Beyond Traditional Private Equity The New Framework for Late-Stage US Tech

The analytical framework that actually matters, and the one that doesn't

by Pablo Venturino, Co-Founder, AVC Turing

May 2026

AVC TURING

This paper presents a practitioner's perspective for discussion. It does not constitute legal, financial, or investment advice. The views expressed are those of the author and do not represent any affiliated organizations.

The families and institutions allocating serious capital to late-stage US technology today are not novices. They have legal counsel, tax advisors, and investment committees. They understand illiquidity. What they frequently lack is not process, it is the right analytical lens for an asset class that has fundamentally changed.

The standard private equity toolkit (DPI, TVPI, vintage year benchmarks, historical return series) was built for a different market. Applying it to Databricks, Anthropic, or Cursor is like navigating a new city with a map from twenty years ago. The streets have moved.

Three things actually matter: **industry foresight, execution speed, and analytical discipline**. The intersection of the three is where superior returns are generated.

I. Revenue Quality. But Industry Context Determines What Quality Means

Every serious investor talks about revenue quality. Fewer apply it correctly, because the definition of quality is not universal. It is sector-specific.

For a classic SaaS business (contractual, recurring, with low marginal delivery cost) the analytical framework is well established. The relevant metrics are ARR growth, Net Revenue Retention, gross margin, and the relationship between growth rate and free cash flow generation. The Rule of 40 (growth rate plus profit margin) remains a useful first filter. A SaaS business growing at 60% with a 20% free cash flow margin is a fundamentally different asset than one growing at 60% while burning 40% of revenue. The quality of the growth matters as much as the growth itself.

But apply that same framework to a robotics company and you will draw the wrong conclusions. A robotics business typically generates a blend of hardware revenue (lower margin, capital intensive, often lumpy) and software or service revenue that is recurring and high margin. The analytical question is not what the blended gross margin is. It is what the revenue mix looks like, how it is trending over time, and whether the business is on a trajectory toward a software-dominant model or permanently anchored to hardware economics. A robotics company at 45% blended gross margin with 70% of new bookings in software is a categorically different investment than one at the same blended margin with hardware growing faster than software. One is becoming a SaaS business. The other is not.

The same logic applies across the universe. An AI infrastructure company is analyzed on compute utilization, inference cost curves, and customer concentration, not on the SaaS metrics designed for a Salesforce or a Workday. A defense tech company is analyzed on funded backlog, program gross margins, and contract structure, because the revenue is real but the comparables are entirely different.

Industry foresight (the ability to identify which framework applies before the market has reached consensus on it) is the first genuine edge in this asset class. Knowing that a robotics company should be valued on its software revenue trajectory, not its blended margin, before that distinction is reflected in the market price is not a minor analytical refinement. It is the difference between a cheap entry and an expensive one.

II. Execution Speed — The Window Closes Faster Than You Think

In traditional private equity, speed is a competitive advantage. In late-stage US technology private markets, speed is closer to a prerequisite.

The secondary market for a specific company does not stay open indefinitely. It opens and closes in response to market events, a funding round announcement, a revenue leak, a competitor’s valuation reset, a macro shift in sentiment toward a sector. When Cursor doubled its valuation in a single day, the secondary price for anyone who had been analyzing that position but had not yet committed moved immediately and permanently. The analytical work done in the prior weeks retained its value. The entry price it could have secured did not.

This compression is structural, not cyclical. AI-native companies are compounding value at a velocity that has no historical precedent in private markets. The gap between “we are interested” and “we have committed” is no longer measured in quarters. In the most consequential situations, it is measured in days. A family office that requires six weeks of internal approval process to deploy capital into a secondary position is structurally disadvantaged relative to one that has pre-approved frameworks, pre-negotiated SPV structures, and decision-makers who can move when the window is open.

The same logic applies to deal structuring. The terms available on a Monday after a major company announcement are not the terms available on the following Friday. Counterparties who understand that they hold a scarce asset in a hot market price accordingly. The ability to structure, negotiate, and close quickly is not just operationally useful, it is a direct determinant of the economics of the transaction.

For non-US family offices in particular, this creates a specific challenge. Cross-border capital deployment involves compliance layers, currency considerations, and internal governance processes that were designed for a different pace of market. Families that have restructured their decision-making process to match the velocity of this market will systematically access better entry points than those that have not. That restructuring is itself a strategic investment in the ability to participate in this asset class at full potential.

III. The Exit Path. You Are a Passenger, Not the Driver

For an asset class that is explicitly illiquid, the exit mechanics deserve clear-eyed analysis, not because you can control them, but precisely because you cannot.

Even as a significant minority investor in a late-stage company, the decisions about when to pursue a liquidity event, what form it takes (traditional IPO, direct listing, M&A, or continued private growth) and on what terms are made by the board and the lead shareholders. A family office entering at Series E or F, even with meaningful capital, has virtually no say in those decisions. The cap table above you was built years before you arrived.

What you can and should analyze is the alignment of incentives among the existing shareholders. A cap table where early investors are sitting at 50–100x their entry and late-round investors are at or below par creates very different pressures around exit timing. Early holders may have no urgency. Late holders may be desperate for any liquidity event at any price.

Understanding where the center of gravity of that cap table sits (and whether it aligns with your own time horizon) is more analytically useful than speculating about exit structure.

What you cannot know in advance: the specific terms that will apply to your share class or SPV interest, whether the company will choose a path that includes restrictions on selling, or how long post-event it will take before your position is freely tradeable. These are determined by decisions made without your input, often under time pressure, and frequently in response to market conditions that did not exist when you invested.

The honest framework for exit analysis in this asset class is not “what is my exit path.” It is: “do I have sufficient conviction in the quality of this business to hold it through an exit process I do not control, on a timeline I cannot predict, under terms that have not yet been negotiated?” If the answer is yes, the investment deserves further analysis. If the answer depends on a specific exit scenario materializing, that is a risk the model needs to reflect explicitly.

IV. Why Legacy Return Metrics Don’t Apply, And What to Use Instead

DPI, TVPI, vintage year benchmarks, and historical PE return series were built for a market where fund cycles were ten years, companies took seven to ten years to reach maturity, and the analytical task was to identify operational improvement opportunities in established businesses.

None of those assumptions hold in late-stage US tech today.

The market regime shifted fundamentally post-2022 with the emergence of large language models and the acceleration of AI infrastructure investment. AI-native companies are reaching billion-dollar valuations in three to five years, compressing the window that traditional fund cycle analysis was designed to measure. The majority of the most compelling companies in the current private tech universe are under ten years old, younger than most PE fund life cycles. The “mature company” assumption embedded in classic benchmarks simply does not apply.

More fundamentally, historical return series for this asset class are non-stationary. The market that produced the return data does not resemble the market that exists today. SpaceX went from a $400 billion valuation to $1.25 trillion in approximately sixty days. Cursor doubled from $30 billion to $60 billion in a single day. These are not statistical outliers to be normalized away. They are signals of a value creation velocity that legacy metrics were not designed to capture. Comparing against them produces not just imprecise conclusions, it produces structurally misleading ones.

The correct unit of analysis for this market is the intersection of three variables:

- **Industry foresight:** the ability to identify which sectors and business models will dominate before the market reaches consensus.
- **Execution speed:** the capacity to deploy capital and structure transactions within the window that the market actually offers.
- **Analytical discipline:** the rigor to distinguish between companies building durable competitive moats and those riding a wave that will eventually recede.

A family office that has developed genuine capability across all three dimensions does not need a DPI comparison that has no statistical validity in this market. It has something more valuable: a repeatable process for identifying and accessing the right assets at the right moment.

The Bottom Line

Late-stage US technology is not a variant of traditional private equity. It is a distinct asset class with its own analytical logic, its own exit mechanics, and its own return drivers. The families that will compound capital most effectively here are not the ones with the most sophisticated legal structure or the most conservative entry price. They are the ones who correctly identified what kind of asset they were buying, and built the internal capabilities to analyze it, access it, and move on it when the window is open.

The map has changed. The investors who recognize that earliest will navigate it best.