP Group**, Responsible AI is not merely a compliance requirement but a core investment-quality criterion. Companies that combine strong AI capabilities with robust governance, transparency, human oversight and measurable customer outcomes are significantly more likely to create sustainable long-term value for investors and society.

Annex 6 — A Practical Application of the 4IP Group AI-Native Investment Assessment Framework

The transformation currently underway at **4IP Group** provides an illustrative example of how a specialist impact investment advisory firm can evolve from an **AI-enabled organisation** into an **AI-native, human-centred impact finance platform**.

Historically, 4IP Group's competitive advantage rested on the expertise, networks and judgement of its senior professionals. Investment opportunities were managed through largely manual workflows involving presentations, financial models, due diligence reports, data rooms, investor meetings and email exchanges. AI tools were used selectively to improve productivity but remained largely separate from the firm's core operating model.

The adoption of the **CoOwn platform** marks a fundamental shift. Rather than introducing another standalone AI application, 4IP Group is progressively implementing what can be described as an **AI-native organisational operating system**, where knowledge, workflows, documents, AI agents and human experts operate within a secure, integrated intelligence environment. The strategic objective is to move from **document-driven advisory services** to **AI-assisted intelligence and decision support**, while preserving human accountability for all investment decisions.

From Documents to AI Brains

Perhaps the most significant conceptual change is the replacement of traditional document-centric fundraising with **company-specific AI Brains**.

Instead of sending investors multiple documents—including pitch decks, financial models, ESG reports, legal documentation and due diligence reports—each portfolio company is progressively represented by a dedicated AI Brain trained exclusively on approved corporate knowledge. These AI Brains are designed to answer investor questions, explain investment opportunities and support due diligence while operating within predefined guardrails established by the company and 4IP Group.

This represents a shift from:

Company → Documents → Investor

to

Company → AI Brain → Interactive Investor Dialogue

AI-Native Operating Model

Under the new operating model, every investment opportunity follows a common digital workflow:

1. Create a secure business space within the CoOwn platform.
2. Upload and organise approved corporate knowledge.
3. Configure an investor-facing AI Brain with a defined personality, responsibilities, communication style and governance rules.
4. Publish the AI Brain through secure investor portals or company websites.
5. Continuously improve the AI Brain through approved knowledge updates and monitored investor interactions.

Rather than replacing human advisers, the AI Brain serves as an intelligent first point of engagement that accelerates information exchange while ensuring consistency, transparency and responsiveness.

AI Across the Investment Value Chain

The CoOwn-enabled operating model supports AI throughout the investment lifecycle rather than at isolated stages.

Deal Origination

Potential investee companies establish dedicated Business Spaces where investment materials are securely organised and indexed.

Knowledge Management

Corporate knowledge—including pitch decks, financial models, ESG reports, legal documentation, impact reports, websites, videos and customer evidence—is transformed into a structured institutional knowledge base accessible through AI Brains.

Due Diligence

Instead of manually reviewing hundreds of documents, AI assists in:

- identifying missing information;
- highlighting inconsistencies;
- answering standard investor questions;
- organising data rooms;
- monitoring document completeness.

Human specialists remain responsible for validating all commercial, legal, financial, technical and impact conclusions.

Capital Raising

Every portfolio company receives an investor-facing AI Brain capable of explaining:

- the business model;
- investment thesis;
- market opportunity;
- financial projections;
- ESG strategy;
- impact objectives;
- principal risks.

This significantly reduces repetitive meetings and document requests while improving investor responsiveness.

Investor Matchmaking

The long-term vision integrates AI Brains with:

- investor CRM systems;
- LP databases;
- GP databases;
- sector intelligence;
- investment preferences.

AI agents assist in identifying suitable investor–company matches while human advisers retain responsibility for relationship management and fundraising negotiations.

Brain Watch: Continuous Investment Intelligence

A distinctive feature of the CoOwn platform is **Brain Watch**, an AI capability that continuously monitors organisational activity rather than waiting for users to initiate analysis.

For 4IP Group, Brain Watch is expected to monitor:

- investor engagement;
- fundraising progress;
- missing due diligence documentation;

- project updates;
- workflow bottlenecks;
- contextual changes affecting transactions.

For example, Brain Watch may automatically notify advisers when:

- an investor has reviewed an opportunity without following up;
- new documentation has been uploaded;
- additional information is required before investment readiness;
- a transaction advances to the next stage of the fundraising process.

This transforms AI from a passive information retrieval tool into an active organisational intelligence capability.

Human-Centred Governance

Although AI becomes deeply embedded throughout operations, the transformation explicitly preserves human accountability.

Within the 4IP Group operating model:

- AI organises and analyses information.
- AI accelerates investor engagement.
- AI supports due diligence.
- AI recommends actions.
- AI monitors workflows.

However:

- investment decisions remain human;
- legal opinions remain human;
- fiduciary responsibility remains human;
- client relationships remain human;
- investment committee approvals remain human.

This reflects 4IP Group's broader philosophy that AI should augment professional judgement rather than replace it.

Mapping Against the AI-Native Investment Framework

Applying the proposed twelve-dimensional framework yields the following illustrative assessment.

Assessment Dimension	Illustrative Rating
Problem–Solution Fit	High
AI Centrality	High
Proprietary Knowledge Base	High
Technical Architecture	High
Workflow Integration	Very High
Learning & Continuous Improvement	High
Commercial Model	Developing
Defensibility	Moderate to High
Human Capital	High
Responsible AI Governance	High
ESG & Impact Integration	Very High
Transaction Readiness	High

Overall, 4IP Group demonstrates many characteristics of an organisation progressing from **AI-enabled** toward **AI-native**, with AI increasingly embedded in its organisational architecture rather than functioning as an isolated productivity tool.

Expected Benefits

The transformation is expected to deliver measurable improvements across several dimensions:

- faster investment screening;
- reduced due diligence costs;
- improved investor responsiveness;
- enhanced knowledge management;
- stronger institutional memory;

- greater fundraising scalability;
- more consistent investment documentation;
- higher-quality investor matching;
- continuous monitoring of fundraising pipelines;
- improved transparency and governance.

Importantly, these benefits arise not from replacing professionals but from enabling them to focus on higher-value activities such as investment judgement, relationship management and strategic advisory.

Looking Ahead

4IP Group's H2 2026 implementation roadmap envisages the progressive deployment of AI Brains across its portfolio, including **Invisible Heart Ventures II**, **Lagosta**, **Aquasun**, **Legendary Foods**, **PeaceGold**, **Gempacs**, **Timely Learning** and other client companies. The objective is to build a portfolio-wide network of secure, investor-facing AI representatives supported by integrated CRM, investor intelligence and multi-agent workflows.

This case illustrates that becoming **AI-native** is not simply about adopting more advanced AI models. It requires redesigning organisational processes, knowledge management, client engagement, governance and decision-making around AI while preserving human oversight and accountability. In this respect, 4IP Group's collaboration with CoOwn represents a practical example of how AI can serve as the digital intelligence infrastructure of an impact investment advisory firm, supporting faster capital mobilisation, stronger due diligence and more effective investor engagement without compromising responsible governance.