

DEAD MONEY



THE HIDDEN COST OF INDECISION
FOR HIGH-INCOME INVESTORS AND
THE SIMPLE FRAMEWORK TO FIX IT

JOSHUA HOO

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1	6
<i>Dead Money</i>	6
The silent wealth killer hiding in your portfolio	6
The Real Cost of Doing Nothing	8
The Power of One Percent	9
Why Smart People Stay Stuck	11
The System That Keeps You in Place.....	13
Indecision Is a Decision	14
The Dead Money Audit.....	15
CHAPTER 2	19
<i>The Smartest People in the Room</i>	19
Why high earners are the most underserved investors in North America	19
The Long Way Back to Simple	20
Complexity Is Not the Same as Sophistication.....	24
The Four Traps	25
The Pattern Behind the Traps.....	28
The Stuck Investor Self-Assessment	29
Reading Your Results	30
CHAPTER 3	33
The Return-Risk-Liquidity Triangle	33

The Triangle	34
The Strategic Advantage of Illiquidity.....	36
Why Your Past Investments Disappointed You.....	39
The Structural Gap	41
How To Implement It.....	45
CHAPTER 4	49
<i>The DEALS Framework</i>.....	49
A five-step system to evaluate any private investment with confidence	49
Investing Is a Long Game.....	51
You Do Not Need to Become an Expert	52
The DEALS Scorecard.....	60
CHAPTER 5	68
<i>D — Decode the Math</i>	68
How does this investment actually make money?.....	68
Every Investment Has a Profit Engine.....	69
You Do Not Need to Run the Model	71
The Revenue Assumption Is Where Most Deals Go Wrong.....	73
A Note on Presales in Development.....	74
The Three-Sentence Test.....	76
Profit Engines Across Asset Classes.....	78
When the Sponsor Cannot Explain It Simply	80
The Decode Checklist	81

DEAD MONEY

How to Use These Questions.....	84
A Note on Using AI Tools.....	86
CHAPTER 6	89
E — Evaluate the Deal	89
What the E Filter Is Really About.....	90
How the Pie Gets Split.....	91
The Return-Risk Ratio.....	95
Staying Focused on the Right Question.....	97
The Evaluate Checklist.....	97
How to Score the E Filter	99
CHAPTER 7	103
A — Assess the Operator.....	103
The person behind the deal matters more than the deal itself	103
The Operator Is the Investment	105
What to Look For: The Universal Markers	106
The Operator-Deal Relationship	112
The Operator Assessment Checklist	113
CHAPTER 8	123
L — Locate the Risks	123
What can go wrong, and who bears the consequences?.....	123
Two Dimensions of Risk	125
The Risk Taxonomy: What Can Go Wrong.....	126

The Risk Allocation: Who Carries Each Risk	132
The Risk You Cannot See Is the One That Hurts You	135
The Risk Mapping Exercise	136
The Risk Map Template	141
CHAPTER 9	145
<i>S — Spread Your Capital</i>	<i>145</i>
“Diversifying well is the most important thing you need to do in order to invest well.”	145
Why Diversification Works	146
What Diversification Actually Means in Practice	147
The Emotional Discipline of Portfolio Thinking	151
The Portfolio Construction Template	154
Scoring the S Filter	159
CHAPTER 10.....	163
<i>From Dead Money to Compounding capital.....</i>	<i>163</i>
Your next move and the identity shift that makes it stick.....	163
The Real Obstacle Was Never Information.....	166
The Identity Shift.....	168
You Do Not Have to Make Investment Decisions All the Time	169
Your 30-Day Action Plan	171
Beyond the First 30 Days	174
What Comes Next.....	176

CHAPTER 1

Dead Money

The silent wealth killer hiding in your portfolio

You know the feeling. You open your investment statement, scan the numbers, and nothing has really moved. The balance is a little higher than last year. Inflation ate most of the difference. You close the screen, go back to work, and tell yourself you will deal with it later.

Later never comes. Another year passes. The statement looks about the same.

Meanwhile, a colleague mentions over lunch that he just closed on a private deal earning double digits. You nod, ask a couple of polite questions, and change the subject. But the conversation stays with you for the rest of the week. Not because you are jealous. Because you know, somewhere in the back of your mind, that your money should be doing more than what it is doing. And you have no idea where to start.

That feeling has a name. It is called dead money. And I need to show you what it is actually costing you, because the numbers are going to be uncomfortable.

Take \$100,000. Park it somewhere earning 4%, which is generous for a CD, GIC, or high-yield savings account. Leave it alone for 30 years.

At the end of those 30 years, you have about \$324,000. Not bad, right? Your money tripled. Most people would look at that and feel fine about it.

Now take the same \$100,000 and put it somewhere earning 12% per year. Same time horizon. Same starting capital. Thirty years later, you have roughly \$3 million.

Read that again. The difference between 4% and 12% over 30 years is not a small gap. It is not even a large gap. It is a \$2.7 million gap. On one hundred thousand dollars.

And here is what makes this worse. That gap does not grow in a straight line. It accelerates. At 10 years, the difference is modest. You are looking at maybe \$160,000 versus \$310,000. Noticeable, but not life-changing. At 20 years, the gap widens to around \$220,000 versus \$960,000. Now it is getting serious. But at 30 years, the compounding effect has done its real work, and that original \$100,000 has either become a comfortable sum or a genuinely transformative one.

The point is not that 12% is easy to find. It is not. But even a generous 4% assumption is not safe. Not when inflation runs at 2 to 3% annually and quietly eats half your purchasing power over two decades. And if your actual rate is closer to 1 or 2%, the picture is far worse. The real cost of sitting in a low-yield vehicle is measured in millions of dollars you will never see.

This is what dead money looks like. Not zero returns. Not losses. Just the slow, invisible erosion of wealth that happens when capital sits in the wrong place for too long. And the worst part is that it does not feel like a problem. It feels like safety.

DEAD MONEY

The Real Cost of Doing Nothing

Most investors think about risk in one direction. They worry about losing money. They stress over bad deals, market crashes, poor timing. Those fears are legitimate. Nobody wants to hand their capital to the wrong person or buy at the top of a cycle.

But there is a second kind of risk that almost nobody talks about, and it is the one doing the most damage to high-income portfolios across North America right now.

It is the risk of inaction.

Every month your capital sits in a savings account, a CD, a GIC, or a bond fund earning well below its potential, you are not preserving wealth. You are losing it. Not in a dramatic, headline-grabbing way. In a quiet, mathematical way that is completely within your control to fix.

And the math is not kind.

Let me extend the example. Instead of one percentage point, let us look at what happens when you compare a conservative 5% annual return against a low-teens return, say 13%, over different time periods.

On \$500,000 of investable capital:

At 10 years: 5% gives you roughly \$814,000. At 13%, you are looking at approximately \$1.7 million. The gap is nearly \$900,000.

At 20 years: 5% grows to about \$1.3 million. At 13%, it becomes roughly \$5.6 million. The gap is over \$4 million.

At 30 years: 5% gives you \$2.2 million. At 13%, you are north of \$19 million. The gap is \$17 million.

These are basic compound interest calculations that any spreadsheet can verify in thirty seconds. The variable that matters most is not how much you start with. It is the rate at which your capital compounds.

Here is why that matters so much. Moving a portfolio's average annual return up by even one or two percentage points is one of the highest-impact financial decisions you will ever make. One point. That is it. But compounded over decades, it separates a comfortable retirement from a generational legacy.

The Power of One Percent

Let me make this concrete, because this concept is worth spending a minute on. It will change the way you evaluate every investment decision for the rest of your life.

Take \$100,000. Compare what happens at 12% versus 13% per year. One single percentage point of difference. That is all.

\$100,000 Starting Capital: The 1% Difference

Time Horizon	At 12%	At 13%	The Gap
30 Years	\$2,996,000	\$3,912,000	\$916,000
40 Years	\$9,305,000	\$13,268,000	\$3,963,000
50 Years	\$28,900,000	\$45,009,000	\$16,109,000

DEAD MONEY

At 30 years, one percentage point has created a gap of roughly \$900,000. That is almost nine times the original investment, generated by nothing more than a single point of return difference. Most people would look at that and say it is meaningful but not shocking.

Then look at 40 years. The gap has jumped to nearly \$4 million. On a \$100,000 starting amount. That is when compounding starts to show what it really does. It does not add. It multiplies. And the longer it runs, the wider the gap gets.

And at 50 years, the gap between 12% and 13% is over \$16 million. Sixteen million dollars. From one percentage point. On one hundred thousand dollars.

Now think about what this means in practice. Every deal decision you make, every fee you negotiate, every allocation choice that nudges your average return up or down by even a fraction of a percent is either compounding in your favor or compounding against you. Over a 30 or 40-year investing life, those small edges stack into generational differences.

This is why serious investors obsess over details that seem small in the moment. A management fee that is 0.5% higher than it needs to be. A deal structure that gives the operator an extra point of carry. A portfolio that sits in 5% vehicles when 8 or 10% alternatives were available. None of these feel like big decisions at the time. But compounding does not care how a decision feels. It only cares about the number. And over time, it is ruthless about the difference.

The rest of this book is built around this principle. Every chapter, every framework, every checklist exists to help you find, evaluate, and capture those incremental percentage points of return without taking on reckless risk. Because the math is clear. The investors who win over 30, 40, 50 years are not the ones who found one spectacular deal. They are the ones who systematically earned a little bit more, year after year, and let compounding do the heavy work.

Why Smart People Stay Stuck

If the math is this clear, you would expect every high-income professional to be obsessing over their portfolio's average return. You would expect them to be hunting for the best risk-adjusted opportunities they can find and deploying capital with urgency.

That is not what happens.

What actually happens is this. A surgeon in Toronto earns \$400,000 a year. She has \$1.2 million across her RRSP, TFSA, and a non-registered account. Her financial advisor has her in a balanced portfolio of mutual funds and a couple of bond ETFs. The annual return has averaged somewhere around 5 to 6% after fees. She knows, on some level, that this is not great. She has heard about private real estate, private equity, and other alternative investments. A colleague mentioned a deal over lunch last year that sounded interesting. She thought about looking into it.

But she did not. She was busy. She had patients. She had two kids in school. Her advisor did not bring it up. And honestly, she was not sure how to evaluate something like that anyway. What if it was a bad deal?

DEAD MONEY

What if the sponsor turned out to be unreliable? What if she locked up her money for five years and needed it?

So she did nothing. Another year passed. Her portfolio grew by 5.2%. Inflation ran at 2.8%. Her real return was about 2.4%. Over the next 20 years, the difference between her 5.2% portfolio and a 12% alternative on \$1.2 million is roughly \$7 million. That is not a rounding error. That is her retirement. That is the difference between working until she is 68 and stepping away at 58.

A thousand miles south, an attorney in Dallas is living the same story. He earns \$350,000 a year and has about \$900,000 across his 401(k), a Roth IRA, and a taxable brokerage account. His advisor has him in a mix of index funds and some individual stocks. Returns have been decent in good years, but after the last correction he watched \$120,000 disappear in eight weeks. He held on, but the anxiety stayed. His wife asked if they should do something different. He said he would look into it. That was fourteen months ago. On \$900,000, the gap between his current trajectory and a higher-returning alternative over 20 years is north of \$5 million. That is his kids' college fund, his lake house, and a decade of financial freedom. Gone. Not because he lost it. Because he never captured it.

These are not rare cases. This is the silent majority of high-income investors across North America. Lawyers, dentists, engineers, accountants, business owners. People who are genuinely good at what they do, earning more than most, and yet quietly watching their wealth underperform because they cannot find a path they trust.

The problem is not that they are lazy or uninformed. The problem is that the investment landscape is designed to keep them exactly where they are.

The System That Keeps You in Place

Here is something that does not get discussed enough. Most financial advisors operate within a product shelf. In Canada, they can recommend what their dealer or firm has approved. In the United States, broker-dealers and registered investment advisors each have their own set of approved products and compliance requirements. The end result is the same on both sides of the border. The shelf is dominated by mutual funds, ETFs, target-date funds, segregated funds, annuities, and maybe some structured notes. These are liquid, regulated, easy to administer, and they generate predictable fee revenue for the firm.

Private investments, real estate development deals, direct alternatives? Those rarely make it onto the shelf. Not because they are bad investments. But because they are harder to administer, harder to monitor, and they do not fit neatly into the quarterly reporting and compliance frameworks that the advisory industry runs on.

The products your advisor can sell you were never designed to get you where you want to go. The products that were designed for that are not on the shelf. Whether your accounts are in Canadian dollars or US dollars, the structural problem is identical. Your capital is not underperforming because you made bad decisions. It is underperforming because the system you are in was never built to serve your actual goals.

DEAD MONEY

Indecision Is a Decision

Most people think that doing nothing with their money is a neutral act. It feels that way. You are not losing anything. You are not taking a risk. You are just waiting for the right moment, the right opportunity, the right amount of certainty before you act.

But doing nothing is not neutral. It is a decision. And it is a decision with a very real, very measurable cost.

Every month of indecision is a month of compounding that you will never get back. Not because the opportunity disappears, but because time does. Compound interest does not wait for you to feel ready. It does not pause while you read another article, attend another webinar, or sit through another meeting with your advisor where nothing changes. It just runs. And it runs for the people who deployed their capital, not the people who thought about it.

I am not saying you should rush into anything. Reckless action is worse than thoughtful inaction. But thoughtful inaction that stretches into months and years stops being thoughtful. It becomes avoidance. And avoidance, when it comes to capital allocation, is the most expensive habit a high-income earner can develop.

The cost of a bad investment is recoverable. You learn from it, you adjust, and you deploy again. The cost of years of dead money is not. Those compounding years are gone. The math does not offer a do-over.

The Dead Money Audit

Before you do anything else, you need to see the problem clearly. Not in theory. In your own numbers. With your own capital. That is what makes this real.

Here is a simple exercise that will take you less than thirty minutes. You do not need special software. A basic spreadsheet or even a calculator on your phone will work. You are going to calculate the actual cost of your current allocation by comparing it against a realistic alternative.

Step 1: Identify your idle or low-performing capital.

Go through your accounts. In Canada, that means your RRSP, TFSA, non-registered accounts, and any corporate holdings. In the US, your 401(k), IRA, Roth IRA, taxable brokerage accounts, and any entity-held capital. For each account, write down the current balance and the approximate annual return it has generated over the past three years. If you are not sure of the exact return, use the yield on whatever you are holding. CDs, GICs, savings accounts, treasury funds, bond funds. Get as close as you reasonably can.

Step 2: Calculate what that capital would produce at a higher return.

Take the total amount of low-performing capital and run two future value calculations. First, project it forward at its current rate over 10, 20, and 30 years. Then project the same amount at 10%, 12%, or 13% over the same periods. You are not committing to anything. You are just seeing the gap.

DEAD MONEY

Step 3: Calculate the difference.

Subtract the low-return projection from the higher-return projection at each interval. Write those numbers down. Look at them. That is the cost of inaction. Not the risk of investing. The cost of not investing.

Here is what this might look like. Say you have \$800,000 in low-performing capital averaging 4.5%. At that rate, in 20 years you have roughly \$1.93 million. At 11%, that same \$800,000 becomes approximately \$6.4 million. The gap is \$4.5 million. That is your dead money number. That is what sitting still is costing you.

Step 4: Ask yourself one question.

"Am I comfortable with this gap growing every year for the rest of my investing life?"

If the answer is yes, this book is not for you. Close it, keep doing what you are doing, and I genuinely wish you well.

If the answer is no, keep reading. Because the rest of this book is a system for closing that gap without reckless risk, without becoming a real estate expert, and without handing your money to someone you cannot trust.

One note on the math. The numbers in this chapter are compound interest calculations. They are not projections of what any specific investment will return. No one can guarantee 12% or 13% per year. Markets fluctuate. Some years will be higher, some lower, and some will lose money. Even if your alternative investments average 9 or 10% instead of 13%, the gap between that and a 4% savings vehicle is still enormous over time. This book will give you a framework for

evaluating those alternatives honestly, including their risks. But the first step is understanding that the biggest risk you face right now is probably not a bad deal. It is the decades of dead money sitting in your portfolio, compounding at a rate that will never get you where you need to go.

If you complete the dead money audit, something shifts. It is subtle, but it changes everything that comes after.

For the first time, the cost of inaction stops being abstract. It stops being a vague sense that you should probably do something different with your money. It becomes a specific number on a page. Your number. Your capital. Your gap.

And once you see it, you cannot unsee it.

That is the beginning of the end of analysis paralysis. Not because you suddenly know which deal to pick or which operator to trust. You do not have that yet. That comes later in this book. But because the emotional equation has changed.

Before the audit, the fear was about making a mistake. Losing money. Picking wrong. After the audit, a second fear appears on the other side of the scale. The fear of letting your capital sit dead for another year. Another five years. Another decade. Watching the gap widen while you wait for perfect certainty that will never arrive.

That tension between two fears is actually productive. It moves you from frozen to searching. From paralyzed to curious. From "I'll figure it out eventually" to "I need a way to figure this out now."

DEAD MONEY

And that is exactly what the rest of this book provides. Not a pitch. Not a list of deals. A repeatable decision system that lets you evaluate any private investment opportunity with confidence, whether it is real estate, private equity, or anything else outside the public markets.

But none of it matters until you see your own dead money for what it is.

Run the audit. Do the math. Then turn the page.

CHAPTER 2

The Smartest People in the Room

Why high earners are the most underserved investors in North America

You close the app on your phone and set it on the counter. Same statement. Same numbers. Same allocation you had last year. Nothing went wrong, exactly. Nothing went right, either.

Meanwhile, you are excellent at what you do. You built a career that most people would envy. You earn well into six figures, maybe more. You have done nearly everything right when it comes to building professional income.

And yet, when it comes to your investments, you feel stuck.

Not broke. Not reckless. Just stuck. Your money sits in the same vehicles it sat in three years ago. Your returns are fine but forgettable. You have thought about doing something different, maybe looked into a deal or two, but you never pulled the trigger. Something always got in the way. Time. Trust. Uncertainty. The fear that you might be the smart person who made a dumb bet.

If you did the math in Chapter 1, you already know what that inaction is costing you. Now let us talk about why it is happening.

DEAD MONEY

High-income professionals are, by almost every measure, the most underserved investor class in North America. Not because the financial industry ignores them. It does the opposite. It drowns them in products, platforms, advisors, and options. The problem is that almost none of it is designed to solve the one problem that actually matters: how to deploy meaningful capital into investments that produce real, above-market returns without requiring the investor to become an expert or a full-time manager.

The problem is not your decision-making. The problem is that nobody built a decision system for people in your position.

This chapter is about why smart, successful people stay stuck. Some stay stuck because they cannot decide. I stayed stuck because I made too many decisions. I was never short on conviction or appetite. I was short on discipline. And the cost of that was just as high.

The Long Way Back to Simple

I started my career in real estate development. Not as an investor on the sidelines, but inside the machine. I spent six years as general manager for a development firm. Project management. Land acquisition. Permits and resource consent. Construction oversight. Sales. Bank financing. I learned how the entire development cycle worked, from raw land to finished product to sold units. I was good at it.

After six years in the business, I went back to school. I completed my Executive MBA at the University of Auckland, finished at the top of my class in 2005, and represented my university at the BCG postgraduate

case competition. Our team won first in New Zealand and placed third against Australia.

And that is where the trouble started.

The MBA sharpened my analytical thinking. It also inflated my confidence. I had six years of real-world real estate experience and now a top-tier graduate degree to go with it. I convinced myself that real estate was too simple. Too straightforward. Surely I should be doing something more sophisticated with my capital. Something that matched my self-image as a smart, analytically trained professional.

So I jumped into forex day trading. With 100x leverage.

I blew up my capital. Not once. Three times. My mind was glued to the screen during dinner with my wife. I would check positions in the middle of the night. The returns were not just bad. They were catastrophic. And every time I lost, I told myself I had learned the lesson, adjusted my strategy, and went back in. The market taught me the same lesson three times before I finally heard it.

I moved to options trading. Butterflies. Calendar spreads. Iron condors. This was not day trading. These were strategy-based positions I would set up and let play out over time. The strategies were intellectually fascinating. But the deeper I went, the clearer it became. Every options strategy is just a different way of packaging the same fundamental trade-offs. You are always betting on one risk factor over another. There was no magic formula. There was no free lunch.

Then I launched a hedge fund.

DEAD MONEY

I was a value investor. Long-term positions. I calculated fair market values, built conviction around companies I believed were mispriced, and invested accordingly. The thesis was sound. The research was thorough. But the market went against me. Month after month.

My investors were understanding. They trusted the process. But the pressure I put on myself was relentless. Every month I sat down to write the same report. The stocks are undervalued. The fundamentals are strong. The market will come around. Hold the course. And every month, the numbers said otherwise.

The hardest part was not the losses. It was the feeling of being trapped in something I could not control. Public markets move on sentiment, on headlines, on forces that have nothing to do with the underlying value of a company. I could be right about the analysis and still lose money for the people who trusted me. That was not the kind of investing I wanted to do.

So I made a decision. I moved my investors' capital out of the hedge fund and into real estate private equity. Back to the asset class I understood from the inside out. Back to something where the outcome was driven by execution, not by market sentiment.

Every one of those investors recovered their losses. And they did not just recover. They made many times more than what they had lost.

* * *

My problem was never indecision. It was the opposite. I kept deciding. Forex. Options. A hedge fund. Each time I was certain I had found the right vehicle. Each time I committed capital and conviction. And each

time, the returns told me I was wrong. Too many decisions, made without a system, cost me just as much as no decision at all.

After forex, options, and a hedge fund, I did not discover some brilliant new strategy that finally cracked the code. I did not find a more sophisticated system. I went back to real estate. The simple thing. The thing I had walked away from because it did not feel impressive enough for someone with my credentials.

But each detour taught me something I would not have learned by staying put. Forex taught me how fast undisciplined risk can destroy capital. Options taught me that complexity and edge are not the same thing. Value investing taught me that being right about the analysis does not matter if you cannot control the outcome. And real estate taught me that the best investments are the ones where you can see exactly how the money is made, where execution drives the result, and where a disciplined process beats a brilliant thesis every time.

I spent the next 11 years at a private equity real estate firm that has raised and deployed over \$2 billion of investor capital. Of that, \$300 million was raised and deployed by me and my team across development projects. My assistants and I serve over a thousand investor families. The returns were strong, the process was disciplined, and the investors who stayed with us over multiple deal cycles built serious wealth.

The sophisticated path nearly broke me. The disciplined, simple path built my wealth and my investors' wealth.

DEAD MONEY

And the lesson I took from that experience is the one I want you to hear clearly, because it applies to every high-income professional reading this book.

You may not have blown up a forex account. But if you have ever talked yourself out of a straightforward investment because it felt too simple for someone with your background, you have been where I was. If you have ever spent weeks researching a complex strategy and come out the other side with nothing to show for it, you know the trap. The exit is not a better strategy. It is a simpler one, applied with discipline.

Complexity Is Not the Same as Sophistication

There is a trap that intelligent people fall into more often than anyone else. It sounds like this:

"I'm smart enough to figure this out. I just need a better strategy."

That belief sends people chasing complexity. More asset classes. More exotic instruments. More moving parts. More analysis. The assumption is that the reason their portfolio is underperforming is that their approach is not advanced enough. That if they just found the right combination of strategies, the returns would follow.

It rarely works that way.

The most successful investors I have met over the past two decades are not the ones with the most complex strategies. They are the ones with the clearest systems. They know exactly what they invest in. They know why they invest in it. They have a repeatable process for evaluating opportunities. And they ignore everything that falls outside their circle of competence.

That is real sophistication. Not complexity. Discipline.

I have watched this play out across more than a thousand investor families. The ones who built serious wealth were not the ones with the most creative deal structures or the deepest understanding of derivatives. They were the ones who picked an asset class they understood, built a process for evaluating opportunities within it, and followed that process with patience. Year after year. The ones who kept searching for a smarter approach kept searching. Their capital did not compound. Their education did.

The Four Traps

If complexity is not the answer, then why are so many high-income professionals still stuck? In my experience, it comes down to four patterns. Nearly everyone I have worked with falls into at least one of these. Most are caught in two or three at the same time.

Trap 1: Paralysis

This is the most common pattern. You have the capital. You have the intent. You may even have a general sense of what you want to invest in. But you cannot get to a decision. There are too many options, not enough time to evaluate them, and the fear of choosing wrong is louder than the desire to choose at all. So another quarter passes. Another year. The capital sits. And the dead money math from Chapter 1 keeps compounding against you.

Paralysis is not laziness. It is the rational response of a busy professional who does not have a decision system. Without a clear

DEAD MONEY

framework for evaluating opportunities, every deal feels like a gamble. And smart people do not gamble with family money. So they wait.

Trap 2: False Sophistication

This was my trap. The belief that the solution is a more advanced strategy. If your portfolio is underperforming, it must be because you have not found the right complex approach yet. Maybe it is options. Maybe it is crypto. Maybe it is some algorithmic trading platform that promises market-beating returns with proprietary technology.

False sophistication feels productive. You are reading, researching, analyzing. You are learning new vocabulary and studying new asset classes. But productivity and progress are not the same thing. I spent years being productive in forex and options and hedge fund management. I made almost no progress. I made real progress when I returned to a simple, understandable asset class and applied discipline to it.

Trap 3: Advisor Dependency

This is the quietest trap, and it catches people who have done the responsible thing by hiring a financial advisor. The problem is not that advisors are incompetent. Many are smart, well-intentioned professionals. The problem is structural.

Your advisor works within a system. That system has a product shelf, compliance requirements, fee structures, and business incentives that do not always align with your goals. In Canada, most advisors operate under a dealer that approves specific products. In the United States, broker-dealers and RIAs have their own approved lists and suitability rules. Most advisors can sell real estate private equity, but only within

their firm's guidelines. And those guidelines usually limit it to a small fraction of your portfolio, because of the way their compliance teams view risk, particularly liquidity risk. The result is that even when private real estate is technically available, the allocation your advisor is permitted to recommend may be far smaller than what would actually serve your long-term goals.

And most advisors are not incentivized to push those boundaries. Not because they are dishonest, but because their business runs more smoothly when they stay within the center of their approved shelf. So the conversation stays within the boundaries of what is easy to recommend, and you never hear about the scale of allocation that might actually move the needle on your long-term returns.

I have met investors whose advisors offered them a small slice of private real estate and called it diversified. They assumed that allocation represented the right amount. They did not realize it was the maximum their advisor's firm would allow, not the amount that matched their actual goals and risk capacity. The portfolio looked balanced on paper. In practice, it was still anchored to the same public market returns they were trying to move beyond.

Advisor dependency is not about trusting the wrong person. It is about outsourcing your investment decisions to someone whose guidelines cap your exposure to the very asset classes that could make the biggest difference.

Trap 4: Passive Saving

This is the one that looks the safest. You have capital in a high-yield savings account, a CD, a GIC, a money market fund, or a conservative

DEAD MONEY

bond portfolio. It is not losing money. It is earning something. And because the number on the screen goes up every month, it feels like progress.

We covered this in Chapter 1. Passive saving is not safe. It is slow erosion disguised as stability. After inflation and taxes, a 3 to 4% return may produce near-zero real growth. Over a decade, you are barely treading water. Over two or three decades, you have fallen dramatically behind where you could have been.

The danger of passive saving is that it does not hurt. There is no moment of crisis, no dramatic loss, no statement that makes you feel sick. It just quietly costs you more every year than almost any single bad investment would.

The Pattern Behind the Traps

Here is what all four traps have in common: none of them are caused by a lack of intelligence, a lack of capital, or a lack of desire. They are caused by a lack of system.

The paralyzed investor does not need more information. They need a decision framework. The falsely sophisticated investor does not need a more complex strategy. They need a simpler one applied with discipline. The advisor-dependent investor does not need a new advisor. They need to understand whether the allocations they are being given reflect their goals or their advisor's compliance limits. The passive saver does not need motivation. They need to see the math clearly enough that staying still becomes more uncomfortable than moving forward.

Every one of these traps has the same exit: a repeatable system for evaluating investments that removes the guesswork, reduces the emotional load, and produces a clear yes or no.

That is what the rest of this book builds toward. Not a pitch for any specific deal. A system that works regardless of what you are evaluating.

The Stuck Investor Self-Assessment

Before you can break a pattern, you need to name it. This exercise takes five minutes. Be honest with yourself. Nobody else needs to see your answers.

Read each of the four descriptions below. For each one, rate yourself on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 means "this does not describe me at all" and 5 means "this is exactly where I am right now."

Pattern 1: Paralysis

I have capital I want to invest differently, but I have not made a move in the past 12 months. I have looked at opportunities but could not commit. I keep waiting for more certainty before I act.

Your score: _____ / 5

Pattern 2: False Sophistication

I have spent time and money exploring advanced or complex investment strategies. I have tried or researched things like options,

DEAD MONEY

forex, crypto, algorithmic trading, or other exotic instruments. I felt like I was making progress, but my net returns did not reflect the effort.

Your score: _____ / 5

Pattern 3: Advisor Dependency

I rely primarily on a financial advisor to make investment decisions for me. I have not independently evaluated a deal or investment outside of what my advisor has recommended. I am not sure whether the allocations my advisor suggests reflect my goals or their firm's guidelines.

Your score: _____ / 5

Pattern 4: Passive Saving

A significant portion of my investable capital is sitting in savings accounts, CDs, GICs, money market funds, or conservative bond holdings. I know the returns are low, but it feels safer than making a move I am not confident about.

Your score: _____ / 5

Reading Your Results

You are not looking for a single number here. You are looking for the pattern.

Highest score in Paralysis? Chapters 4 through 9 are built for you. The DEALS framework turns overwhelming options into a clear yes or no.

Highest score in False Sophistication? You need to simplify. Chapter 3 on the return-risk-liquidity triangle will reframe how you think about every investment, and the DEALS framework will give you a filter to cut through the noise.

Highest score in Advisor Dependency? You do not need to fire your advisor. You need to understand what they can and cannot offer you. Chapter 3 will show you how institutional capital is actually allocated, and the gap between that and what most advisory models provide. That knowledge changes the conversation entirely.

Highest score in Passive Saving? Go back to Chapter 1 and run the dead money audit with your real numbers. Make the cost personal. Then use the rest of this book to build the confidence you need to deploy capital with a system rather than a guess.

Most readers will score high in more than one category. That is normal. The traps overlap and reinforce each other. A passive saver who is also advisor-dependent may never hear about opportunities that could break the pattern. A paralyzed investor who also chases false sophistication gets stuck in an endless loop of research and inaction.

Name the pattern. That is the first step to breaking it.

Something changes when you see your own pattern written down in front of you. It is a small shift, but it matters.

For most high-income professionals, the frustration of being stuck comes with a layer of confusion. You know you are not where you want to be, but you cannot quite articulate why. You earn well. You are not stupid. You have access to information. So what is the problem?

DEAD MONEY

The self-assessment answers that question. It puts a name on the specific pattern that is keeping your capital idle. And once you can name it, you can stop blaming yourself for a lack of willpower or intelligence and start addressing the structural issue underneath.

Paralysis is not a character flaw. It is the absence of a decision system. False sophistication is not greed. It is misdirected effort. Advisor dependency is not naivety. It is a structural blind spot. Passive saving is not fear. It is the rational response to having no trusted alternative.

Each of these has a solution. And the solutions are not complicated. They do not require you to become a real estate expert, a finance professional, or a full-time investor. They require a framework. A set of filters. A repeatable process that takes the emotional weight off each individual decision and replaces it with a system that does the heavy thinking for you.

That is what we are building in the next chapter. The foundation of everything that follows.

In the next chapter, you will learn the one lens that separates institutional investors from everyone else. It is not complicated. But once you see it, you will never look at a deal the same way.

You have seen the cost of dead money. You have identified your pattern. Now it is time to learn the framework that breaks it.

CHAPTER 3

The Return-Risk-Liquidity Triangle

The one concept that changes every investment decision you will ever make

You are sitting across from your financial advisor. It is your annual review. They pull up a chart, walk you through a year of market volatility, point to a modest gain, and say something like, "*Given the environment, this was a solid year.*" You nod. You thank them. You drive home. And somewhere between the parking lot and your front door, a thought hits you that you cannot shake: *why am I paying someone to tell me that?*

If that moment sounds familiar, you are not alone. Most high-income professionals I talk to have a version of it. Maybe it was not an advisor meeting. Maybe it was watching your portfolio drop 15% in a month and feeling physically ill. Maybe it was hearing two stories in the same month. A colleague who put capital into a private real estate deal and earned double what your advisor delivers. And a friend who invested in a similar deal that went sideways, lost a year of communication from the sponsor, and still does not know if they will get their money back. Both stories left you in the same place: frozen, because you had no way to tell the difference between the two.

Whatever the moment, the frustration is the same. And most people blame the obvious targets. The market was volatile. The advisor did not deliver. There was no time to research. There was no one to trust.

DEAD MONEY

Those are all real factors. But they are symptoms. They are not the root cause.

The root cause is something nobody has shown you before. Every investment in the world, whether it is a stock, a bond, a rental property, a private equity deal, a savings account, or a cryptocurrency, involves a trade-off between three forces. Return. Risk. And liquidity.

You can optimize for any two. You cannot have all three.

That single idea, the return-risk-liquidity triangle, is the lens that separates investors who build wealth over decades from those who spend decades chasing it. And the reason most high-income professionals are stuck is not that they lack intelligence or capital. It is that nobody has ever handed them this framework. So they keep trying to find investments that offer high returns, low risk, and easy access to their money, all at the same time. And when those investments do not exist, they either take on more risk than they realize or they do nothing at all.

Both paths lead to the same outcome you saw in Chapter 1: capital that sits still while the world compounds around it.

The Triangle

Here is how the triangle works. Every investment you will ever encounter sits somewhere inside a three-sided trade-off.

Return is the money your investment generates. Yield, appreciation, profit distributions, capital gains. The number most investors focus on first.

Risk is the probability and magnitude of losing some or all of your capital. This includes market risk, execution risk, operator risk, leverage risk, and a dozen other forms that most pitch decks never mention.

Liquidity is how quickly and easily you can convert your investment back into cash without taking a significant loss. A savings account is fully liquid. A five-year real estate development deal is not.

The triangle says this: you can optimize for two of these three, but the third one will always push back.

The Return-Risk-Liquidity Triangle

Trade-off	Return	Risk	Liquidity	Example
High Return + High Liquidity	High	High	High	Day trading, speculative stocks, crypto
High Return + Low Risk	High	Low	Low	Private equity, real estate development
High Liquidity + Low Risk	Low	Low	High	GICs (Canada), CDs (US), savings accounts, T-bills

Disclaimer: The classifications above are relative and for illustration purposes only. Different investors may assess these trade-offs

DEAD MONEY

differently based on their experience, risk tolerance, and objectives. This is not investment advice.

Notice the middle row. High return and low risk, but low liquidity. That is private equity. Real estate development. The space where institutional investors, pension funds, and ultra-high-net-worth families put a significant portion of their capital. They accept illiquidity because the return premium is worth it, and because their time horizons are long enough to wait.

Now notice the top row. High return and high liquidity usually means high risk. Day trading. Speculative stocks. Leveraged crypto. These attract smart people who want strong returns without locking up their capital. But risk is the price you pay for that combination.

And the bottom row is where most retail investors park their money. GICs (Canada), CDs (US), savings accounts, treasury bills. Safe and accessible, but after taxes and inflation, the real return on these vehicles is often negligible. Over decades, this is the dead money we discussed in Chapter 1.

Once you internalize this triangle, something changes in the way you evaluate opportunities. You stop asking, *"What is the return?"* and start asking, *"What am I giving up to get that return?"* That question is the foundation of every good investment decision.

The Strategic Advantage of Illiquidity

Most investors view illiquidity as a problem. Something to avoid. Something that makes an investment worse. And from a short-term

comfort standpoint, that makes sense. Nobody likes the idea of locking up capital for five or seven years.

But most investors have it backwards. Illiquidity is one of the strongest structural edges available to any investor with a long time horizon.

Think about it from the other direction. Why do liquid investments tend to produce lower risk-adjusted returns over long periods? Because liquidity invites interference. When you can sell at any time, you are constantly tempted to sell at the wrong time. Every market dip, every bad headline, every quarter of underperformance creates an emotional decision point. And most investors, even smart ones, make worse decisions under emotional pressure than they would with a cool head and a long runway.

Fidelity reportedly conducted an internal review to understand which account holders achieved the best long-term returns. The results were striking. The accounts that performed best were the ones nobody touched. Some belonged to investors who had died. Others to people who had forgotten they had accounts at all. The rest belonged to long-term holders who rarely traded. No panic selling, no sector rotation, no attempts to time the market. Just years of uninterrupted compounding.

The pattern is clear. The less you touch your portfolio, the better it tends to perform. Not because doing nothing is always the right strategy, but because the urge to act in liquid markets almost always costs more than it saves.

One investor sold \$400,000 in equities during the 2020 COVID crash. By the time he felt confident enough to buy back in, the market had recovered most of its losses. That round trip cost him over \$150,000 in

DEAD MONEY

real money. Not because of a bad investment. Because he had the ability to sell.

That story is not unusual. It plays out every cycle, in every market correction, with investors at every income level. Every time someone sells at a low and buys back higher, every time they chase a trend and arrive late, every time they rotate into a sector after it has already run, they are eroding their own returns.

Private investments remove that temptation entirely. When you invest in a real estate development deal with a five-year hold period, you make one decision: whether to invest. After that, you do not decide when to sell. You do not watch the price fluctuate daily. You do not feel the pull of fear when the stock market drops 15% in a month, because your investment is not connected to the stock market. Your capital goes to work, and you go back to your life.

That is a structural advantage, not a drawback. The best investments you will ever make are the ones you do not need to think about after you have made them.

And here is the connection back to Chapter 1. Remember the compound return table. The difference between 12% and 13% over 30 years was \$900,000 on \$100,000. Over 50 years, it was \$16 million. Every behavioral mistake you make in a liquid portfolio, every emotional trade, every panic sell, every late entry, chips away at your effective rate of return. Even shaving half a percent off your average annual return through bad timing costs you hundreds of thousands of dollars over a long investing life.

Illiquid investments protect you from yourself. They remove the single biggest source of return erosion for most investors: their own behavior. And they do it structurally, not by asking you to have more willpower or better discipline, but by simply taking the option of interference off the table.

Why Your Past Investments Disappointed You

If you have ever watched your portfolio drop by tens of thousands of dollars in a week and felt physically ill, or wondered why you are paying an advisor to deliver the same returns you could get from an index fund, this section will explain what actually went wrong.

Let us map the triangle onto the investments most high-income professionals have already tried. If any of these sound familiar, you are not alone.

DEAD MONEY

Common Investments Through the Triangle Lens

Investment	Return	Risk	Liquidity	The Problem
Public equities	Volatile	High	High	Unpredictable returns, emotional toll
GICs (Canada) / CDs (US) / Savings	Low	Low	High	Returns may barely keep pace with inflation after taxes
Rental properties	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Tenant headaches, concentrated risk

Disclaimer: The classifications above are relative and for illustration purposes only. Different investors may assess these trade-offs differently based on their experience, risk tolerance, and objectives. This is not investment advice.

Public equities. High liquidity. You can buy and sell in seconds. But the returns are volatile, unpredictable, and highly sensitive to market sentiment. In a good year you feel like a genius. In a bad year you feel sick. And the emotional rollercoaster of watching your portfolio swing by tens of thousands of dollars in a week takes a psychological toll that never shows up in a return calculation. The triangle diagnosis: you got liquidity and potentially high returns, but you paid for it with high risk and high emotional cost.

GICs (Canada), CDs (US), and savings accounts. Low risk, high liquidity. Your capital is protected, and you can access it easily. But the nominal return on these products can be misleading. Once you account for taxes and inflation, the real growth is often close to zero. In some years it is negative. This is the classic dead money position. The triangle diagnosis: you got safety and access, but you sacrificed return.

Rental properties. Moderate returns and moderate risk on paper. But there is a hidden cost that does not show up on any spreadsheet: your time. Tenant calls at midnight. Repair bills you did not budget for. Vacancy periods that eat into your cash flow. And because all your capital is concentrated in one or two physical assets, a single bad tenant or a local market downturn can wipe out years of income. The triangle diagnosis: illiquid, moderate return, moderate risk, but with a significant personal time cost and concentration risk that most landlords underestimate.

Every one of these past experiences was a triangle mismatch. The investment did not fail because you made a bad decision. It failed because the trade-off it offered did not align with what you actually needed.

The Structural Gap

Here is where it gets interesting. The mismatch is not entirely your fault. It is partly a product of the system you are investing through.

Most financial advisors, whether in Canada or the United States, operate within a product shelf. In Canada, dealers approve specific funds and products. In the US, broker-dealers and RIAs have their own approved lists. The shelf is built around liquid, regulated, easily

DEAD MONEY

administered products. Mutual funds. ETFs. Annuities. Segregated funds. Structured notes. These generate predictable fee revenue and fit neatly into compliance and reporting frameworks.

Illiquid alternative investments like private real estate, private equity, infrastructure, and venture capital are categorized differently. Most advisory models cap alternatives at roughly 5 to 15% of a portfolio. Some firms do not offer them at all. The reasoning is partly regulatory, partly administrative, and partly because illiquid products are harder to monitor and report on within the existing infrastructure.










But look at how large, sophisticated pools of capital are actually allocated.

Consider the Tiger 21 network. This is an invitation-only peer membership organization for ultra-high-net-worth entrepreneurs, investors, and executives. To qualify, you need a minimum of \$20 million in liquid, investable assets. The average member's investable net worth is approximately \$100 million. Collectively, these members manage personal assets exceeding \$200 billion.

These are people who have the resources, the access, and the sophistication to invest anywhere they choose. And when you look at how they actually allocate their capital, the picture is very different from what most retail advisors recommend.

Tiger 21 publishes a quarterly Asset Allocation Report based on aggregated member data. The chart below shows their most recently published allocation as of Q4 2025:

Tiger 21 Member Asset Allocation (Q1 2025 - Q4 2025)

Asset Class	Allocation	
Private Equity	31%	
Real Estate	25%	
Public Equities	23%	
Cash & Cash Equivalents	9%	
Fixed Income	6%	
Hedge Funds	2%	
Commodities	2%	
Cryptocurrencies	1%	
Miscellaneous	1%	

Source: Tiger 21 Q4 2025 Asset Allocation Report. Trailing 12-month data (Q1 2025 - Q4 2025) based on annual Portfolio Defense presentations.

DEAD MONEY

Look at those numbers. Private equity and real estate together account for 56% of the average member's portfolio. Private equity has now overtaken real estate as the single largest allocation at 31%, up from 28% just a year earlier. Public equities represent 23%, and that portion is increasingly concentrated in index funds and ETFs rather than individual stock picks. Cash remains at 9%. And cryptocurrencies have earned their own line item at 1%, reflecting a growing but still measured interest among members.

When nearly 80% of a \$200 billion collective portfolio is in long-only, risk-on assets like private equity, real estate, and public equities, that tells you something about where the most experienced wealth builders in the world are placing their conviction.

That allocation is not an accident. It reflects decades of entrepreneurial experience and a deliberate choice to prioritize long-term, illiquid investments that offer more control, more predictability, and higher risk-adjusted returns over time. These investors are not avoiding public markets entirely. But they are choosing to put roughly half their wealth in assets that most retail investors never get access to.

Pension funds, endowments, and sovereign wealth funds follow a similar pattern. The Canada Pension Plan Investment Board, the California Public Employees' Retirement System, the Harvard and Yale endowments, all allocate significant portions of their assets to private markets. They accept illiquidity because the data shows that over long time horizons, the return premium is worth it. The illiquidity is not a flaw. It is the mechanism that creates the premium.

Now compare that to your portfolio. If you are like most high-income professionals, your allocation to alternatives is somewhere between

zero and 10%. Not because you made a deliberate choice to avoid them, but because the system you invest through was never set up to give you access.

Your portfolio is not underperforming because you are doing something wrong. It is underperforming because the traditional advisory model was designed for a different era and a different investor. It was not built to give people like you access to the same asset classes and trade-offs that institutional capital relies on.

That gap between your portfolio and theirs is not a knowledge gap. It is an access gap. And it has been costing you money every year it stays open.

Closing it starts with understanding the triangle.

How To Implement It

Exercise 1: Triangle Mapping

This exercise takes about twenty minutes. You will need your most recent account statements or login access to your investment accounts.

Step 1: List every investment you currently hold.

Go account by account. In Canada, that includes your RRSP, TFSA, non-registered accounts, and corporate investment accounts. In the US, your 401(k), IRA, Roth IRA, taxable brokerage, and any entity-held investments. Write down each holding along with its approximate current value.

Step 2: For each investment, rate the three sides of the triangle.

DEAD MONEY

Use a simple scale: high, medium, or low. What is the expected return? What is the risk level? What is the liquidity? Be honest. If you are holding an index fund, the liquidity is high but the return has been volatile. If you own a rental property, the liquidity is low and the time-risk is high even if the cash flow looks decent on paper.

Step 3: Look at the pattern.

When you step back and look at your full portfolio mapped this way, you will almost certainly see one of two imbalances:

- The safety cluster. Most of your capital is concentrated in high-liquidity, low-risk, low-return vehicles. This means your portfolio is optimized for access and safety, but it is not optimized for growth. You are paying for peace of mind with dead money.
- The volatility cluster. Most of your capital is in high-liquidity, high-return, high-risk vehicles like public equities. This means you are exposed to market swings that erode your effective return through behavioral mistakes and emotional decision-making.

In either case, the gap is the same: little or no allocation to the high-return, low-risk, low-liquidity quadrant. The space where private investments live. The space where institutional capital compounds.

Exercise 2: The Allocation Comparison

Now take one more step. Calculate the total percentage of your investable assets that is currently allocated to private or alternative investments. This includes private real estate, private equity, direct business investments, private debt, or any vehicle that is not publicly traded and not a standard savings or bond product.

Write that number down.

Now compare it to these benchmarks:

- Typical retail advisory portfolio: 0 to 10% in alternatives
- Tiger 21 ultra-high-net-worth members (avg. \$100M investable, Q4 2025): 56% in private equity and real estate combined
- Major pension funds and endowments: 25 to 40%+ in illiquid alternatives

If your number is close to the first benchmark and far from the second and third, you are not underperforming because of bad luck or bad decisions. You are underperforming because your portfolio is structured like a retail portfolio, not like an institutional one. And the advisory system you are in was never designed to close that gap.

That does not mean you need to immediately move 50% of your capital into alternatives. That would be reckless and premature. But it does mean you now have the language and the data to ask better questions.

When you walk into that conversation with your advisor and say, "My alternative allocation is at 5%. Institutional capital runs at 30 to 40%. Help me understand why my portfolio looks nothing like theirs," you are no longer a passive client. You are an informed investor asking the right question. That shift changes everything that happens next.

When you complete these two exercises, you walk away with two things that most investors never have.

First, you have a visual map of where your portfolio actually sits within the triangle. Not where you thought it sat. Not where your advisor told you it sat. Where it actually sits based on the trade-offs each holding is making. That clarity alone is worth the twenty minutes it takes. Most investors have never looked at their portfolio through this lens, and the imbalance is usually obvious once they do.

DEAD MONEY

Second, you have a benchmark. You know what your current alternative allocation looks like compared to how institutional and ultra-high-net-worth capital is deployed. That number gives you a target, not a rigid one, but a directional one. It tells you roughly how far your portfolio is from the structure that the most sophisticated investors in the world have chosen for themselves.

Together, these two pieces of information do something powerful. They take the vague feeling of "*my investments are not working hard enough*" and turn it into a specific, measurable gap. You can point to it. You can quantify it. And you can start closing it.

For the first time, you are not guessing. You are not hoping your portfolio is okay. You are looking at real data and seeing exactly where the gap is. That clarity replaces anxiety with direction.

But closing it requires more than just knowing the gap exists. You need a system for evaluating the private investments that belong in that gap. You need to know how to tell a good deal from a bad one, a strong operator from a weak one, a fair structure from one that favors the sponsor at your expense.

You now know where the gap is. The next question is: how do you fill it without getting burned? That is what the DEALS framework is built for. Five filters. One decision.

CHAPTER 4

The DEALS Framework

A five-step system to evaluate any private investment with confidence

A dentist in Vancouver wired \$500,000 into a private real estate deal in 2019. Five years later, his return barely beat a savings account. The story of how that happened, and how an engineer in Calgary avoided the same fate with a five-question checklist, is the story of this entire book.

Same city type. Same profession type. Same starting capital.
Completely different outcomes.

Investor A was smart. Successful practice. Earned well north of \$300,000 a year. A colleague told him about a private real estate development deal. A condo project in the suburbs. The pitch deck looked beautiful. Projected returns of 18% IRR. The sponsor was charismatic, confident, and showed a couple of before-and-after photos from a previous project. Investor A did some light research, liked what he saw, and wired the money.

Within a year, things started going sideways. Construction timelines slipped. Costs came in higher than projected. The sponsor sent quarterly updates that raised more questions than they answered, and when Investor A pushed for clarity, the responses got slower and vaguer. By year three, the deal had not delivered a single distribution. By year five, the final accounting showed a net return that barely

DEAD MONEY

exceeded what a savings account would have paid. After fees. After five years of illiquidity.

Investor A did not lose his principal. Technically. But he lost five years of compounding, the opportunity cost of deploying that capital elsewhere, and something harder to measure but just as real: his confidence. The next time someone brought him a private investment opportunity, he said no without looking at it. The deal after that, same thing. He was burned, and the scar tissue made him gun-shy. His capital went back into GICs and a balanced mutual fund. Dead money, earning 4 to 5%, slowly falling behind.

Now meet Investor B. An engineer in Calgary. Similar income. Similar capital. She got the same type of pitch deck from a different colleague around the same time. Same asset class. Same type of development deal.

But Investor B did something different. Before she invested a dollar, she ran the opportunity through a structured evaluation process. Five questions, five filters. She looked at how the deal actually made money and whether the revenue projections were grounded in real market data. She stress-tested the underwriting and examined the fee structure to see who got paid and when. She dug into the operator's track record across multiple market cycles, not just the highlight reel. She mapped every risk she could identify, checked who was carrying each one, and verified the legal structure protected her downside. And she looked at how this deal would fit within her broader portfolio, not just whether it was a good deal in isolation.

The deal failed two of her five filters. The operator had limited experience with projects of that scale, and the fee structure paid the sponsor handsomely regardless of investor returns. She passed.

She closed the pitch deck, told her colleague it was not the right fit, and moved on with her week. No second-guessing. No fear of missing out. No lying awake wondering if she had made the wrong call. The system gave her a clear answer and she trusted it. That feeling, that calm certainty in the face of a decision that used to cause anxiety, is what a framework gives you.

Over the next three years, she evaluated nine more opportunities using the same process. She invested in four of them. One underperformed slightly. Three exceeded projections. Her blended portfolio return across those four deals landed in the low teens. More importantly, no single deal threatened her financial security, because she had built diversification into her approach from the start.

Investor A had no system. He had a gut feeling, a nice pitch deck, and a persuasive sponsor. Investor B had five filters and the discipline to use them.

The only difference between those two outcomes was whether there was a system. And the system Investor B used is what this chapter introduces.

Investing Is a Long Game

Before we get into the framework itself, there is a mindset shift that needs to happen first. Because the framework will not help you if you approach it with the wrong orientation.

DEAD MONEY

Most people treat investing like a single transaction. They evaluate one result and decide whether they are good at it. That is the wrong frame entirely.

Investing is a 40 to 50 year practice. The most successful investors in the world are not the ones who found one spectacular deal that changed everything. They are the ones who built a system, followed it consistently, and let compounding do its work over decades. Their philosophy may evolve as markets shift and experience deepens, but the discipline of following a process does not waver.

This distinction matters because most people evaluate investments the way they evaluate purchases. They look at one deal, one opportunity, one moment in time, and they try to decide if this particular thing is worth their money right now. That approach guarantees emotional decision-making. Every deal feels like a gamble because there is no context, no framework, no scoring system that separates this opportunity from the last one or the next one.

Speculating is reacting to emotion, headlines, and short-term noise. Investing is executing a repeatable process with patience, clarity, and conviction. The DEALS framework exists to give you that repeatable process. Not for one deal. For every deal you will evaluate for the rest of your investing life.

You Do Not Need to Become an Expert

Here is a fear I hear from nearly every high-income professional I talk to about private investing: “I don’t have the expertise to evaluate these deals.”

That fear is understandable. Private investments come with thick offering memorandums, complex legal structures, financial projections that require a finance degree to decode, and terminology that seems designed to keep outsiders out. It is intimidating. And the intimidation serves a purpose, because it keeps a lot of smart people on the sidelines, which means less competition for the investors who do know how to evaluate opportunities.

But here is what I want you to understand. You do not need to become a real estate analyst, a private equity professional, or a venture capitalist to invest well in private markets. You do not need to build financial models or run Monte Carlo simulations. You do not need to learn valuation theory or master discounted cash flow analysis.

You need a decision system. A set of filters that tells you, clearly and quickly, whether an opportunity deserves your capital or not. The same way a pilot uses a pre-flight checklist before every takeoff. The pilot does not re-derive the principles of aerodynamics each time. They run the checklist. If everything passes, they fly. If something fails, they do not. The checklist does the heavy thinking. The pilot provides the judgment.

You are the pilot. The DEALS framework is your checklist. You do not need to understand the engineering behind every instrument on the panel. You need to read the five gauges that tell you whether it is safe to fly.

The Five Filters

DEALS is an acronym. Each letter represents one filter in the evaluation process.

DEAD MONEY

Letter	Filter	Core Question
D	Decode the Math	How does this investment actually make money?
E	Evaluate the Deal	Is it a good deal considering the return and the risks?
A	Assess the Operator	Who is managing my capital, and how much skin in the game do they have?
L	Locate the Risks	What can go wrong, and who bears the consequences?
S	Spread Your Capital	Does this fit my portfolio, and am I properly diversified?

Each filter is covered in depth in its own chapter. Chapters 5 through 9 will walk you through exactly how to apply each one, with checklists, scoring systems, and plain-language questions you can use on any opportunity. This chapter is about the framework as a whole. How the five filters work together. Why you need all five, not just the ones that feel comfortable. And how this system changes the way you make decisions.

Why Five Filters, Not One

Most investors, when they evaluate an opportunity, default to one or two questions. The most common is: “What is the return?” The second

most common is: “Do I trust this person?” Both are important. Neither is sufficient. Each filter catches problems the others miss.

Filter	What It Catches	What Happens Without It
Decode the Math	Deals where you cannot explain how the money is made	You invest in something you do not understand and cannot evaluate when things change
Evaluate the Deal	Aggressive underwriting, unfair fee structures, no margin of safety	You accept projections at face value and miss structural problems that erode your return
Assess the Operator	Inexperienced, misaligned, or unaccountable sponsors	You hand capital to someone whose interests are not aligned with yours
Locate the Risks	Hidden risks, unfair risk allocation, missing legal protections	You carry risks you did not agree to or did not even know existed
Spread Your Capital	Concentration, poor portfolio fit, overexposure to one deal or sector	A single underperforming deal damages your entire financial position

DEAD MONEY

A pilot who only checks fuel and skips everything else would not last long. Same principle here. No single filter gives you the full picture. All five together give you a comprehensive view of whether an opportunity is worth your capital.

The Framework Is Asset-Class Agnostic

One thing worth emphasizing. The DEALS framework was developed through my experience in real estate development and private equity, and most of the examples in this book come from that world. But the five filters are not limited to real estate.

Decode the math applies to any investment where you need to understand how profits are generated. Evaluate the deal applies to any structure where fees, terms, and projections need scrutiny. Assess the operator applies to any opportunity where someone else is managing your capital. Locate the risks applies to literally every financial decision you will ever make. And spread your capital is the principle that protects every portfolio, regardless of what it holds.

If you are evaluating a private equity fund, you run it through DEALS. A venture capital opportunity, same thing. A direct business investment, a private debt deal, even a publicly traded stock where you want more rigor in your process. The five questions remain the same. Only the specific details change.

That means you are not learning a trick for one asset class. You are building an investor's operating system that works for decades, across every opportunity you will ever see.

That is by design. I wanted a system that would serve readers for decades, not just for the next deal. Markets change. Asset classes rotate

in and out of favor. New investment vehicles emerge. But the fundamental questions of how it makes money, whether it is fairly structured, who is running it, what can go wrong, and how it fits your portfolio will never become obsolete.

The Two Investor Paths

Let me return to the contrast from the opening of this chapter, because it illustrates something important about how the framework changes outcomes over time.

Investor A deployed \$500,000 into a single deal based on a compelling pitch and projected returns. No system. No scoring. No structured evaluation. The deal underperformed. The sponsor communicated poorly. Investor A spent five years locked into a position with no recourse, no transparency, and no way to influence the outcome. At the end, the return barely covered inflation. And the experience poisoned his willingness to try again.

DEAD MONEY

Now zoom out on Investor B's path over the same period. Here is what a system-built portfolio looks like after three years.

Deal	Capital	Asset Type	Status	Result
Deal 1	\$200,000	Land development	Exited, Year 3	14.2% IRR
Deal 2	\$150,000	Industrial build	Exited, Year 2.5	16.8% IRR
Deal 3	\$175,000	Mixed-use project	In progress	Tracking to plan
Deal 4	\$125,000	Townhome infill	Exited, Year 3	9.1% IRR (below target)

Disclaimer: These are illustrative examples. Actual investment results vary based on market conditions, deal specifics, operator performance, and other factors. Past performance does not guarantee future results.

Four deals. Three strong performers. One that came in below target but still returned capital and a positive, if modest, return. The blended result across the portfolio: a low-teens IRR with no single point of failure.

Notice what happened with Deal 4. It underperformed. In a concentrated portfolio where that was the only investment, an

underperforming deal would dominate the entire experience. It would feel like a failure. It would erode confidence. It might trigger the same retreat to GICs and mutual funds that Investor A experienced.

But in Investor B's portfolio, Deal 4 is a data point. Not a disaster. The portfolio absorbed the variance because it was diversified across four deals, multiple asset types, and different timelines. The system accounted for the possibility that not every deal would be a home run. Because that is reality. No framework eliminates all risk. What a framework does is make risk manageable and outcomes predictable at the portfolio level.

That is the shift. From evaluating each deal as a standalone bet to building a portfolio where the system produces consistent results even when individual deals vary.

Speculating is reacting without a process. Investing is running every opportunity through a system before you write a check. Most high-income professionals who feel burned by private investments were not investing. They were speculating. Not because they are reckless people, but because nobody gave them a system. They were handed a pitch, asked to make a gut decision with a large amount of money, and told to hope for the best.

The DEALS framework replaces hope with structure. It does not promise that every deal will succeed. No system can do that. But it dramatically improves your odds by ensuring you never invest in something you do not understand, never accept a structure that works against you, never trust an operator you have not vetted, never ignore risks you should have seen, and never concentrate your capital in a way that leaves you exposed.

DEAD MONEY

That is a fundamentally different way to operate. And it starts the moment you decide to run every opportunity through five filters before you write a check.

The DEALS Scorecard

Here is the tool that ties the entire framework together. The DEALS Scorecard is a one-page evaluation sheet that you can use on any investment opportunity, starting with the very next one that crosses your desk.

Each of the five filters gets a detailed chapter later in this book. Chapters 5 through 9 will walk you through exactly how to score each one, what questions to ask, what red flags to watch for, and what a passing grade looks like. But you do not need to wait until you have read the full book to start using the scorecard. Even at a high level, the five questions will sharpen your evaluation immediately.

Here is how to use it.

Step 1: Print or copy the scorecard. You want a clean copy for each opportunity you evaluate. Keeping them lets you compare deals side by side over time.

Step 2: For each filter, answer the core question. Write your notes. Be specific. Do not write “looks good” or “seems fine.” Write what you actually found. The specificity is what makes this useful.

Step 3: Score each filter as Pass, Conditional, or Fail.

- **Pass** means the deal clearly satisfies this filter based on the evidence you reviewed.

- **Conditional** means you need more information before you can make a judgment. It is not a red flag yet, but it is not a green light either.
- **Fail** means the deal does not satisfy this filter, and no amount of strength in the other four filters should override the concern.

Step 4: Make your decision.

- **Five passes:** Invest with confidence. This deal has survived your full evaluation.
- **One or more conditionals, no fails:** Request the missing information. Set a deadline for yourself. If the conditionals convert to passes, proceed. If not, walk away.
- **Any fail:** Pass on the deal. No negotiation, no exception. A single fail means the risk-reward equation is broken.

That last rule is the hardest to follow, especially when the projected returns are attractive or the sponsor is persuasive. But it is the most important rule in the entire system. One fail is disqualifying. Period. There will always be another deal. There will not always be another \$200,000.

DEAD MONEY

The Scorecard Template

DEALS Scorecard

Deal Name: _____ Date: _____ Capital Considered:

Filter	Key Question	Notes	Score
D - Decode	Can I explain how this deal makes money in plain language?		Pass / Cond / Fail
E - Evaluate	Is it a good deal considering the return and the risks?		Pass / Cond / Fail
A - Assess	Who is managing my capital, and how much skin in the game do they have?		Pass / Cond / Fail
L - Locate	Have I identified the key risks and confirmed who bears each one?		Pass / Cond / Fail
S - Spread	Does this deal improve my portfolio's		Pass / Cond / Fail

	diversification and risk-adjusted return?		
--	---	--	--

Decision: Invest / Request More Info / Pass

Reason:

Keep your completed scorecards. Over time, you will build a library of evaluated opportunities. That library becomes a reference tool. You start to see patterns. You notice which filters trip up most deals. You develop faster pattern recognition for red flags. The scorecard is not just a one-time evaluation tool. It is a training system that makes you a better investor with every deal you review.

What a Scored Deal Looks Like

To make this concrete, here is what a partial scorecard might look like for a hypothetical townhome development deal. This is simplified. Chapters 5 through 9 will add layers of detail. But even at this level, notice how the notes force clarity.

DEAD MONEY

Filter	Notes	Score
D - Decode	Revenue comes from sale of 12 townhomes at projected \$620K avg. Land cost confirmed. Construction budget reviewed against two comparable projects. Revenue model clear.	Pass
A - Assess	Sponsor has completed two projects of similar size. Strong exits on both. However, this is their first project in this municipality. Need to verify permitting experience.	Conditional

Notice the difference between “looks good” and “Revenue comes from sale of 12 townhomes at projected \$620K avg.” The first tells you nothing. The second tells you exactly what you evaluated and gives you something to revisit if the deal changes. That specificity is what separates a real evaluation from a gut check.

How to Use the Scorecard Before You Finish This Book

You do not need to wait until Chapter 9 to start. If an opportunity comes across your desk tomorrow, pull out the scorecard and answer

the five core questions at whatever level of depth you can right now. Even a surface-level pass through the five filters will reveal gaps and concerns you might have missed with a less structured approach.

Then, as you read Chapters 5 through 9, go back to that same scorecard. Deepen your evaluation. Add the specific sub-questions and scoring criteria from each chapter. You will be surprised at how much more you see the second time through, armed with the detailed checklists each chapter provides.

The goal is to make the DEALS framework feel natural. Like a reflex. Within a few evaluations, you will not need the printed scorecard anymore. The five questions will be automatic. You will hear a pitch and your brain will immediately start running it through the filters. That is when the framework has done its job. Not when you understand it intellectually, but when it becomes the way you think about every opportunity.

If you commit to running every investment opportunity through the DEALS framework before you write a check, three things change.

First, you stop being overwhelmed by options. One of the biggest drivers of analysis paralysis is the feeling that you need to understand everything about an opportunity before you can make a decision. That is not true. You need to understand five things. Five filters. Five questions. The scorecard tells you what to focus on and what to ignore. It compresses a complex evaluation into a structured, manageable process that respects your time.

Second, you start making decisions faster. Not reckless decisions. Confident ones. The difference between someone who takes

DEAD MONEY

six months to evaluate a deal and someone who does it in two weeks is rarely knowledgeable. It is usually the absence of a decision framework. When you know what to look for, you find it quickly. When you do not, every piece of information feels equally important and you drown in details that do not drive the decision. The DEALS scorecard tells you exactly when you have enough information to act.

Third, you build a track record of good decisions. Not perfect decisions. Good ones. Some deals will underperform. That is normal. But over time, a portfolio built through a disciplined evaluation process will outperform a portfolio built on gut instinct, persuasive pitches, and unstructured research. The math favors systems over hunches. Every time.

And here is the change underneath all three. The fear that keeps most high-income professionals in low-yield vehicles was never a fear of the asset class. It was a fear of not knowing how to evaluate it. Once you have a system, that fear dissolves. You know what to look for. You know what to ask. You know when to say yes and when to walk away. The uncertainty that kept your capital dead is replaced by a repeatable process that lets you act with clarity.

The DEALS framework does not eliminate risk. Nothing does. What it eliminates is confusion. And confusion was the only thing keeping your capital dead. The framework removes it. What remains is a clear, actionable path from idle capital to compounding capital.

The next five chapters give you the detailed playbook for each filter. We start with the first and most fundamental question any investor can ask about any opportunity.

How does this deal actually make money?

CHAPTER 5

D — Decode the Math

How does this investment actually make money?

I want you to try something right now. Think about the last investment you made. Could be a stock. A mutual fund. An ETF. A rental property. A private deal. Whatever your most recent allocation was, think about it for a moment.

Now answer this question: how does that investment actually make money?

Not the projected return. Not the yield or the dividend rate. Not what your advisor told you it was expected to produce. I am asking something more fundamental. What is the economic engine underneath that investment? Where does the profit come from? What activity generates the cash that eventually flows back to you?

If you can answer that clearly, in plain language, without jargon, in about three sentences, you are already ahead of most investors. If you cannot, you are in the majority. And that is a problem worth solving, because it is the root cause of almost every bad investment decision.

Let me make this real. A dentist in Calgary puts \$200,000 into a real estate syndication. She reads the pitch deck, likes the projected returns, and writes the check. But she cannot explain how the deal actually generates profit. Two years later, the project stalls because the revenue

assumptions were 15% above anything the market had actually delivered. She had no way to see it coming because she never understood the math underneath. That \$200,000 sits frozen for five years producing nothing while the rest of her capital compounds elsewhere. The deal was not a scam. The sponsor was not dishonest. The numbers just did not work, and she did not know how to check them.

Here is the principle. If you cannot explain how a deal makes money in language a teenager could follow, you do not understand it well enough to invest in it. This applies to everyone, from first-time investors to seasoned professionals managing eight-figure portfolios.

The first filter in the DEALS framework exists because of this reality. Before you evaluate the structure, before you vet the operator, before you map the risks, before you think about portfolio fit, you need to answer one question. How does this thing actually make money?

If the answer is not clear, nothing else matters. You are flying blind.

Every Investment Has a Profit Engine

Think of a profit engine as the core mechanism that converts capital into returns. Every investment has one. Some are obvious. Some are buried under layers of financial engineering. But the engine is always there, and your job as an investor is to find it and understand it before you commit a dollar.

Let me walk through a few examples to make this concrete.

Real estate development. The profit engine in a development deal works backwards. You start with what the finished product will sell for.

DEAD MONEY

Condos, townhomes, an industrial building, whatever the end product is. You estimate revenue based on current market comparables. Then you subtract all the costs to build it: construction, permits, financing, soft costs, marketing, contingency. What remains after costs is the developer's margin. And that margin determines what you can afford to pay for the land in the first place. Revenue minus costs minus margin equals land price. If the math works at a land price you can actually acquire, you have a viable deal. If it does not, you walk away before you spend a cent.

Private equity. The profit engine in PE is operational improvement amplified by leverage. A PE firm buys a company using a combination of investor capital and debt. They improve the business over three to seven years by cutting costs, growing revenue, professionalizing management, or expanding into new markets. The goal is to increase profitability. And because the acquisition was funded partly with debt, every dollar of profit improvement produces an outsized return on the equity invested. That leverage effect is one of the key drivers of PE returns. The company is then sold, and the difference between the purchase price and the sale price, minus fees and debt service, flows back to investors. The exit price may or may not involve a higher earnings multiple. Sometimes it does, particularly if the PE firm has built better systems, stronger management, and more predictable revenue that makes the business attractive to a larger buyer or qualifies it for a public listing where valuations tend to be higher. But the core engine is not multiple expansion. It is making the business more profitable and using the debt structure to amplify the return on equity.

Venture capital. The profit engine in VC is portfolio math. A venture fund invests in 20 to 30 early-stage companies knowing that most will

fail. The model does not require every investment to succeed. It requires a small number of massive winners that return enough to cover all the losses and produce an attractive overall return. If a fund invests in 25 companies and 20 of them go to zero, but three return 10x and two return 50x, the fund does very well. The engine is asymmetry: small bets with limited downside and uncapped upside, spread across enough companies that the winners can carry the portfolio.

Public equities. The profit engine for a stock is the underlying business. How does the company generate revenue? What are its costs? Are margins sustainable? A stock price over the long term reflects the earnings power of the company beneath it. If you cannot explain a company's business model and why its margins are durable, buying the stock is speculation, regardless of what the chart looks like.

These are different asset classes with different mechanics. But the discipline is identical. Before you invest, identify the profit engine. Understand how capital goes in and how returns come out. If the path from investment to return is not clear to you, do not proceed.

You Do Not Need to Run the Model

I want to be clear about what “decode the math” does and does not mean. It does not mean you need to build a financial model from scratch. It does not mean you need to verify every cell in a sponsor's proforma. It does not mean you need a finance degree or a CFA designation.

It means you need to understand the logic well enough to ask smart questions. There is a difference between running the numbers and making sense of the numbers. The sponsor or operator runs the

DEAD MONEY

numbers. Your job is to look at those numbers and ask: does this make sense? Are the assumptions reasonable? Is the logic sound?

That requires knowing some rule-of-thumb benchmarks for whatever asset class you are evaluating. In real estate development, that might mean knowing that construction costs in your market typically run between \$250 and \$400 per square foot depending on building type and finishes. It might mean knowing that a typical development margin is 15 to 20% and that anything significantly above that number requires an explanation. It might mean understanding that condo absorption rates in a healthy market usually run a certain number of units per month for a given price point and location.

You do not need to memorize these benchmarks. You need to know they exist and know how to check them. AI tools have made this remarkably easy. You can ask a question like “what is the average construction cost per square foot for mid-rise residential in Vancouver” and get a useful answer in seconds. You can look up comparable sale prices, absorption rate data, and cap rates for virtually any market. The information that used to require industry connections and paid databases is now accessible to anyone willing to spend fifteen minutes researching.

The point is not to calculate the return down to the decimal. The point is to determine whether the return makes sense. Does the math feel reasonable given what you know about the market and the asset class? Or does it depend on assumptions that seem aggressive, optimistic, or disconnected from observable data?

The Revenue Assumption Is Where Most Deals Go Wrong

If there is one thing I want you to take away from this chapter, it is this: the single most important number in any deal is the revenue assumption. Not the cost estimate. Not the fee structure. Not the timeline. The revenue assumption.

Why? Because everything else in a deal's financial model flows from what the finished product will sell for or the income it will generate. If the revenue projection is solid, there is room to absorb cost overruns, timeline delays, and unexpected expenses. The margin of safety is built into realistic revenue. But if the revenue projection is inflated, nothing else can save the deal. You can control costs to the penny and execute on schedule and still lose money if the product sells for less than the model assumed.

I have seen this pattern hundreds of times across my career. I reviewed a condo development proforma a few years ago that projected sale prices 12% above anything that had actually closed in the neighborhood. The construction budget was reasonable. The timeline was aggressive but plausible. The fee structure was standard. Everything checked out on the surface. The sponsor's explanation for the pricing was market trajectory. The market moved sideways. The units eventually sold at a discount, and the investors saw their projected 18% return shrink to single digits. The deal was not fraudulent. The sponsor believed in the growth assumption. But the entire return depended on prices that the market never delivered.

DEAD MONEY

Baking in a reasonable increase in property values over a multi-year development timeline is not reckless. Real estate in most markets appreciates at roughly 7 to 10% per year over the long term. Expecting some price growth between today and a delivery date three years from now is a reasonable assumption grounded in long-term trends.

The problem is when the model only shows the revenue side of the growth equation. Costs increase too. Construction materials, labor, permits, financing. If the sponsor is projecting that sale prices will rise 15% over the build period but not adjusting costs upward by a similar factor, the model is quietly inflating the margin. What matters is the net increase: how much more revenue grows relative to how much costs grow. A deal that projects revenue based entirely on today's prices is conservative. A deal that includes a reasonable annual increase consistent with historical trends is still grounded. A deal that depends on aggressive above-trend growth to hit its target return, with no corresponding adjustment on the cost side, is a different animal. You need to see these assumptions clearly and understand how much of the projected return comes from growth versus from the deal's fundamentals at current prices.

A Note on Presales in Development

Before we leave the revenue discussion, there is a structural feature of most residential development deals that changes the math. Presales.

In most residential development projects, the developer does not build first and sell later. They presell. Before construction begins, they market the units, take deposits, and sign purchase agreements with

buyers. Banks typically require a certain threshold of presales before they will finance the construction.

This means that by the time a shovel hits the ground, the revenue is largely locked in. The sale prices are committed. That is important context when you are decoding the math, because it tells you that the real variable during the construction phase is not revenue. It is cost. Once presales are signed, every dollar of cost overrun comes directly out of the developer's margin. We will dig much deeper into the specific risk scenarios this creates, and how experienced developers mitigate them, in Chapter 8 when we cover the L filter: Locate the Risks. For now, the key takeaway is simple: in a presold development deal, the profit engine is driven by the spread between locked-in revenue and actual construction costs. Understanding that changes how you read the numbers.

The questions to ask are straightforward:

- Are the revenue projections based on actual recent comparable transactions in the same market?
- What is the absorption rate assumption, and how does it compare to what the market has actually delivered over the past 12 to 24 months?
- Does the pricing model include price appreciation assumptions? If so, what annual rate, and how does it compare to historical averages for that market? Are cost increases factored in at the same rate?
- What is the projected profit margin on the deal, and how does it compare to typical margins for this asset class and market?

That last question matters more than most investors realize. In real estate development, for example, profit margins typically run in the

DEAD MONEY

range of 15 to 20%. The math on a development deal is relatively straightforward, and margins do not vary wildly from project to project within the same market. If a deal is showing a margin well above that range, you need to understand why. And if it is showing a margin at the thin end, you need to understand how much room exists to absorb cost increases, timeline delays, or slower-than-expected absorption. The margin is the buffer. Knowing the typical range for the asset class you are evaluating tells you instantly whether a deal has breathing room or whether it is stretched to the limit.

The Three-Sentence Test

Here is a simple test I use on every deal that comes across my desk, and it has saved me from more bad investments than any financial model ever has.

I call it the three-sentence test. After reviewing an opportunity, I try to explain how the deal makes money in three sentences. Plain language. No jargon. No acronyms. If I can do it clearly, I understand the profit engine well enough to evaluate the rest. If I struggle, I either need more information or the deal is more complex than it should be.

Let me show you what this looks like in practice.

Real estate development example: “The developer is buying a vacant lot in a growing suburb for \$3 million. They will build 40 townhomes at a total cost of \$18 million including land, construction, and soft costs. Based on comparable sales in the neighborhood, those townhomes should sell for a total of \$24 million, leaving roughly \$6 million in gross profit before fees and investor distributions.”

That is clear. You can see where the money comes from. You can see what the key assumptions are: the land price, the construction cost, and the sale price. You can ask intelligent follow-up questions about any of those three numbers.

Private equity example: “The fund is buying a regional logistics company for \$50 million using \$20 million of investor capital and \$30 million of debt. They plan to cut operating costs by consolidating warehouse operations and grow revenue by expanding into two adjacent markets, which should increase annual profit from \$6 million to \$10 million. Because only \$20 million of equity was used, that profit improvement combined with the debt paydown means the equity investors could roughly triple their money when the business is sold, even without the company selling at a higher earnings multiple than what they paid.”

That is clear. You can see the purchase price, the capital structure, the value creation plan, and the role of leverage. You have enough to start asking questions.

Now here is what a failing three-sentence test sounds like:

Unclear example: “The developer is acquiring a portfolio of underperforming assets in emerging neighborhoods and repositioning them through a value-add strategy targeting above-market NOI within 24 months.”

That sounds professional. It uses all the right vocabulary. But it tells you nothing about where the profit actually comes from. What does “repositioning” mean in practice? What are they actually doing to the buildings? What does “above-market NOI” mean in dollar terms? How

DEAD MONEY

much are they paying for the assets, and what will they be worth after the work is done? You cannot tell from that description, which means you cannot evaluate the deal. And if the person pitching it cannot explain it more simply, either they do not understand it themselves or they do not want you to understand it. Neither possibility should make you comfortable writing a check.

Profit Engines Across Asset Classes

To help you pattern-match quickly, here is a reference table showing the core profit engine, the key assumption to pressure-test, and the red flag to watch for across common investment types.

Asset Class	Profit Engine	Key Assumption	Red Flag
Real Estate Development	Revenue minus costs minus margin determines land price	Sale prices and absorption rates based on current comparables	Revenue projections above current market with no justification
Private Equity	Improve profitability and amplify returns through leverage	Realistic cost reduction plan, revenue growth targets, and debt structure	Returns dependent on multiple expansion with no clear operational

			improvement plan
Venture Capital	Portfolio math: a few big winners cover many losses	Total addressable market size and path to revenue for each bet	Fund concentrated in too few bets or sector already overcrowded
Private Debt / Lending	Interest income on secured loans	Loan-to-value ratio and borrower creditworthiness	High yields with thin collateral coverage or unsecured positions
Public Equities	Earnings growth and dividend income from the underlying business	Sustainable margins, competitive moat, and growth trajectory	Price disconnected from earnings, story stock with no profits

Use this as your starting point. Every deal you evaluate through the framework adds depth to these patterns.

DEAD MONEY

The profit engine column tells you what to look for. The key assumption column tells you what to verify. The red flag column tells you when to walk away.

Over time, you will develop your own pattern library. Every deal you evaluate through the DEALS framework adds to your database of what good deals look like and what bad deals look like. The framework is not just a decision tool. It is a learning system.

When the Sponsor Cannot Explain It Simply

There is one more thing to address before we move to implementation. What happens when you ask a sponsor to explain how their deal makes money and they cannot do it clearly?

This happens more often than you might expect.

Sometimes the sponsor is honestly struggling to simplify something that is genuinely complex. The deal has multiple revenue streams, layered capital structures, or unusual mechanics that do not reduce easily to three sentences. That is not automatically disqualifying. Ask the sponsor to explain each component separately. Break it into pieces. Can they explain how each revenue stream works, one at a time? If yes, you can piece the picture together yourself. If they cannot explain even the individual components simply, that is a different problem.

Other times, the complexity is intentional. The sponsor does not want you to see how thin the margins are, how aggressive the assumptions are, or how dependent the return is on a single optimistic outcome. Complexity becomes a shield. If you cannot understand the deal, you

cannot question it. And if you cannot question it, the sponsor does not have to defend it.

I have sat across the table from both types. The difference is usually obvious within a few minutes. The honest sponsor who is struggling to simplify will welcome your questions, slow down, and try different explanations until you get it. The sponsor who is hiding behind complexity will get defensive, redirect your questions, or tell you that “the model handles all of that” without ever explaining what the model is actually doing.

Your rule is simple. If you cannot understand how the deal makes money after a reasonable effort to decode it, do not invest. It does not matter how good the projected return looks. It does not matter how impressive the sponsor’s resume is. It does not matter how many other investors are already in. If you cannot explain it, you cannot evaluate it. And if you cannot evaluate it, you are gambling, not investing.

The Decode Checklist

Here is a set of plain-language questions to use on any investment opportunity. These are the questions that implement the D filter of the DEALS framework. You can ask them directly to the sponsor, GP, or fund manager. You can also use them to evaluate a pitch deck or offering memorandum on your own.

Print these out. Keep them in a folder or save them on your phone. Pull them out every time someone brings you a deal.

Question 1: “Walk me through how this investment makes money in three sentences.”

DEAD MONEY

This is the opening question and the most important one. You are not looking for a technical answer. You are looking for clarity. Can the person pitching this deal explain the profit engine in plain language? If they cannot, that is significant information. A well-underwritten deal with a clear thesis should be easy to explain simply. If the explanation is confused, circular, or packed with jargon, slow down and ask follow-up questions until you either understand it or determine that clarity is not available.

Question 2: “What are the key assumptions driving the revenue projection?”

This is where you find out whether the deal is built on solid ground or wishful thinking. You want to know what the revenue number is based on. Are the sale prices based on actual comparable transactions from the past 6 to 12 months? Is the rental income assumption based on current lease rates in the market? Is the exit assumption based on realistic profitability improvements and recent M&A transactions in the same sector? Or are the revenue assumptions based on what the sponsor thinks the market will do in two or three years? One of those foundations is concrete. The other is a guess dressed up in a spreadsheet.

Question 3: “What specific factors could squeeze the profit margin on this deal?”

Every investment has a margin between what it earns and what it costs. Your job here is to understand what threatens that margin from the cost side. In real estate development, the realistic pressures are construction cost overruns, timeline delays that increase financing costs, and slower absorption that extends carrying costs. In PE, the

equivalent question is what happens if the operational improvements take longer or the exit market softens. In lending, it is what happens if defaults run higher than projected. You are not asking about hypothetical worst-case scenarios that would obviously kill any deal. You are asking about the common, realistic pressures that erode margins in practice. The answer tells you whether the deal has breathing room or whether it is stretched to the limit.

Question 4: “What are the total project costs, and is there a contingency budget?”

Costs matter. In a development deal, you want to know the total budget including hard costs, soft costs, financing costs, and any contingency reserves. A deal with no contingency budget is a deal that assumes nothing will go wrong. That is not conservative underwriting. That is optimism. You want to see a contingency line item, and you want to understand what percentage of total costs it represents. In development, a contingency of 5 to 10% on hard costs is common practice. Below that, the deal is exposed to any cost surprise, and cost surprises in construction are not rare events. They are near certainties.

Question 5: “Does the revenue forecast include price appreciation, and if so, how much? Are cost increases also factored in?”

This question forces the sponsor to be transparent about what portion of the projected return comes from market growth versus the deal’s fundamentals at today’s prices. A reasonable annual increase consistent with historical market trends is not a problem. Real estate in most markets appreciates at roughly 7 to 10% per year over the long term, so some growth assumption over a multi-year project is

DEAD MONEY

grounded in reality. But costs also rise over time. Materials, labor, permits, financing. If the model shows revenue climbing while costs stay flat, the margin is being quietly inflated. What you want to see is the net effect: revenue growth minus cost growth. That net number is the real driver. And if the deal only hits its target return because of aggressive above-trend appreciation on the revenue side with no corresponding adjustment on the cost side, you need to weigh that carefully given the specific market conditions.

Question 6: “What happens to the deal if costs increase by 10% and the timeline extends by six months?”

This is the combined stress test. Question 3 tests the margin in general terms. This question tests what happens when two realistic pressures hit at the same time. In development, cost overruns and timeline delays are not edge cases. They are common. And they compound each other, because a longer timeline means more months of financing costs on top of the higher construction budget. In PE, the equivalent is operational improvements taking longer than expected while the holding period extends and debt service accumulates. You want to know whether the deal can absorb these pressures and still protect your capital. If the sponsor has not modeled a scenario where things take longer and cost more, that tells you something about the depth of their underwriting.

How to Use These Questions

You do not need to ask all six questions in a formal meeting. You can extract the answers from a pitch deck, an offering memorandum, or a conversation over coffee. The format does not matter. What matters is

that by the time you finish your initial review, you can answer each one.

Here is a practical approach:

Step 1: Read the deal summary or pitch deck first. Try to answer the three-sentence test on your own. If you can, great. Move to the assumption questions. If you cannot, that is your first follow-up with the sponsor.

Step 2: Identify the key revenue assumption. Look for the sale price, rental income, exit value, or whatever drives the top line. Check it against publicly available market data. AI tools, real estate listing databases, industry reports, and comparable transaction records are all useful here. You are not building your own model. You are sanity-checking theirs.

Step 3: Run a quick mental stress test. What is the profit margin, and what would realistically squeeze it? If costs go up by 10% and the timeline extends by a few months, is there a buffer? You do not need precise calculations at this stage. You need a rough sense of whether the deal has breathing room or whether the margin is so thin that any cost pressure will wipe it out.

Step 4: Score the D filter on your DEALS scorecard. Pass means you understand the profit engine, the assumptions are grounded in current market data, and there is a margin of safety. Conditional means you need more information to verify one or more assumptions. Fail means the profit engine is unclear, the revenue assumptions are unsupported, or the deal has no margin of safety against a reasonable downside scenario.

DEAD MONEY

That is it. Four steps. You can complete them in under an hour for most deals. Ten minutes if you already know the asset class and the market.

A Note on Using AI Tools

I want to mention this because it has changed the game for individual investors. Five years ago, researching market benchmarks, comparable transactions, and construction cost data required either industry experience or paid databases. Today, you can ask an AI assistant to look up average construction costs per square foot in a specific market, recent comparable sales within a kilometer of a proposed development site, typical cap rates for industrial properties in a given city, or standard management fee ranges for private equity funds.

The information is not perfect. AI outputs should be verified against primary sources when possible. But as a starting point for sanity-checking a deal's assumptions, these tools are a significant advantage. They compress hours of research into minutes. And they remove one of the biggest barriers that kept individual investors from doing proper due diligence: the time cost of finding baseline data.

Use them. They make the Decode filter faster and easier to apply than it has ever been.

If you start applying the Decode filter to every opportunity that comes your way, the first thing that happens is surprisingly simple. You start saying no faster.

That sounds negative, but it is actually the most valuable outcome. Most of the deals you will encounter in your investing life will not

survive this filter. The revenue assumptions will be too aggressive. The profit engine will be unclear. The sponsor will not be able to explain how the deal makes money without retreating into jargon. And you will see it. Quickly. Without spending weeks in analysis paralysis. Every bad deal you filter out in ten minutes is capital you preserved. And every minute you spend applying this filter is a minute your capital is no longer sitting dead while you agonize over whether to act.

Saying no quickly is the superpower of a systematic investor. Every questionable opportunity you filter out early is capital you preserved for something better. The DEALS framework is as much about knowing what to skip as it is about knowing what to pursue.

The second thing that happens is that your conversations with sponsors and operators get sharper. When you start asking “walk me through how this makes money in three sentences” and “what is the profit margin and what happens if costs run 10% over budget,” the quality of the dialogue changes. Good operators will recognize that you are a serious, informed investor. They will respect the questions and give you direct answers. Bad operators will get uncomfortable, redirect, or pile on complexity. Both reactions give you useful information.

Over time, you also develop something that no book or framework can give you directly: pattern recognition. After you have evaluated a handful of deals through this filter, you start recognizing the patterns. The aggressive assumptions start jumping off the page the way a worn brake pad jumps out at a mechanic. It becomes instinctive. But the instinct only develops through repetition, and repetition requires a framework to guide the process.

DEAD MONEY

The Decode filter is the foundation of that process. If the math does not make sense, nothing else in the evaluation matters. Get this one right, and you have already eliminated the majority of bad deals before you spend any real time on them.

In the next chapter, we move to the second filter. You now understand how the deal makes money. But understanding the profit engine does not tell you how the profits get split, or whether the structure is tilted in the sponsor's favor. That is where most investors get quietly squeezed.

Is it a good deal considering the return and the risks?

Turn the page.

CHAPTER 6

E — Evaluate the Deal

Is it a good deal considering the return and the risks?

The project returned 17.2% IRR. The investor earned 9.8%. Here is how that happened.

A real estate development sponsor brought an investor a condo project. Mid-rise building, experienced developer, growing suburb, 16% projected IRR over a four-year hold. The investor ran it through the Decode filter and understood the profit engine. Revenue minus costs minus margin. Simple.

So they invested. Four years later, the project was completed. The condos sold. The developer reported a gross return of 17.2% IRR on the project. Even better than projected.

Then they got the distribution statement. Their net return after all fees was 9.8%.

Where did the other 7.4% go?

It went to the fee structure. A 2% annual asset management fee on committed capital. A 3% acquisition fee. A 1% disposition fee on exit. A 20% performance fee calculated on gross returns with no hurdle rate, meaning the operator started taking their cut from the first dollar of profit. By the time you subtract the layers of fees from the headline number, nearly half the return went to the sponsor.

DEAD MONEY

The deal performed well. The market cooperated. The construction came in on budget. And the investor still earned less than 10%. Not because the project failed, but because the deal was structured to pay the operator before the investor.

This is the problem the E filter solves. Understanding how a deal makes money, which is the D filter, is important but it is not the whole picture. You also need to understand whether the deal is good for you. Not good in the abstract. Good considering the return you are actually getting, the risks you are actually taking, and the structure that determines how profits are divided between you and the operator.

Bad numbers are easy to spot. The deals that actually hurt investors are the ones with great numbers built on aggressive assumptions and structures that pay the operator whether the investor wins or not. Learning to see through both is worth more than any single deal you will ever find.

What the E Filter Is Really About

A deal can have a sound profit engine and realistic assumptions and still be a bad deal for the investor. How? Because the way profits are divided between you and the operator eats the return you thought you were getting. Because the fee structure pays the operator handsomely regardless of how you do. Because the headline return that attracted you is a gross number, and the net number, the one that actually lands in your account, is dramatically lower.

This is the layer most investors skip, and it is the layer that most directly determines your actual outcome. You can do everything right

on the D filter, understand the math perfectly, and still end up disappointed because you never examined how the pie gets split.

How the Pie Gets Split

The deal's gross performance might be excellent. But your net return depends entirely on how the profits are divided between you and the operator.

There are two broad categories of fees in most private investment structures. Understanding the difference is essential.

Management fees are charged for running the deal. They are typically calculated as a percentage of committed capital or assets under management and they are paid regardless of performance. Common examples include an annual asset management fee of 1 to 2%, an acquisition fee of 1 to 3% charged when the deal closes, and sometimes a disposition fee charged on exit. These fees compensate the operator for their time and overhead. Running a development project or a fund requires staff, legal work, accounting, and operational infrastructure. The operator needs to cover those costs.

The issue arises when management fees are excessive relative to the deal size, or when they are structured in a way that pays the operator handsomely regardless of how the investment performs for you. If the management fee layer is large enough, the operator makes good money even on a deal that barely returns your capital. That is a misalignment of interests.

Performance fees (also called carry, carried interest, or incentive fees) are charged as a percentage of the profits. This is where alignment gets

DEAD MONEY

interesting, because the details of how performance fees are structured matter enormously.

Let me walk through the key terms you need to understand.

The carry split. The most common structure in private equity and real estate is an 80/20 split. This means 80% of the profits go to the investors (called limited partners or LPs) and 20% goes to the operator (called the general partner or GP). Variations exist. Some deals are 70/30. Some use tiered structures where the split changes at different return thresholds. But 80/20 is the industry standard and a useful baseline for comparison.

The hurdle rate. This is the minimum return investors must receive before the operator earns any performance fee. A hurdle rate of 8% means the first 8% of annual return goes entirely to investors. The operator's carry only kicks in on profits above that threshold. A deal with no hurdle rate means the operator starts taking 20% from the very first dollar of profit. That is a significant difference. If a deal returns 10% with no hurdle, the operator takes 2% and you keep 8%. If the same deal has an 8% hurdle, the operator only takes 20% of the profits above 8%, which on a 10% return means they take 0.4% and you keep 9.6%. Same gross return. Very different net return to you.

Hurdle Rate Impact on Investor Returns

Gross Return	Hurdle Rate	Carry to Operator	Net to Investor
12%	None (0%)	2.4% (20% of 12%)	9.6%
12%	8%	0.8% (20% of 4%)	11.2%
15%	None (0%)	3.0% (20% of 15%)	12.0%
15%	8%	1.4% (20% of 7%)	13.6%

Note: Simplified illustration excluding management fees and catch-up provisions. Actual structures vary.

Look at the difference. On a 12% gross return, the gap between no hurdle and an 8% hurdle is 1.6% of net return to the investor. Over a multi-year hold, compounded across multiple deals, that gap is substantial. Over a 30-year investing life, it is enormous. This is exactly the kind of incremental percentage point that Chapter 1 showed you is worth millions over time.

The catch-up provision. This is a mechanism that exists in some structures to ensure the operator eventually receives their full 20% carry on all profits, not just on the profits above the hurdle. Here is how it works. Once the hurdle rate has been met and investors have received their preferred return, the next tranche of profit goes entirely or mostly to the operator until they have "caught up" to a full 20% share of all profits earned from dollar one. After the catch-up is

DEAD MONEY

complete, the remaining profits are split at the agreed ratio, typically 80/20.

Catch-up provisions are common in institutional private equity. They are not inherently unfair. The logic is that the hurdle rate protects investors on the downside, and the catch-up ensures the operator is still compensated fully when the deal performs well. But the presence or absence of a catch-up meaningfully affects your net return, especially on deals that perform near or just above the hurdle. You need to know whether it exists and how it is calculated.

How fees interact. Here is the part that most investors miss.

Management fees and performance fees are not separate costs. They stack. A deal that charges a 2% annual management fee and a 20% carry with no hurdle is extracting a very different amount from your return than a deal that charges a 1% management fee and a 20% carry above an 8% hurdle. Both might describe themselves as "standard industry terms." Both might sound reasonable in isolation. But the cumulative impact on your net return is significantly different.

Let me show you exactly how this plays out on a real number. Say you invest \$500,000 in a four-year development deal. The deal charges a 2% annual management fee on committed capital and a 20% carry with no hurdle rate. The project returns a gross IRR of 15%.

Management fees over four years: 2% of \$500,000 per year equals \$10,000 per year, or \$40,000 total. Gross profit on the deal: approximately \$300,000. Performance fee: 20% of \$300,000 equals \$60,000 to the operator. Your net profit: \$300,000 minus \$40,000 in management fees minus \$60,000 in carry equals \$200,000. Your net IRR: roughly 10%.

Now run the same deal with a 1% annual management fee and a 20% carry above an 8% hurdle. Management fees over four years: \$20,000 total. The first 8% of annual return goes to you. The operator only takes 20% of profits above that threshold. Your net profit: approximately \$252,000. Your net IRR: roughly 12.6%.

Same project. Same gross return. But the second structure puts an extra \$52,000 in your pocket on a single deal. Multiply that across a portfolio of five deals over a decade, and the difference is not incremental. It is transformational.

Always calculate the total fee load. Add up all the management fees over the projected hold period. Then add the expected performance fee based on the projected return. Subtract both from the gross projected return. That net number is what you are actually earning. If it is still attractive, the deal may be worth pursuing. If the gross return looks great but the net return looks ordinary, the structure is the problem.

The Return-Risk Ratio

Once you understand the math from the D filter and the fee structure from this chapter, you can answer the real question: is the return I am getting worth the risk I am taking?

This sounds obvious. But most investors do not think about it this way. They look at the projected return and decide whether it sounds attractive in absolute terms. Fifteen percent sounds good. Twenty percent sounds great. But those numbers are meaningless without context.

Here is what I mean. Consider two deals side by side.

DEAD MONEY

Deal A projects a 15% net return after fees. The leverage is 60% loan-to-value. The profit margin has a 20% buffer before investors lose money. The operator has built twelve similar projects, has co-invested their own capital, and the carry kicks in above an 8% hurdle.

Deal B projects an 18% gross return. The leverage is 80% loan-to-value. The profit margin has an 8% buffer. The operator is on their second project, charges a 2.5% management fee, and takes 20% carry from dollar one with no hurdle. After fees, the net return drops to around 13%.

Most investors would look at those two deals and be drawn to the 18% headline. But Deal A at 15% net with conservative structure and downside protection is a fundamentally stronger risk-adjusted investment than Deal B at 13% net with thin margins, heavy leverage, and a fee structure that pays the operator regardless of your outcome. Same ballpark return. Wildly different risk profiles. The first is an investment. The second is a gamble with a professional pitch deck.

The return-risk ratio is how you compare opportunities on an apples-to-apples basis. You are not asking "what is the return." You are asking "what return am I getting per unit of risk."

This is where the DEALS framework starts connecting to itself. The D filter gave you the profit engine and the key assumptions. The E filter gives you the fee structure and the risk-return assessment. Together, they produce a picture of what you are likely to earn net of fees, and whether that net return justifies the risk. That picture is what you compare across opportunities. Not the headline IRR from the pitch deck. The fee-adjusted, risk-adjusted net return.

Staying Focused on the Right Question

The E filter does not ask you to compare every deal in the market against every other deal. It asks you to evaluate each deal on its own terms: given the net return after fees and the risks involved, does this deal compensate me fairly for the risk and the illiquidity?

That question works regardless of asset class, time horizon, or structure. A three-year development deal and a seven-year PE fund have different risk profiles, different liquidity profiles, and different fee structures. You do not need to build a unified risk model to handle that. You need to ask the same core question of each one individually. No single number will ever tell you whether a deal is good. But evaluating the structure and the risk-return ratio gives you something much better than a number. It gives you judgment.

The question of how multiple deals fit together in a portfolio is a separate question, and we will address it in Chapter 9 when we cover the S filter: Spread Your Capital.

The Evaluate Checklist

The E filter focuses on whether the deal is structured fairly and whether the return justifies the risk. By this point, you have already decoded the profit engine and the key assumptions through the D filter. Now you are asking: given what I know about this deal, am I getting a fair shake?

Here are the questions to ask.

Question 1: "What fees does the operator charge, and when are they collected?"

DEAD MONEY

Get a complete list. Acquisition fees, annual management fees, disposition fees, construction management fees, financing fees. Write them all down. For each one, note whether it is charged upfront, annually, or on exit. Calculate the total fee load over the projected hold period. If the total fees represent more than 3 to 5% of committed capital annually, you need to look closely at whether the net return still justifies the investment.

Question 2: "Does the fee structure incentivize the operator to protect the downside or to swing for maximum upside?"

This is the alignment question, and it is the most important one in this chapter. An operator who earns large management fees regardless of performance has less incentive to protect your capital. An operator who earns most of their compensation through carry above a hurdle rate has a strong incentive to deliver results. Look at where the operator's paycheck comes from, and you will understand how they will behave when things get difficult. The structure tells you whose interests are being served.

Question 3: "What is the carry or performance fee, and is there a hurdle rate?"

A 20% carry with an 8% hurdle is standard and fair. A 20% carry with no hurdle pays the operator from dollar one. A 30% carry is above market and needs strong justification through exceptional track record. Know what you are agreeing to and calculate the impact on your net return at the projected performance level.

Question 4: "Is there a catch-up provision?"

If yes, understand how it works. After the hurdle is met, how much of the next tranche goes to the operator? 100% until they catch up, or a partial catch-up? This directly affects your net return on deals that perform above the hurdle but not dramatically so.

Question 5: "What is my net return after all fees, and does it justify the risk and the illiquidity?"

This is the final question that ties everything together. Add up all management fees over the projected hold period. Add the expected performance fee based on the projected return. Subtract both from the gross projected return. That net number is what you are actually earning. Now compare it to what you could earn in a liquid, lower-risk vehicle. The difference is the premium you are being paid for accepting illiquidity and private market risk. If that premium is meaningful, the deal may be worth pursuing. If the gross return looks great but the net return is only a point or two above what a balanced portfolio would deliver, the structure has eaten the advantage.

How to Score the E Filter

After working through the checklist, score the E filter on your DEALS scorecard.

Pass means the fee structure is fair, with a hurdle rate, reasonable management fees, and clear alignment between operator compensation and investor returns. The net return after all fees justifies the risk and illiquidity you are accepting.

DEAD MONEY

Conditional means the fee structure has one or more elements that need clarification or negotiation. The deal may still be worth pursuing, but you need specific answers before you can determine whether the net return is fair. You have a clear list of what to follow up on.

Fail means the fee structure is heavily tilted toward the operator, with no hurdle rate, excessive management fees, or a structure where the operator gets paid well regardless of investor outcomes. Or the net return after fees does not justify the risk and illiquidity. If the structure is wrong, no amount of strong performance will make this a good deal for you.

A Note on Negotiation

Here is something most investors do not realize: fee structures are often negotiable, especially for larger commitments. If you are writing a check for \$250,000 or more into a deal, you have the standing to ask questions and sometimes request adjustments. Not every sponsor will negotiate. But the ones who are confident in their deal and their track record will often have a conversation about structure if the investor is serious and informed.

You do not need to be aggressive about this. A simple question works: "Can you walk me through the rationale for the fee structure and how it compares to market standards for this type of deal?" That question accomplishes two things. It signals that you are a knowledgeable investor who understands how structures work. And it gives the sponsor an opportunity to either justify their fees or adjust them. Both outcomes are useful to you.

Asking about fee structure is not aggressive or adversarial. It is what informed investors do. The question itself signals that you are not the passive LP who signs on page 47 without reading it. You are the investor the sponsor wants in the deal because you understand how it works.

The worst thing you can do is ignore the fee structure entirely and focus only on the headline return. That is how investors end up in deals where the project performs well and their net return is mediocre. The fee structure is not a detail. It is a primary determinant of your outcome.

When you start evaluating deals through the E filter, something changes in how you see opportunities. You stop looking at headline returns and start looking at net returns. You stop comparing pitch decks and start comparing fee loads.

Compare the deal from the opening of this chapter to one I evaluated recently. The gross projected return was 15%. Nothing flashy. But the management fee was 1%, there was an 8% hurdle rate, the operator had co-invested 10% of their own capital, and the net projected return after all fees was around 13%. That 13% on conservative assumptions with genuine alignment was worth more than the 16% headline number that turned into 9.8% in that investor's pocket. When you find a deal that passes the E filter, you can proceed to the next three filters with real confidence that the economics work in your favor.

The next time you open an offering memorandum, you will flip to the fee structure first. Not the renderings, not the market analysis, not the projected IRR. The fees. Because that is where you will find the answer

DEAD MONEY

to the only question that matters at this stage: is this deal built for me, or for the operator?

Over time, your fee literacy becomes one of your most valuable assets as an investor. Most investors in the private markets never do this analysis. They look at the projected return, they evaluate the asset and the operator, and they sign. The fee structure is buried on page 47 of the offering memorandum, and nobody reads page 47. You will. And that single habit will save you more money over your investing life than almost any other skill in this book.

You now know how the deal makes money. You know whether the deal is good for you considering the return and the risks. The next question is about the person behind the deal. Because a well-structured deal with the wrong operator still fails.

Who is managing my capital, and how much skin in the game do they have?

Turn the page.

CHAPTER 7

A — Assess the Operator

The person behind the deal matters more than the deal itself

In 2017, two development deals launched in the same city, in the same quarter, targeting the same buyer profile. Similar unit counts.

Comparable price points. Nearly identical projected returns on paper.

Deal One was run by an operator who had built and delivered over a dozen projects across two market cycles. He had invested his own capital alongside his investors in every deal he had ever done. His quarterly reports were detailed, honest, and arrived on schedule. When a previous project hit a cost overrun, he disclosed it within two weeks, explained the cause, outlined the mitigation plan, and delivered the final return within half a point of his original projection. His investors did not panic because they were never surprised.

Deal Two was run by an operator who had completed two projects, both during a rising market. His marketing was polished. His pitch events were impressive. He projected higher returns than Deal One and spoke with absolute confidence about timelines and margins. He had not invested any of his own capital in the deal. His previous investor communications were glossy one-pagers that read more like brochures than financial reports.

Both deals hit the same headwind eighteen months in. A shift in municipal permitting requirements added four months to the timeline

DEAD MONEY

and roughly 8% to the soft cost budget. Not catastrophic. Not unusual. Just the kind of friction that every development project encounters at some point.

The first operator adjusted. He had built contingency into his budget. He renegotiated the construction draw schedule with the lender. He communicated the delay and the revised timeline to investors within ten days. The project delivered six months late, and the final return came in at 12.4% IRR instead of the projected 14%. Investors were informed every step of the way. Nobody was happy about the delay, but nobody was blindsided.

The second operator went quiet. The quarterly update that was due in March arrived in June. It was vague. When investors called, they reached voicemail. The project eventually delivered fourteen months behind schedule. The additional carrying costs, combined with a softening resale market, pushed the final return down to 4.1% IRR. Some investors did not receive their final accounting for another eight months after that.

Same city. Same market. Same headwind. One operator delivered a solid result through a difficult period. The other turned a manageable setback into a near-total loss of investor trust and most of their expected return.

The deal did not fail. The operator failed.

You can decode the math. You can evaluate the structure. You can locate the risks. But if the person running the deal cannot execute under pressure, communicate honestly when things go sideways, and

protect your downside when the plan hits reality, none of that analysis matters.

The quality of the operator determines the outcome more than the quality of the deal. A mediocre project with a disciplined, experienced operator behind it will find a way. A beautiful proforma with the wrong person running it will fall apart. The single highest-leverage question in private investing is not “what am I investing in?” It is “who is managing my capital?”

The Operator Is the Investment

Most investors spend 90% of their due diligence on the deal and 10% on the operator. The ratio should be reversed.

In my years reviewing investor questions before a deal closes, the pattern has been consistent. Investors will ask fifteen questions about the proforma, the construction budget, the timeline, the comparable sales. Maybe one or two questions about the sponsor’s background. The deal gets scrutinized. The operator gets a glance. That is backwards.

Here is why. The deal is a plan. A proforma. A set of assumptions about what will happen over the next three to seven years. Every plan changes on contact with reality. Costs shift. Timelines extend. Markets soften or overheat. Regulations change. Tenants default. Contractors underperform. Interest rates move. None of these are hypothetical. They are certainties. The only question is which ones hit your specific deal and when.

DEAD MONEY

The operator is the person who navigates those changes. Their experience is the difference between a cost overrun that gets handled quietly and one that spirals into something much worse. Their relationships determine whether a contractor delay gets resolved in weeks or months. Their financial discipline determines whether contingency reserves actually exist when they are needed. How they communicate determines whether you spend the hold period feeling informed or feeling abandoned.

I have seen beautifully underwritten deals collapse because the operator could not manage a general contractor. I have seen deals with thin margins succeed because the operator had twenty years of relationships and knew exactly which levers to pull when the timeline slipped. The numbers on the page are a starting point. The operator is the engine that turns those numbers into your return.

When you invest in a private deal, you are not buying a building or a fund or a financial projection. You are hiring a manager for your capital. And you would not hire someone to run your business without checking their track record and their character under pressure. Your investment capital deserves the same scrutiny.

What to Look For: The Universal Markers

I have worked with and alongside dozens of operators over two decades in real estate private equity. I have also seen hundreds of deal pitches from sponsors I ultimately passed on. Over that time, patterns became clear. The operators who consistently deliver for their investors share a set of traits. And the ones who disappoint share a different set.

These markers are not specific to real estate. They apply to any private investment where someone else is managing your capital. Private equity, venture, private debt, operating businesses. The asset class changes but the human qualities that separate good operators from bad ones do not.

Marker 1: Skin in the game.

This is the single most important indicator of alignment. Does the operator have their own meaningful capital invested in the deal, alongside yours, on the same terms?

I am not talking about a token amount. I am talking about a sum that would genuinely hurt them to lose. The specific number varies by deal size and operator, but the principle is absolute. If the operator is asking you to commit \$200,000 of your family's wealth and they have zero of their own money at risk, you need to ask yourself why. If the deal is as good as they say it is, why are they not investing in it?

There are legitimate reasons an operator might invest less than you would like. A younger operator building their track record may not have accumulated significant personal capital yet. An operator running multiple concurrent deals may spread their co-investment across several projects. And experienced operators who have personally guaranteed bank financing on active projects have real financial exposure that does not show up as a line item on the co-investment schedule. Those are fair explanations. But "I don't invest in my own deals" is not. That is a disqualifying statement.

When an operator has real money at risk, their behavior changes. They negotiate harder with contractors. They build larger contingency

DEAD MONEY

reserves. They stress-test assumptions more carefully. They communicate more transparently, because they are living the same outcome you are. Alignment of interest is not a nice-to-have. It is the foundation of the entire relationship.

Marker 2: A track record across market cycles.

Everyone looks like a genius in a rising market. Construction costs stay predictable. Units sell fast. Financing is cheap. Margins are fat. The operators who launched during a bull run and have only operated during a bull run have never been tested.

The real question is: what happened when things got hard? What did the operator do during the last downturn, the last rate hike, the last time the market shifted underneath them mid-project?

An operator with experience across multiple market environments has done something invaluable. They have made mistakes and recovered from them. That matters more than any case study. They have learned which risks are real and which ones are noise. They have built relationships with lenders, contractors, and buyers that survive difficult times. They have developed the judgment to know when to push forward and when to pause.

A track record that only includes favorable conditions tells you almost nothing about how the operator will perform when your capital needs them most. Ask specifically about deals that went sideways. Every experienced operator has at least one. How they talk about it tells you more than every successful case study combined.

Marker 3: Transparent and consistent communication.

The fastest way to learn how an operator will treat you as an investor is to look at how they communicate. Not what they say in the pitch meeting. What they put in writing after they have your money. And you can test this before you invest a dollar.

A good operator has a defined reporting cadence. The frequency should match the stage of the project. During active construction, quarterly updates are reasonable. During earlier stages like permitting and approvals, where progress moves more slowly and there is simply less to report, twice a year is often sufficient. What matters is that the cadence is set in advance, that reports arrive when promised, and that they contain real information: project status, budget tracking, timeline updates, risk disclosures, and honest commentary on what is going well and what is not. They are written in plain language, not marketing speak.

A bad operator communicates when things are going well and goes quiet when things are not. Their updates are vague, delayed, or formatted to look impressive without actually saying anything substantive. They respond to investor inquiries slowly or defensively. They treat communication as a burden rather than a responsibility.

Here is a test I recommend to every investor before committing capital: ask the operator for copies of their last three quarterly or annual reports from a current or previous deal. Not the pitch deck. Not the offering memorandum. The actual investor updates they sent during the hold period. Read them. Are they specific? Are they honest about challenges? Do they include real numbers and timelines? Or are they polished summaries designed to reassure without informing?

DEAD MONEY

The quality of those reports tells you exactly what your experience will be as an investor in their next deal.

Marker 4: Conservative assumptions as a default.

Pay attention to how an operator talks about their projections. There is a revealing difference between an operator who says “we are projecting 15% IRR based on current market pricing with a 7% construction contingency” and one who says “we are targeting 20% IRR based on where we think the market is heading.”

The first operator is grounding their projection in today’s data and building a buffer. The second is baking in optimism and presenting it as a target.

Conservative underwriting is not about pessimism. It is about intellectual honesty. An operator who builds their proforma on current comparable sales rather than projected appreciation, who includes contingency line items in the budget, who stress-tests assumptions before presenting them to investors, is an operator who would rather underpromise and overdeliver than the reverse.

Over a multi-deal relationship, this habit matters enormously. Trust compounds just like capital does. The operator who consistently projects 12% and delivers 13% builds trust that compounds over time. The operator who projects 18% and delivers 11% erodes confidence, even though the absolute return might still be acceptable. Expectation management is a skill, and the best operators treat it as central to their practice.

Marker 5: Willingness to discuss what went wrong.

Ask any operator about their best deal and you will get a polished, enthusiastic answer. That tells you nothing useful. Ask them about a deal that underperformed and watch what happens.

A trustworthy operator will answer directly. They will explain what happened, what they learned, and what they changed as a result. They will not blame external factors exclusively. They will own their role in the outcome. They might even show you how a specific failure led to a process improvement that strengthened every subsequent deal.

An operator who claims they have never had a disappointing result is either lying, too inexperienced to have been tested, or too lacking in self-awareness to have learned from their mistakes. None of those are qualities you want in the person managing your capital.

Every seasoned operator has scar tissue. The ones worth investing with are the ones who will show you theirs and explain what it taught them.

Marker 6: Clear alignment of interests in the fee structure.

We covered fee structures in detail in Chapter 6. But from the operator assessment perspective, the fee structure tells you something important about the operator's confidence in their own deal.

An operator who charges heavy management fees and no hurdle rate is an operator who gets paid handsomely whether you do well or not. An operator who takes modest management fees and earns most of their compensation through carry above a meaningful hurdle rate is telling you: "I make my real money when you make money." That is alignment.

DEAD MONEY

Look at where the operator's economic incentive sits. If the structure pays them primarily for managing your money, their incentive is to raise more capital. If the structure pays them primarily for growing your money, their incentive is to deliver returns. You want the second arrangement.

The Operator-Deal Relationship

There is one more concept to understand before we move to implementation, and it ties together the A filter with the D and E filters you have already applied.

The operator and the deal are not independent variables. They are deeply connected. A great operator shapes the deal. They negotiate better land prices because of their reputation and relationships. They secure better financing terms because of their track record with lenders. They manage construction more tightly because they have done it dozens of times. They sell or lease faster because they understand the market and have built a brand that buyers and tenants trust.

I watched this play out at the most basic level years ago. Two builders were constructing similar houses in the same area. Same type of build. Comparable scope. One completed the house in three months. The other took fifteen months.

The difference was not the plan. The plans were nearly identical. The difference was the operator. The faster builder was diligent, hands-on, ran tight project management, and had strong relationships with his trades. His subtrades showed up when they were supposed to because they wanted to work with him again. The slower builder was

disorganized, hard to reach, and had burned through enough subcontractors that scheduling became a constant battle.

Same house. Same market. Five times the timeline.

That is what operator quality looks like in practice.

This means that the same deal, on paper, will produce a different outcome depending on who operates it. Two sponsors can start with the same piece of land, the same building plan, and the same market conditions, and deliver returns that are several points apart. The difference is execution. And execution is a function of the operator's experience, discipline, relationships, and character.

That is why the A filter carries so much weight in the DEALS framework. You can decode the math and the math can look solid. You can evaluate the structure and the structure can be fair. But if the operator cannot execute, the math is fiction and the structure is irrelevant. The operator turns the plan into reality. Everything else is a spreadsheet.

The Operator Assessment Checklist

Here is a structured set of questions to use when evaluating any sponsor, GP, or fund manager. These implement the A filter of the DEALS framework. You can ask them directly in a meeting or extract the answers from offering documents.

The goal is to score the operator across six dimensions, each corresponding to one of the universal markers above. For each dimension, you will gather information and assign a score of Pass, Conditional, or Fail.

DEAD MONEY

Dimension 1: Skin in the Game

Questions to ask:

“How much of your own capital are you investing in this deal?”

You are looking for a meaningful personal commitment. Keep in mind that experienced operators often have multiple projects running simultaneously and may have provided personal guarantees on bank financing for those projects. Those guarantees represent real financial exposure that does not show up as a dollar figure on the co-investment line. An operator who has personally guaranteed millions in construction loans across several active deals has significant skin in the game, even if their direct equity co-investment in any single deal appears modest relative to the total raise.

Score: Pass if the operator has meaningful personal capital in the deal on the same terms. Conditional if the co-investment exists but is small relative to deal size or operator wealth, or if the terms differ from LP terms. Fail if the operator has no personal capital at risk.

Dimension 2: Track Record

Questions to ask:

“How many deals have you completed and what were the realized returns, net of all fees?”

“How many of those deals were completed during a market downturn or challenging conditions?”

“Can you share a specific example of a deal that underperformed, and what you did about it?”

You are looking for a track record that includes realized returns, not just projected or gross returns. You want to see performance across different market conditions, not just favorable ones. And you want evidence that the operator has handled adversity with competence and integrity.

Score: Pass if the operator has a multi-deal, multi-cycle track record with verifiable realized returns and honest discussion of setbacks. Conditional if the track record is limited but promising, or if it covers only favorable market conditions. Fail if there is no verifiable track record, or if the operator cannot discuss any deal that went wrong.

Dimension 3: Communication Standards

Questions to ask:

“What is your standard reporting cadence and format for investors?”

“Can I see a sample of your actual quarterly or annual investor report from a current or previous deal?”

“How do you handle communication when a deal is off-plan?”

You are looking for a defined, consistent reporting process that includes real data, not just reassuring language. The sample report is the most revealing piece of due diligence in this entire dimension. Read it carefully. Does it include specific project updates, budget comparisons, timeline status, and risk disclosures? Or is it a one-page summary designed to keep investors from asking questions?

Score: Pass if the operator has a clear reporting cadence, provides substantive reports with real data, and has a defined process for communicating challenges. Conditional if reports exist but are thin, or

DEAD MONEY

if the cadence is inconsistent. Fail if the operator has no standard reporting process, cannot provide a sample report, or has a history of going silent during difficult periods.

Dimension 4: Underwriting Approach

Questions to ask:

“Are your projections based on current market comparables, or do they include price appreciation assumptions?”

“What contingency percentage is built into the budget?”

“What return does the deal produce in your downside scenario?”

You are looking for evidence that the operator defaults to conservative assumptions. Projections grounded in today’s market data.

Contingency reserves that account for realistic cost and timeline pressures. A downside scenario that still protects investor capital. If the operator’s base case depends on everything going right, their base case is actually their best case, and you should evaluate it accordingly.

Score: Pass if projections are grounded in current market data, contingency reserves are adequate, and a downside scenario has been modeled that still protects capital. Conditional if underwriting is reasonable but relies on some growth assumptions or has a thin contingency. Fail if projections are aggressive, contingency is absent or inadequate, or no downside scenario has been prepared.

Dimension 5: Response to Failure

Questions to ask:

“Tell me about a deal that did not go as planned. What happened and what did you do?”

“What specific process changes did you make as a result of that experience?”

You are looking for honesty, ownership, and evidence of learning. The operator who takes responsibility for their role in a setback and explains what they changed is an operator with nothing to hide. The operator who deflects blame, minimizes the impact, or gets defensive is showing you how they will behave when your capital is the one at stake.

Score: Pass if the operator discusses failures openly and demonstrates specific lessons learned. Conditional if the operator acknowledges setbacks but is vague about specifics or what they changed. Fail if the operator claims no deal has ever underperformed, deflects all blame to external factors, or refuses to discuss past challenges.

Dimension 6: Alignment of Incentives

Questions to ask:

“What percentage of your total compensation comes from management fees versus performance-based fees?”

“Is there a hurdle rate on your carry, and what is it?”

“If this deal returns only my principal and no profit, what do you earn?”

DEAD MONEY

You are looking for a structure where the operator's largest payday comes from delivering strong returns to investors, not from collecting fees on committed capital. The last question is particularly revealing. If the deal returns zero profit and the operator still walks away with significant fee income, the alignment is broken. They have been paid for your patience, not for your results.

Score: Pass if the majority of the operator's compensation is performance-based with a meaningful hurdle rate. Conditional if management fees are reasonable but carry terms are less favorable than market standards. Fail if the operator earns substantial fees regardless of investor outcomes and performance-based compensation is minimal or has no hurdle.

Scoring the A Filter

Once you have gathered information across all six dimensions, step back and look at the full picture.

Dimension	Pass	Conditional	Fail
Skin in the Game	Meaningful personal capital, same terms	Small or different-class co-investment	No personal capital at risk
Track Record	Multi-deal, multi-cycle, verified returns	Limited but promising; favorable conditions only	No verifiable record; no

			failure discussed
Communication	Defined cadence, substantive reports, proactive on problems	Reports exist but thin or inconsistent	No reporting process; history of silence
Underwriting	Current data, adequate contingency, downside modeled	Reasonable with some growth assumptions	Aggressive projections, no contingency
Response to Failure	Honest, specific, shows lessons learned	Acknowledges but vague on specifics	Claims perfection; deflects blame
Incentive Alignment	Performance-based pay with hurdle rate	Reasonable fees, less favorable carry terms	Heavy fees regardless of outcomes

These guidelines will not cover every edge case. But they will cover 90% of situations you will encounter. Score the operator honestly, look at the full picture, and trust the pattern the scores reveal.

DEAD MONEY

Your overall A filter score follows the same logic as every other filter in the DEALS framework.

Pass means the operator scores well across all six dimensions. You have high confidence in their ability to execute, communicate, and protect your capital.

Conditional means one or two dimensions need clarification or additional verification. Set a deadline. Get the information. If the conditionals convert to passes, proceed. If they do not, walk away.

Fail means one or more dimensions revealed a disqualifying weakness. No matter how attractive the deal looks on paper, the operator risk is too high. Pass and move on. There will be other deals with better operators.

How Long Should This Take?

A thorough operator assessment can be completed in about 30 to 60 minutes of focused work. That includes reviewing the offering documents for co-investment disclosure and fee structure, having a direct conversation with the operator or their team, and reviewing sample investor reports.

Thirty minutes of your time to evaluate the person who will manage your capital for the next five to seven years. That is the highest-return activity in your entire due diligence process. Do not skip it.

And once you have found an operator who passes every filter, subsequent deals with that same operator take a fraction of the time. Your first assessment is the investment. Every one after that is a shortcut.

When you start assessing operators with the same rigor you apply to the deal itself, something important shifts in how you experience private investing.

The most immediate shift is confidence. Not confidence in the deal's projections, which are always uncertain. Confidence in the person behind them. When you have verified that the operator has real skin in the game, a track record that includes adversity, communication standards that keep you informed, and an incentive structure that only pays them well when you do well, the emotional weight of the investment drops significantly. You are no longer wondering whether this person will disappear when things get tough. You have evidence that they will not.

After evaluating three or four operators through this checklist, you will also start noticing the tells immediately. The operator who talks extensively about projected returns but gets vague when asked about past challenges. The one who projects confidence in the pitch meeting but cannot produce a sample quarterly report. The one whose fee structure quietly guarantees them a strong payday regardless of your outcome. These patterns become visible fast once you know what to look for.

But the real shift happens over years, not deals. You start building relationships with operators you trust. Private investing is not a one-deal activity. The most successful investors I have worked with do not invest with a different sponsor every time. They find an operator who passes every filter, invest alongside them, verify the experience through the first deal cycle, and then continue to invest across multiple deals over years.

DEAD MONEY

That relationship compounds. The operator learns your preferences, your risk tolerance, your portfolio objectives. You learn their strengths, their process, their communication style. Each subsequent deal requires less due diligence because you have already verified the operator through real performance. Your evaluation shifts from “can I trust this person?” to “does this specific deal fit my portfolio?”

That is a fundamentally different position to invest from. And it only becomes available to investors who do the operator assessment properly on the front end.

You now know how the deal makes money. You know whether the deal is structured fairly. And you know whether the person running it is someone you can trust with your capital.

You now know how to find an operator you can trust. The next question is whether the deal itself can survive what the market throws at it. Because the risks you do not see are the ones that hurt you.

CHAPTER 8

L — Locate the Risks

What can go wrong, and who bears the consequences?

A few years ago, an investor I know reviewed a mid-rise residential development deal. The pitch deck was polished. The projected returns were strong. The risk section mentioned the usual suspects: construction timelines, market softening, interest rate movement. He read through it, felt satisfied the sponsor had been transparent, and wired his capital.

Eight months later, the project stalled. Not because of construction delays or a market downturn. The issue was the guarantee structure. The investor had signed into a joint venture arrangement where he shared personal liability on the construction loan. When the project hit a financing wall, the lender came after him directly for a debt he did not realize he had accepted. The risks he had evaluated were real. The risk that hurt him was one he never thought to look for.

There is no free lunch in finance. That principle sounds obvious, but most investors do not behave as if they believe it. They evaluate a deal, see an attractive projected return, and focus their energy on the upside. They ask how much they could make. They rarely spend equal time asking what could go wrong, how bad it could get, and who pays the price when it does.

DEAD MONEY

Risk sits at the center of every investment decision you will ever make. Every strategy, every asset class, every deal structure is simply a different arrangement of risks. Consider options trading: a trader who sells options collects steady premium income, but in exchange accepts the risk of large losses when markets move sharply. A trader who buys options for downside protection pays for it through daily time decay. Each strategy shifts the balance between different risks. None of them remove risk from the equation. When investors believe they have eliminated risk, they have usually just replaced one type with another they cannot see yet.

Outside of textbook examples, you can choose investments where the risk-return trade-off makes sense for your goals and time horizon. But the key word is choose. You have to see the risks clearly before you can choose intelligently. And most investors do not see them clearly, because most pitch decks are designed to make the opportunity look as attractive as possible, not to help you understand what could go wrong.

The investors who get hurt in private markets are not the ones who took risks. Every investor takes risks. The ones who get hurt are the ones who did not know which risks they were taking or who was carrying them. They signed documents they did not fully understand, accepted structures that shifted liability in ways they did not anticipate, and discovered the real risk profile of their investment only after something went wrong.

The L filter exists to prevent that. It is not about avoiding risk. That is impossible and, frankly, undesirable. Risk is the reason returns exist. If there were no risk, there would be no premium for bearing it. The goal is to understand what risks are present, whether the potential return

compensates you fairly for those risks, and whether the deal structure allocates those risks in a way that is transparent and reasonable.

In practice, the closest thing to a "holy grail" in investing is finding situations where risk is lower than what the market believes while the potential return remains attractive. When that happens, the odds tilt in the investor's favor. Understanding risk is not just part of investing. It is the foundation of it. And by the end of this chapter, you will have a single question that ties every risk together into one decisive test of whether a deal deserves your capital.

Two Dimensions of Risk

When most investors think about risk, they think about one thing: can I lose money? That is a valid concern, but it is the wrong stopping point. It is one question when you need two: what can go wrong, and who pays when it does.

To properly locate the risks in any private investment, you need to analyze two separate dimensions.

The first dimension is the risk taxonomy. What types of risk are present in this deal? Every private investment carries a specific combination of risks, and the mix changes depending on the asset class, the market, the structure, and the operator. Your job is to identify which risks are relevant to this particular opportunity and understand what each one means for your capital.

The second dimension is the risk allocation. For each risk you have identified, who bears it? This is where the legal structure of the investment becomes critically important. A risk that is carried by the

DEAD MONEY

operator is very different from a risk that is carried by you. And a risk that is shared between you and the operator can be structured fairly or unfairly, depending on the specifics.

The majority of investors stop at the first dimension. They ask "what could go wrong?" and leave it there. The second dimension is where the real due diligence happens. Knowing that a risk exists is not enough. You need to know who pays when that risk materializes.

The Risk Taxonomy: What Can Go Wrong

Every private investment has its own risk profile, and that profile should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. But there are categories of risk that appear across nearly every deal type. Understanding these categories gives you a vocabulary for identifying and discussing the risks in any opportunity you evaluate.

What follows is not an exhaustive list. It is a working framework. The specific risks that matter most will vary by deal, by market, and by asset class. AI tools can help you quickly research risks you are unfamiliar with in a particular sector. The goal is not to memorize every possible risk. It is to know the categories well enough that you can systematically check for each one.

To make these categories concrete, I will reference a composite deal throughout this section. Call it the Riverside project: a 120-unit mid-rise residential development in a secondary Canadian market. The sponsor is raising \$8 million in LP equity, has secured a \$16 million construction loan, and projects a 24-month build with unit sales beginning at month 18. The projected equity multiple is 1.7x over a 30-

month hold. Every risk category below showed up, in some form, in this deal.

Market risk.

External market conditions change in a way that hurts the deal. In the Riverside project, market risk meant that comparable unit prices in the area could soften between the time the land was acquired and the time the finished units hit the market. A shift in buyer preferences, a competing development launching nearby, or a broader economic downturn could all reduce the sale prices the sponsor was projecting. In PE, market risk might mean a recession that reduces the target company's revenue or compresses the exit multiple.

No operator can fully control market risk. They can mitigate it through conservative underwriting, diversification, and timing, but they cannot eliminate it. The key question is not whether market risk exists. It always does. The question is whether the deal has been underwritten to survive a reasonable market downturn and still protect your capital. A deal that only works in a strong market is not a conservative investment. It is a bet on conditions staying favorable.

Execution risk.

The operator cannot deliver on the plan. In development, execution risk shows up as construction delays, quality issues, permit complications, or poor project management. On Riverside, execution risk was partially mitigated by the sponsor's track record of completing four similar buildings in the same region. A first-time operator building the same project would carry significantly more execution risk regardless of how good the plan looked on paper. In PE, execution risk

DEAD MONEY

shows up as failed operational improvements or an inability to integrate acquisitions. Execution risk is directly tied to the operator, which is why the A filter from the previous chapter is so important.

Timeline risk.

The project takes longer than planned. In private investing, time is not free. A development project that runs six months behind schedule does not just deliver late. It accumulates additional financing costs, carrying costs, and potentially faces a different market at delivery than the one that existed at underwriting. Every month of delay has a direct cost, and those costs come out of the profit margin.

On Riverside, the sponsor budgeted a 24-month build but municipal permitting in that region had been running three to four months behind schedule for the past two years. That delay alone would add roughly \$400,000 in additional interest carry on the construction loan. Timeline risk and execution risk are closely related, but they are not identical. A project can be executed well and still face delays from factors outside the operator's control: permitting backlogs, weather, supply chain disruptions, utility connections. The question is whether the operator has built enough buffer into the schedule and the budget to absorb realistic delays without the deal falling apart.

Leverage risk.

Debt creates its own category of risk. Most private investments use some form of leverage, meaning they borrow money to amplify returns. The Riverside project was financed with \$8 million in equity and \$16 million in construction debt, putting the leverage ratio at roughly 67%. Leverage is a double-edged tool. When the deal performs well, it

amplifies the return to equity investors. When the deal underperforms, it amplifies the losses.

Unlike equity, debt has contractual obligations. Interest payments must be made on schedule. Loan covenants must be maintained. If the project cannot service its debt, the lender has remedies that can include taking control of the asset, regardless of what the equity investors prefer. A deal with 50% leverage has more cushion than a deal with 80% leverage. The higher the leverage ratio, the less room there is for things to go wrong before the debt becomes a problem.

Financing risk.

Related to leverage risk but distinct. Financing risk is the risk that the terms of the debt change during the project, or that the financing is not available when needed. The Riverside construction loan carried a variable interest rate. If rates rose significantly during the build period, the financing costs would increase and the margin would shrink. In some cases, a project may need to refinance mid-stream if the original loan term expires before the project is complete. If credit markets have tightened, that refinancing may come at worse terms or may not be available at all.

Financing risk also includes the risk that the project cannot secure the required presales or other conditions the lender has set before they will fund the construction loan. If those conditions are not met, the project may stall before it even breaks ground.

Regulatory risk.

Government actions change the economics of the deal. Zoning changes. New building codes. Environmental regulations. Tax law changes. Rent

DEAD MONEY

control legislation. Foreign buyer restrictions. On the Riverside project, the sponsor's pro forma assumed that current development charge rates would apply at the time of building permit issuance. A municipal increase in those charges midway through the approval process would add directly to the cost basis and reduce the margin.

Regulatory risk is difficult to predict and impossible to eliminate. The best operators monitor the regulatory environment closely and build flexibility into their plans, but no one can anticipate every legislative change. Investors should understand which regulatory assumptions the deal depends on and what happens if those assumptions change.

Concentration risk.

Too much capital exposed to a single deal, a single asset class, a single geography, or a single operator. We will cover this in detail in Chapter 9 when we discuss the S filter. But it belongs in the risk taxonomy because concentration is itself a risk factor. A portfolio with \$1 million spread across five deals in three different markets has a fundamentally different risk profile than a portfolio with \$1 million in a single project with a single operator.

Capital loss risk.

The most straightforward risk and the one investors fear most: the possibility of losing some or all of your invested capital. In a development deal, capital loss can occur if construction costs exceed the budget by a wide margin, if the market declines sharply and the finished product sells for less than the total cost, or if the project fails to complete at all. In PE, capital loss occurs when the acquired

company declines in value and is sold or wound down for less than the total investment.

Capital loss risk is real, but it is also the risk that conservative underwriting is specifically designed to mitigate. A deal with adequate contingency reserves, realistic revenue projections, reasonable leverage, and an experienced operator has meaningful protection against total capital loss. The question is always how much margin of safety exists between the base case and the point at which investor capital is impaired.

Asymmetric risk.

A category most investors never think about, but one that can be the most consequential. Asymmetric risk exists when the consequences of a negative outcome are disproportionately larger than the probability of that outcome suggests. A low-probability event that would be catastrophic if it occurred.

On the Riverside site, the Phase 1 environmental assessment came back clean. But the adjacent property had a history of industrial use, and soil contamination can migrate. The probability of a contamination issue was low. The cost of remediation, if it materialized, could have been enormous and could have delayed the project by years. In PE, an asymmetric risk might be a key customer representing 60% of the target company's revenue. The probability of losing that customer may be small, but the impact would be devastating.

Asymmetric risks surprise investors precisely because they seemed unlikely. The discipline is to identify them before investing and

DEAD MONEY

determine whether the deal structure accounts for them or whether you are silently carrying the exposure.

The Risk Allocation: Who Carries Each Risk

Identifying the risks is the first half of the L filter. The second half is understanding who bears each one. This is where the legal structure of the investment matters enormously.

In most private investments, the relationship between the investor and the operator is defined by a legal structure. In real estate and PE, this is often a limited partnership. The operator is the general partner (GP). The investors are limited partners (LPs). The partnership agreement, offering memorandum, and subscription documents together define who is responsible for what and what happens when things go wrong.

The core principle of a limited partnership is that the LP's liability is limited to the amount they invested. If the deal loses money, the most you can lose is your investment. You are not personally responsible for the project's debts, obligations, or liabilities beyond your committed capital.

That sounds straightforward. And in most well-structured deals, it is. But there are nuances that investors need to understand.

The guarantee question.

In real estate development, the project typically requires bank financing. A construction loan. The bank wants assurance that someone is personally responsible for repaying that loan if the project fails. That someone is the guarantor.

In a properly structured deal, the GP provides the guarantee. The operator, not the investors, is on the hook to the bank. The LP's exposure is limited to their equity investment. If the project collapses and the bank calls the loan, the GP is the one who has to answer.

This matters for two reasons. First, it protects you as the investor from liability beyond your committed capital. Second, it creates a powerful alignment incentive. An operator who has personally guaranteed millions of dollars in bank debt has enormous motivation to make sure the project succeeds. Their personal financial life depends on it. That is skin in the game at the deepest level.

However, not every deal is structured this way. I have seen investors sign into joint venture structures where they unknowingly shared the bank guarantee. When the project stalled, the lender came after them personally for a debt they did not realize they had accepted. In other arrangements, the guarantee may be formally shared. In others, especially in JV structures rather than limited partnerships, the investor may have direct exposure to the debt. You need to know, before you invest, whether you are shielded from the project's bank obligations or whether you are carrying some portion of that guarantee risk.

The question is direct: "Who guarantees the bank debt on this project, and is the LP shielded from any personal liability beyond their equity commitment?" If the answer is anything other than a clear yes, you need legal counsel to review the documents before you proceed.

DEAD MONEY

The waterfall and loss allocation.

The partnership agreement also defines how losses are allocated, not just profits. In a deal that underperforms, who absorbs the losses first? In most limited partnership structures, losses flow through to investors proportionally. But some structures include provisions where the GP absorbs losses first up to a certain threshold, or where certain classes of investors are protected ahead of others.

These provisions are not standard. They vary from deal to deal. And they matter significantly in a downside scenario. Understanding the loss allocation structure before you invest is essential, because the one time you will care about these provisions is exactly the time when it is too late to negotiate them.

The exit provisions.

What happens at the end of the deal? How is the asset sold or the investment wound down? Who makes the decision to sell, and at what point? Does the LP have any input into the timing or terms of the exit?

In most limited partnerships, the GP has full discretion over the exit. They decide when to sell, how to sell, and at what price. The LP is along for the ride. That is normal and not inherently problematic, as long as you trust the operator and the partnership agreement includes reasonable provisions around timing, conflicts of interest, and distribution of sale proceeds.

What you want to look for is any provision that allows the GP to extend the hold period indefinitely without investor consent, that permits the GP to sell the asset to a related entity at a price that may not reflect fair market value, or that delays distributions after the sale without clear

justification. These are structural risks that have nothing to do with the project itself and everything to do with how the legal documents are written.

The Risk You Cannot See Is the One That Hurts You

Here is a pattern I have seen repeatedly over two decades in this industry. An investor reviews a deal. The pitch deck includes a section on risks. The investor reads through it, feels satisfied that the sponsor has been transparent, and moves forward.

The problem is that the risk section in a pitch deck is written by the sponsor. It is not an independent risk assessment. It is a curated list designed to demonstrate awareness without scaring the investor away. The risks that are disclosed are real, but they are usually the obvious ones: construction takes longer than planned, the market might soften, interest rates could rise. These are legitimate risks, but they are the ones the investor would have identified on their own.

The risks that actually damage investor returns are usually the ones that are not in the pitch deck. On one deal I reviewed, the pitch deck disclosed market risk and timeline risk in detail. What it did not mention was that the partnership waterfall included a provision where the GP could recoup management fees and overhead charges before any profit was split with LPs. In a base-case scenario, investors would not notice. In a deal that underperformed by 15 to 20 percent, that provision meant the GP recovered their costs while LPs absorbed nearly all the loss. The disclosed risks were real. The structural risk

DEAD MONEY

buried in the legal documents was the one that would have actually hurt investors.

That is why the L filter is not a passive exercise. You are not reading a risk section and checking a box. You are actively asking: what is missing from this list?

That question is uncomfortable. It requires you to think about scenarios the sponsor has not presented. It requires a degree of skepticism that can feel adversarial, especially when the sponsor has been transparent and professional throughout the process. But it is not adversarial. It is your responsibility as the custodian of your own capital. And the best operators will welcome the question, because they have already thought about it themselves.

The Risk Mapping Exercise

Here is a five-step process for locating and evaluating the risks in any private investment opportunity. This implements the L filter of the DEALS framework. It works for real estate development, private equity, private debt, venture capital, or any other alternative investment. Every step builds toward a single decisive question at the end: if multiple things go wrong at the same time, does the deal still protect your capital?

Step 1: List every risk the sponsor has disclosed.

Start with what is on the table. Review the offering memorandum, the pitch deck, and any supplementary materials. Write down every risk factor the sponsor has identified. Categorize each one using the taxonomy above: market, execution, timeline, leverage, financing,

regulatory, concentration, capital loss, or asymmetric. This gives you a structured view of what the sponsor considers the relevant risk landscape.

Step 2: Ask "What is missing from this list?"

The most important step in the entire exercise. Take the categorized list from Step 1 and go through each category. Has the sponsor addressed market risk? Execution risk? Timeline risk? Leverage risk? Financing risk? Regulatory risk? If any category is missing entirely from their disclosure, that is a gap you need to fill.

Then think beyond the categories. Are there risks specific to this particular deal that do not fit neatly into a standard bucket? A project that depends on a single municipal approval. A development in a flood zone. A PE deal where the target company has one dominant customer. These deal-specific risks are the ones most likely to be absent from the standard risk section.

AI tools can be useful here. You can ask a question like "what are the common risks in mid-rise residential development in [specific market]" and get a useful starting list to compare against the sponsor's disclosures. You are not trying to identify every conceivable risk. You are trying to catch the ones that the sponsor may have overlooked or underemphasized.

Step 3: For each risk, identify who carries it.

Here you move from the risk taxonomy to the risk allocation. Go through your complete list, both the sponsor's disclosed risks and the ones you added, and for each one, determine who bears the consequences if it materializes.

DEAD MONEY

Some risks are carried by the operator. If the GP has provided personal guarantees on the bank debt, the leverage and financing risks are partially borne by the operator at the personal level. If the operator's compensation is primarily performance-based, they carry the economic risk of underperformance alongside you.

Some risks are carried by the investor. Market risk, for example, is almost always carried by the investor. If the market declines and the finished product sells for less than projected, the investor's return is reduced. The operator may lose their performance fee, but the investor loses actual capital.

Some risks are shared. Timeline risk is often shared in the sense that delays reduce returns for both the operator and the investor, but the proportional impact may differ depending on the fee structure. If the operator collects management fees during the extended hold period, they are partially compensated for the delay while the investor is not.

Write down the allocation for each risk. Operator, investor, or shared. Where it is shared, note whether the sharing is proportional or whether one party bears a disproportionate share.

Step 4: Check the legal structure.

Review the partnership agreement or offering documents for three specific provisions:

First, is the LP shielded from personal liability beyond their equity commitment? Are there any clauses that could expose you to the project's debts or obligations?

Second, how are losses allocated in a downside scenario? Does the LP absorb losses proportionally, or are there provisions that protect certain parties ahead of others?

Third, what are the exit provisions? Who controls the timing and terms of the sale? Are there any provisions that could delay your distributions or create conflicts of interest at exit?

If you are not comfortable reading legal documents, this is where a lawyer is worth the fee. A one-hour review of the key provisions by an attorney who understands private investment structures can save you from liabilities you never intended to accept. The cost of that review is trivial compared to the amount of capital you are committing.

One important point: if you do engage a lawyer, make sure you are speaking with a securities lawyer. Not a real estate lawyer. Not a corporate lawyer. Not your family's estate planner. A securities lawyer specializes in the legal structures, disclosure requirements, and investor protections that govern private placements and limited partnerships. They know what to look for in an offering memorandum because they review these documents regularly. An attorney outside this specialty may miss provisions that a securities lawyer would catch immediately. The expertise matters. Ask specifically for someone with experience in private securities offerings.

Any sponsor worth investing with will welcome the fact that you have independent legal counsel reviewing the documents. If a sponsor discourages you from seeking legal advice, treat that as a red flag, not a reassurance.

DEAD MONEY

The DEALS framework gives you the judgment to know which deals deserve deeper scrutiny. Your legal and tax advisors give you the technical verification that the documents match what you were told. Both are necessary. Neither is sufficient alone.

Step 5: The Combined Stress Test.

The final step brings everything together. This is the single most important question in the L filter, and the one that separates a sophisticated investor from someone who reads a pitch deck and checks a box.

Look at your complete risk map. The risks, the allocations, the legal protections. Now ask:

If two or three of these risks materialize simultaneously, does the deal still protect my capital?

Not "what happens if one thing goes wrong" but "what happens if multiple things go wrong at the same time." Because in the real world, risks do not arrive one at a time. A construction delay and a cost overrun often happen together. A market softening and a financing squeeze can hit the same deal in the same quarter. On the Riverside project, the relevant stress test was: what happens if permitting delays push the timeline out by four months, construction costs run 8% over budget, and unit sale prices come in 10% below projection? When you stack those three scenarios, does the deal still return investor capital?

If the answer is yes, the deal has passed a meaningful stress test and the L filter is likely a pass. If the answer is no, or if you cannot answer the question because you do not have enough information, the L filter is conditional at best.

The Risk Map Template

Here is a simple template you can use on any deal. Fill it in as you work through the five steps above. A three-column version works for a quick first pass. If you want more detail, add columns for risk category and a brief description.

Risk	Who Bears It	Margin of Safety
Construction cost overrun (10-15%)	Shared (GP guarantee covers debt; LP margin reduced)	7% contingency; GP has managed similar overruns before

Combined stress test: If risks 1, 2, and 3 hit simultaneously, does the deal still protect capital? _____

L Filter Score: Pass / Conditional / Fail

Notes:

DEAD MONEY

Scoring the L Filter

After completing the risk mapping exercise, score the L filter on your DEALS scorecard.

Pass means you have identified the key risks, you understand who bears each one, the legal structure protects you from liability beyond your equity commitment, and the deal has sufficient margin of safety to survive a realistic combination of adverse events. You are not investing blind. You know what you are accepting and you have determined that the return compensates you fairly for those risks.

Conditional means one or more risks are unclear, the allocation is ambiguous, or you do not have enough information to assess the margin of safety. You need specific answers before you can proceed. Set a deadline for getting them.

Fail means the risk profile is unacceptable. The deal exposes you to liabilities you did not intend to accept. The margin of safety is insufficient. The risks are not adequately disclosed. Or the structure allocates risk unfairly, with the investor carrying the downside while the operator is insulated. A fail on the L filter is a walk-away, regardless of how attractive the projected return is. No return is worth taking risks you do not understand or cannot accept.

When you start mapping risks before you invest, the first thing you notice is how differently you read a pitch deck. The projections section, which used to be the first thing you looked at, becomes secondary. The risk section, which you used to skim, becomes the most important part of the document. And the questions you did not find answers to become the basis of your next conversation with the sponsor.

That shift in attention is worth more than any single piece of analysis. Because the investors who get hurt in private markets are not the ones who miscalculated a return. They are the ones who missed a risk. They signed a document without understanding the guarantee provisions. They assumed the sponsor's risk disclosure was complete when it was actually curated. The L filter trains you to look for what is not on the page, not just what is.

Your emotional relationship with risk changes too. Before the L filter, risk felt like a vague threat. Something to worry about but never quite pin down. After the L filter, risk becomes specific. It has categories. It has allocations. It has mitigations. You can point to each one and say: here is the risk, here is who carries it, and here is the protection in place. That specificity replaces anxiety with clarity. You are not worrying about what could go wrong in general. You know exactly what could go wrong, and you have evaluated whether the deal accounts for it.

A healthy skepticism develops with practice. Not cynicism. The difference matters. A cynical investor assumes every deal is bad and never invests. A skeptical investor assumes every deal has risks that may not be fully disclosed and takes the time to find them. One leads to paralysis. The other leads to informed decisions.

Over time, your risk maps become a library. You start recognizing patterns. The same types of risks appear in similar deals. The same structural issues show up in partnership agreements from different sponsors. Your ability to spot a problematic provision or a missing risk factor gets faster with every evaluation. After five or ten deals, the risk

DEAD MONEY

mapping exercise that took you an hour the first time takes twenty minutes. The framework has become part of how you think.

And here is the outcome that ties it all back to Chapter 1. When you understand the risks clearly and you have verified that the structure protects your downside, you can invest with conviction. Not hope. Conviction. You know what you are accepting. You know who carries each risk. You know the deal has margin of safety. That conviction is what breaks the paralysis that keeps capital dead. Because the paralysis was never about return. It was about fear of the unknown. The L filter makes the unknown known.

You now have four of the five filters in place. You know how the deal makes money. You know whether the structure is fair. You know whether the operator is trustworthy. And you know what risks you are taking and who bears each one.

The final filter shows you how to turn that skill into a portfolio strategy that compounds across multiple deals and market cycles. Because evaluating a single deal well is valuable. Building a portfolio of well-evaluated deals across different asset classes, timelines, and operators is where the real wealth creation happens.

Does this deal improve my portfolio's diversification and risk-adjusted return?

CHAPTER 9

S — Spread Your Capital

“Diversifying well is the most important thing you need to do in order to invest well.”

— Ray Dalio

An investor I worked with started with \$2 million in investable capital. Over the course of about ten years, the value of her capital grew to over \$20 million. She did not do it with one deal. She did not find a single spectacular opportunity that multiplied her money tenfold. She built a portfolio. Methodically. Across multiple deals, multiple asset types, and multiple timelines. One deal outperformed by a significant margin. A few outperformed by a modest amount. A few came in below the projected return. She told me once that the moment it clicked was when she stopped checking individual deal performance and started looking at the portfolio number. The portfolio, taken as a whole, delivered a result that transformed her financial life. And she slept through most of it.

Another investor I know has deployed over \$10 million across close to 30 private deals over the decades. His portfolio return has fluctuated around 10 to 13% annually. When a single project underperforms, he does not lose sleep. He does not panic. He does not call the operator demanding answers at midnight. He reviews the update, assesses whether the underperformance is temporary or structural, and moves

DEAD MONEY

on with his day. Because no single deal represents a large enough portion of his portfolio to threaten his overall position.

The difference between these investors and the ones who end up bitter, burned, and back in GICs is not intelligence. It is not luck. It is not access to secret deals. It is diversification. The disciplined, intentional spreading of capital across multiple investments so that no single outcome determines your financial future.

That sounds simple. And conceptually, it is. But implementing it requires something that most investors overlook. You can only diversify well if you have access to enough high-quality opportunities to choose from. The S filter is about building a portfolio. And building a portfolio requires both a strategy and a pipeline.

Why Diversification Works

Ray Dalio, founder of Bridgewater Associates and manager of over \$100 billion for institutional investors, has called diversification the closest thing investors can get to free money. The reasoning is straightforward. Different assets respond differently to economic conditions. Stocks, bonds, commodities, and real estate do not all move in the same direction at the same time. By combining assets that behave differently across economic environments, investors can reduce overall portfolio volatility without necessarily reducing expected returns.

A well-diversified portfolio can achieve a higher return per unit of risk compared with a concentrated portfolio. That is mathematics. And it is the reason that every major pension fund, endowment, and sophisticated family office builds portfolios across multiple asset

classes, geographies, and time horizons. But Dalio has also pointed out that many investors believe they are diversified when they actually are not. Owning shares in ten technology companies is not diversification. It is concentration with the appearance of variety. True diversification requires combining different asset classes, different risk drivers, and different economic sensitivities.

What Diversification Actually Means in Practice

For the high-income professional building a portfolio of private investments, diversification means spreading capital across several dimensions. Not just owning multiple deals. Owning different types of deals that respond to different conditions and mature on different timelines.

Diversification across deal types.

A portfolio of five condo development projects is not truly diversified, even if the projects are in different cities. They all share the same risk factors: residential buyer demand, mortgage rate sensitivity, and construction cost pressures. True diversification across deal types means combining different asset classes within your private portfolio. Residential development alongside industrial or commercial projects. Real estate alongside private equity. Income-producing assets alongside development assets. Each type responds differently to economic conditions, and the combination smooths your overall return profile.

DEAD MONEY

Diversification across geographies and timelines.

Local market conditions drive a significant portion of real estate outcomes. A housing downturn in one city does not necessarily affect another. Employment growth, population migration, infrastructure investment, and regulatory environments all vary by region. Spreading capital across two or three markets reduces your exposure to any single local economy. The same logic applies to timing. Not every deal should mature at the same time. A portfolio where all five investments exit in 2028 creates a concentration of timing risk. If the market is soft in 2028, every deal in your portfolio is affected simultaneously.

Staggering your investments across different vintage years and different hold periods means you have capital returning and redeploying at different points in the cycle.

Diversification across operators.

Even if you find an operator who passes the A filter with flying colors, concentrating all your capital with a single sponsor creates operator risk. Every person and every firm has limitations. An operator who excels in residential development may be less experienced in commercial. An operator who has thrived in one market may struggle in another. Spreading capital across two or three trusted operators reduces your exposure to any single team's blind spots or execution issues.

Diversification across liquidity profiles.

This one matters most for the audience reading this book. If every dollar you own is locked in five-year private deals, you have no flexibility to respond to changes in your personal circumstances or to

take advantage of new opportunities that arise. A well-constructed portfolio blends liquid holdings, such as public equities, bonds, and cash, with illiquid private investments. The liquid portion provides access and flexibility. The illiquid portion provides the return premium we discussed in Chapter 3. The balance between them depends on your personal situation, your income stability, and your time horizon. I have seen investors get this wrong in both directions. Too much liquidity and their returns stagnate. Too little and a single life event, a divorce, a career transition, a health issue, forces them to exit a position at the worst possible time. Get this ratio right and the rest of the portfolio plan becomes much easier to execute.

The Deal Flow Problem

Here is where diversification runs into a practical challenge that most books and advisors never address.

You can only diversify well if you have access to enough high-quality opportunities to choose from. A filter with nothing to filter is just a piece of paper.

There are plenty of deals in the market. Pitch decks arrive in inboxes every week. Crowdfunding platforms list dozens of offerings. Sponsors host webinars and investor events. The volume of available opportunities is not the problem.

The quality is the problem.

When you apply the DEALS framework to most opportunities, the majority will not survive. The revenue assumptions will be too aggressive. The fee structure will be tilted toward the operator. The sponsor will have a thin track record. The risks will be poorly disclosed.

DEAD MONEY

The math will not hold up under a basic stress test. That is not a flaw in the framework. That is the framework doing its job. It is designed to filter out the deals that are not worth your capital.

But if you filter out 80% of what you see, you need to see enough volume that the remaining 20% gives you three to five investable opportunities over a two to four year deployment period. That requires deal flow. Not random deal flow. Curated, vetted, institutional-quality deal flow from operators and platforms that have already applied their own quality filters before the opportunity reaches you.

I have seen what happens when this piece is missing. An investor completes the DEALS scorecard, sets target allocations, builds a deployment calendar, and then spends 18 months waiting because every opportunity that crosses their desk fails on D or A. The system worked. The pipeline did not. They had the discipline but not the access. And discipline without a pipeline just means sitting on dead money with better reasons for doing so.

Access to quality deal flow is a strategic asset. It is not a luxury. Without it, investors either concentrate their capital in the few deals they happen to stumble across, or they settle for lower-quality opportunities that drag down portfolio returns. The best investors I have worked with treat deal flow sourcing as seriously as deal evaluation. They build relationships with multiple operators. They join investor networks. They position themselves to see quality opportunities consistently, not sporadically.

When forecasting and selecting across multiple deals, objectivity is essential. Investors must resist emotional bias about market direction and instead rely on data, sustainable trends, and conservative

assumptions across every position. The same discipline that applies to evaluating a single deal through the DEALS framework applies to building the portfolio. Every addition should improve the portfolio's overall diversification and risk-adjusted return, not just be a good deal in isolation.

The Emotional Discipline of Portfolio Thinking

There is a psychological shift that happens when you move from evaluating deals one at a time to building a portfolio. It is subtle, but it changes your relationship with every investment decision you make.

When you are concentrated in one or two deals, every piece of news about those deals carries enormous emotional weight. A construction delay feels like a crisis. A quarterly report that shows costs running slightly above budget triggers anxiety. A market headline about rising interest rates sends you into a spiral of what-if scenarios. Every data point is magnified because the stakes on each deal are so high relative to your total portfolio.

When you are diversified across four or five deals, the same data point feels different. A delay on one project is not a portfolio crisis. It is an event in one position that may or may not affect your overall return in a meaningful way. A soft quarter in one deal is offset by strong performance in another. The emotional temperature drops. Not because you care less about each investment. But because the structure of your portfolio has reduced the consequences of any single outcome.

One of my investors described it well. After his third deal closed, he received a quarterly update showing a cost overrun on one project. He

DEAD MONEY

read it, noted it, and moved on with his afternoon. He told me later that a year earlier, that same update would have ruined his weekend. Nothing about his personality had changed. His portfolio structure had changed. And the structure gave him permission to be calm.

This is not just a psychological benefit. It is a performance benefit. Investors who are emotionally reactive make worse decisions. They pressure operators for updates when none are needed. They second-guess allocation decisions based on short-term noise. They pull back from future investments after one disappointing result. All of these reactions reduce long-term returns.

A diversified portfolio protects you from your own worst instincts. It gives you the structural permission to be patient. To let deals run their course. To absorb one below-target result without abandoning the strategy. That patience is worth real money over a 20 or 30 year investing life.

Tax-Efficient Investing for Business Owners

For business owners and incorporated professionals, there is an additional layer to portfolio construction that is worth understanding.

Many business owners leave profits inside their corporation to defer personal tax on dividends. This is sound tax planning. But the result is often a pool of capital sitting inside the company in low-yield holdings. A corporate savings account earning 3 or 4%. A portfolio of GICs or conservative bonds. It becomes its own form of dead money, compounding slowly while inflation quietly erodes its purchasing power.

However, depending on your jurisdiction, there are ways for the corporation itself to invest in active business ventures and joint ventures. This can allow that capital to compound within the corporate structure at potentially higher rates of return, while maintaining the tax deferral benefits that motivated leaving the capital in the corporation in the first place.

I need to be clear about an important caveat. Tax treatment varies significantly between countries. It varies between Canada and the United States. It varies between provinces and states. The rules around what qualifies as an active business investment versus a passive investment within a corporation, and how each is taxed, are complex and jurisdiction-specific. What works in Ontario may not work in British Columbia. What applies in Canada does not necessarily apply in the US.

This is not an area where general guidance is sufficient. You need specific advice from an accountant or tax advisor who understands the rules in your jurisdiction and your particular corporate structure. Do not make any investment decisions for your corporation based on general principles from a book, including this one.

The principle is important: capital trapped in a company does not have to be idle. But the implementation must be guided by a qualified professional who knows your specific situation. For readers who want to explore this further, you can email me directly and I will refer you to the right professional.

The Portfolio Construction Template

Here is a five-step process for building a diversified private investment portfolio. This implements the S filter of the DEALS framework. It works whether you are deploying your first \$200,000 or building toward a multi-million-dollar allocation.

Step 1: Map your current holdings.

Start with where you are. Go through every account, both registered and non-registered in Canada, or tax-advantaged and taxable in the US. For each holding, write down the asset class, the approximate current value, the liquidity profile (can you access the capital within days, months, or years?), the expected timeline to maturity or exit, the risk level (low, moderate, or high), and the expected annual return.

If you completed the triangle mapping exercise in Chapter 3, you already have much of this information. If not, do it now. You cannot build a portfolio plan without knowing where you are starting from.

Organize it in a simple table:

Holding	Value	Liquidity	Timeline	Risk Level	Expected Return
Example: RRSP balanced fund	\$400,000	High	Ongoing	Moderate	5-7%
Example: TFSA high-	\$75,000	High	Ongoing	Low	3-4%

yield					
savings					

Step 2: Identify the gaps and imbalances.

Look at your completed table. Where is your capital concentrated? Is it mostly in liquid, low-return vehicles? That is the dead money problem from Chapter 1. Is it mostly in volatile public equities? That is the emotional rollercoaster from Chapter 3. Is it concentrated in a single asset class or a single geography? That is concentration risk.

Compare your current allocation to the benchmarks from Chapter 3. How does your percentage in alternatives compare to how institutional and ultra-high-net-worth investors allocate? You are not trying to match those benchmarks exactly. They have different circumstances. But if your alternative allocation is at 2% and institutional portfolios are at 30 to 50%, the gap is large enough to warrant a plan for closing it over time.

Step 3: Set target allocations.

Based on the gaps you identified, set target allocations across three dimensions:

Liquid versus illiquid. What percentage of your total investable assets are you comfortable locking up for three to seven years? This depends on your income stability, your near-term cash needs, and your personal comfort with illiquidity. A common starting point for high-

DEAD MONEY

income professionals with stable careers is 20 to 30% in illiquid alternatives, with the remainder in liquid holdings. Over time, as confidence and experience grow, that allocation may increase. But start where you are comfortable.

By asset class. Within your alternative allocation, how do you want to distribute across real estate, private equity, private debt, or other categories? If you are just starting, it is perfectly reasonable to concentrate your alternative allocation in one asset class you understand well and diversify within that class across deal types, geographies, and operators. Diversification across asset classes can come later as your portfolio and your knowledge base grow.

By timeline. Stagger your investments so they do not all mature at the same time. If you are deploying capital over two to four years, aim for a mix of shorter-term deals (two to three years) and longer-term holds (five to seven years). This creates a natural rhythm of capital returning and being redeployed, which reduces timing risk and gives you ongoing decision points.

Step 4: Build a deployment calendar.

This is the step that turns a plan into action. And it is the step that separates the investors who actually build portfolios from the ones who talk about it.

When you write this calendar, something changes. You stop being a person who is thinking about investing and become a person who is investing. The plan does not commit you to any specific deal. It commits you to a timeline, a budget, and an intention. That alone puts

you ahead of 90% of high-income earners who have been "meaning to look into alternatives" for years.

The deployment calendar is not "invest everything now." That would be reckless and unnecessary. It is a schedule for deploying capital into the right opportunities over a realistic time frame. Two to four years across multiple deal cycles is a reasonable horizon for building a portfolio of three to five private investments.

Your calendar might look something like this:

Period	Capital to Deploy	Target Asset Type	Target Geography	Target Timeline	Status
Year 1, H1	\$150,000	Residential development	Market A	3-4 year hold	Evaluating
Year 1, H2	\$125,000	Industrial / commercial	Market B	5-7 year hold	Sourcing
Year 2, H1	\$150,000	Mixed-use or PE	Market A or C	3-5 year hold	Future
Year 2, H2	\$125,000	TBD based on gaps	TBD	TBD	Future

Note: This is an illustrative example only. Actual deployment should be based on your personal financial situation, risk tolerance, and the availability of quality deal flow. This is not investment advice.

DEAD MONEY

The key principle is intentionality. You are not waiting passively for a deal to come along and then deciding whether to invest. You have a plan. You know how much capital you want to deploy, roughly when, and into what types of opportunities. When a deal comes across your desk, you evaluate it not just on its own merits but against your portfolio plan. Does it fill a gap? Does it improve diversification? Or does it duplicate an exposure you already have?

That question changes the decision. It elevates the S filter from a theoretical principle to a practical tool. A deal might score perfectly on D, E, A, and L, and still be a pass because it concentrates your portfolio in a way that increases your overall risk. That is discipline. And it is the discipline that separates portfolio builders from deal chasers.

Step 5: Score every new opportunity against the portfolio.

This is the S filter in action. For every new investment you evaluate, after it has passed the first four filters, ask one final question: does this deal improve my portfolio's overall diversification and risk-adjusted return?

Compare the opportunity against your current holdings and your target allocations. Consider these dimensions:

Does it add a new asset type I do not already hold? Does it diversify me into a new geography or market? Does its timeline complement my existing maturity schedule, or does it stack on top of deals I already have maturing in the same period? Is the operator different from the operators already in my portfolio? Does it shift my liquid-to-illiquid ratio in a direction I am comfortable with?

If the deal improves the portfolio across one or more of these dimensions, the S filter is a pass. If the deal duplicates exposures you already have, or if it pushes your illiquid allocation beyond your comfort zone, it is a conditional or a fail, even if the deal itself is strong.

Scoring the S Filter

Pass means the deal improves your portfolio's diversification across at least one key dimension, fits within your target allocation and deployment calendar, and does not create excessive concentration in any single asset type, geography, timeline, or operator.

Conditional means the deal is attractive but does not clearly improve diversification, or it pushes your allocation slightly beyond your target in one area. You may still proceed if the other four filters are strong and the concentration is manageable, but you are aware of the trade-off.

Fail means the deal would significantly concentrate your portfolio in a way that increases your overall risk. Too much capital with one operator. Too many deals maturing in the same year. Too heavy an allocation to a single market. No matter how good the deal looks on its own, it does not belong in your portfolio right now. Pass and wait for an opportunity that fills the right gap.

A Note on Getting Started

If you are reading this and thinking that a portfolio of three to five private investments sounds like a distant goal, I want to address that directly.

DEAD MONEY

You do not build the portfolio all at once. You build it one deal at a time. Your first investment is the hardest, because everything is new. The language is unfamiliar. The process feels uncertain. The commitment feels large relative to your experience. That is normal. Every investor who now has a multi-deal portfolio felt exactly the same way before their first allocation.

The deployment calendar exists to make this manageable. You are not trying to find five deals this year. You are trying to find one deal this year that passes all five filters and fits your portfolio plan. Then another one next year. Then another the year after that. Over two to four years, the portfolio takes shape. Each deal gets easier to evaluate because the framework has become familiar. Each decision carries less emotional weight because the portfolio absorbs the variance.

Start with one deal. Make it a good one. Run it through the full DEALS framework. Score every filter. If it passes, invest with confidence. If it does not, pass without regret and wait for the next opportunity. The pipeline will produce more. Your job is to be ready with a plan, a framework, and the discipline to follow both.

When you start thinking in terms of portfolio construction rather than individual deal selection, several things change at once.

The first is that the pressure on any single deal drops dramatically. When your entire investing strategy depends on one or two positions, every decision feels enormous. Every deal is either the one that makes your fortune or the one that destroys it. That binary framing is the engine of paralysis. It is why smart people sit on capital for years. The stakes on each individual decision feel impossibly high.

A portfolio plan breaks that framing. No single deal needs to be perfect. You are building a system where the aggregate performance across multiple deals, operators, and timelines produces a consistent result. One deal can underperform. One can exceed expectations. The portfolio absorbs both. That is not a lower standard. It is a more realistic one. And it is the way every sophisticated institutional investor in the world thinks about capital allocation.

The second change is that your relationship with time shifts. Without a portfolio plan, every day of delay feels like a lost opportunity. You see a deal, you feel pressure to act, and the urgency creates rushed decisions. With a deployment calendar, you have a roadmap. You know when you intend to deploy capital and roughly into what. That removes the urgency from any single opportunity. If this deal is not right, the next one will come. Your calendar gives you permission to be patient without being passive.

The third change is the most important one for your long-term returns. You stop being a deal-by-deal investor and start being a portfolio-level thinker. You evaluate every opportunity not just on its own merits but on how it fits the whole. The questions you ask change. Instead of "Is this a good deal?" you start asking "Does this deal make my portfolio better?" Most investors never get to that second question because they are too focused on what is right in front of them to see the bigger picture.

Over time, your portfolio becomes a compounding machine. Capital returns from one deal and gets redeployed into the next. Each redeployment is guided by the same framework, the same filters, the same discipline. The portfolio grows in both size and resilience. And

DEAD MONEY

because it is diversified across deal types, geographies, timelines, and operators, no single market event, no single operator misstep, and no single economic shift can threaten the whole.

That is what it means to spread your capital. Not just owning multiple things. Owning the right combination of things, selected through a disciplined process, and assembled into a portfolio that works while you live your life.

You now have all five filters. D, E, A, L, S. The system is complete. You know how to decode the math, evaluate the deal, assess the operator, locate the risks, and spread your capital. You can evaluate any private investment opportunity that crosses your desk.

The final chapter is about what happens next. How you take everything you have learned in this book and turn it from knowledge into action. From dead money into compounding capital.

CHAPTER 10

From Dead Money to Compounding Capital

Your next move and the identity shift that makes it stick

Let me take you back to the beginning.

You picked up this book because something was bothering you. Maybe it was a number on a statement that had not moved in years. Maybe it was a conversation with a colleague who mentioned a deal that made you feel like you were standing still. Maybe it was just the quiet, nagging sense that your money should be doing more than what it was doing.

Whatever brought you here, I want to acknowledge something. You did not have to read this far. Most people who feel stuck stay stuck. They buy a book, skim the first chapter, nod along, and go back to the same routine. The fact that you are here, at the final chapter, with the entire DEALS framework now in your hands, puts you in a different category.

But I also need to be honest with you. The framework alone is not going to change anything.

I know that sounds strange coming from the person who just spent nine chapters teaching it to you. But it is true. The DEALS framework is a decision system. It tells you how to evaluate any investment opportunity with clarity and confidence. It gives you the filters. It gives

DEAD MONEY

you the scorecards. It gives you the checklists. What it cannot give you is the moment when you actually use it.

And that is what this chapter is about. Not another framework. Not another checklist. The shift that has to happen between knowing what to do and doing it.

I want to tell you a story that brings this full circle. It is one I have lived, and one I have watched hundreds of investors live in their own way.

When I closed down my hedge fund, I was exhausted. Not physically. Mentally. I had spent years chasing complexity. Forex with 100x leverage. Options strategies with names that sounded brilliant in theory and felt like gambling in practice. A value investing fund where I was right on the analysis and wrong on the timing, month after month, while investors waited for returns that never came.

I did not find the answer by discovering a more sophisticated system. I found it by going back to the thing I had walked away from because I thought it was too simple.

Real estate development. The same asset class I had spent fourteen years learning from the inside. The same profit engines, the same risk factors, the same deal structures. Nothing had changed about the fundamentals. What had changed was me. I had spent years proving to myself that complexity was not the same as sophistication. That chasing more variables did not produce better outcomes. That the investors I admired most were not the ones with the most exotic strategies. They were the ones with a clear process they followed with discipline, year after year, deal after deal.

I joined a private equity firm. By the time I left twelve years later, the company had raised and deployed over \$2 billion. My assistants and I personally raised and deployed \$300 million for over a thousand investor families across 60 deals. All together, I have spent over a quarter of a century in investment and in real estate development. The returns were not generated by some proprietary algorithm or secret market insight. They came from disciplined underwriting, conservative assumptions, transparent operations, and diversified deployment across multiple deals and cycles.

The sophisticated path nearly broke me. The disciplined, simple path built my wealth and the wealth of everyone who invested alongside me.

And here is the part of that story I want you to hear most clearly. The investors who did the best were not the ones with the most capital. They were not the ones with the deepest financial background. They were the ones who stopped waiting for perfect conditions, stopped trying to time the market, stopped looking for the one deal that would change everything, and instead started deploying capital through a repeatable system.

One of my investors grew \$2 million into over \$20 million in under ten years. She did not have a crystal ball. She had diversification, discipline, and a trusted operator. She followed a process. She scored deals. She built a portfolio one allocation at a time.

Other investors with large portfolios earning steady low-teens returns annually did not get lucky. They ran every opportunity through a framework. They passed on deals that did not score well, even when the pitch was compelling. They waited for the right ones. And when the

DEAD MONEY

right ones showed up, they moved with confidence because the analysis was already done.

The majority of my investors achieved similar results. The ones who did not typically had one thing in common: they invested in a single deal and stopped. When that one deal underperformed, whether because of external market conditions, project-specific challenges, or timing, their entire experience was defined by that single outcome. But those who invested in two or more deals rarely incurred a loss. The portfolio absorbed the variance. One deal might come in below projections while another exceeded them. The math worked because the capital was spread across multiple positions, multiple timelines, and multiple operators. This is exactly the principle behind the S filter from Chapter 9. Diversification is not a suggestion. It is the strategy. And the track record of my own investor base proves it.

None of them worry when the stock market drops. Their private portfolio is not connected to that volatility. They freed themselves from the screen, from the anxiety, from the indecision. Their capital works as hard as they do.

That is what this book is designed to give you. Not just information. A path from where you are now to where you want to be.

The Real Obstacle Was Never Information

You now know more about evaluating private investments than the vast majority of high-income professionals in North America. That is not an exaggeration. Most investors never learn how to decode the math behind a deal. Most never think about fee structures, hurdle rates, or catch-up provisions. Most have no idea how to assess an

operator beyond gut feeling or how to map risks and identify who bears each one. Most have never even heard of the return-risk-liquidity triangle, let alone used it to evaluate their portfolio.

You have all of that now.

But the reason most people stay stuck is not a lack of knowledge. It is the fear of making a decision they cannot undo. That fear is completely rational. You earned your capital through years of hard work. The idea of deploying a meaningful amount of it into something unfamiliar, something illiquid, something that requires you to trust another person with your family's wealth for five or seven years. That is genuinely uncomfortable.

I am not going to pretend it is not.

What I am going to tell you is that the cost of that discomfort has been quantified. You did the math in Chapter 1. You calculated the gap between where your capital sits today and where it could be compounding. You saw what happens over 10, 20, 30 years when the rate difference is five or six or eight percentage points. You know the number. It is large. And it grows every month you wait.

The DEALS framework does not eliminate risk. No framework does. What it eliminates is confusion. It gives you a structured way to look at any opportunity and arrive at a clear decision. Invest. Pass. Request more information. Those are the only three outcomes, and the framework gets you to one of them without the months of agonizing that keeps most investors frozen.

DEAD MONEY

Confusion was the thing keeping your capital dead. Not risk. Not bad timing. Not a lack of opportunities. Confusion about how to evaluate what was in front of you. That confusion is gone now.

The Identity Shift

There is a deeper shift that happens when you move from sitting on capital to deploying it through a system. It is not just financial. It is personal.

Think about what it feels like right now to be someone who earns well but does not feel confident about their investments. You go to dinner with friends and the conversation turns to money. Someone mentions a deal they are in. Someone else talks about a return they got. And you smile and nod, but inside there is a gap. You know you should be doing more. You know your portfolio is not keeping pace with your income. And the distance between what you earn and how you invest creates a kind of quiet tension that follows you around.

That tension is not about money. It is about identity. You see yourself as someone who is smart, competent, and successful. But your investment life does not reflect that. There is a disconnect. And every month that passes without action makes the disconnect wider.

Here is what happens when you start. Not when you find the perfect deal. Not when market conditions align. When you take the DEALS scorecard, apply it to a real opportunity, and make a decision based on what the analysis tells you.

You become the person who evaluates deals with a system.

That sounds simple, but it changes how you carry yourself. It changes the conversations you have with advisors. It changes how you respond the next time someone pitches you on an opportunity. Instead of freezing up or defaulting to no, you run the filters. You ask the questions from Chapter 5. You check the fee structure from Chapter 6. You score the operator from Chapter 7. You map the risks from Chapter 8. You evaluate how it fits your portfolio from Chapter 9.

And then you decide. Calmly. Confidently. Based on a process, not a feeling.

That is the identity shift. From anxious high earner paralyzed by options to calm, decisive investor deploying capital with clarity. The person your peers start asking for advice. The person who sleeps well at night because you know exactly what you own, why you own it, and how you evaluated it before you committed.

The framework makes this possible. But you have to use it. The shift happens the first time you actually run a deal through the system and make a decision. Not before.

You Do Not Have to Make Investment Decisions All the Time

This is the final lesson of the book, and I want to make sure it lands.

One of the greatest traps in investing is the feeling that you should always be doing something. Public markets create this pressure constantly. Every day, prices move. Headlines scream. Analysts upgrade and downgrade. Your brokerage app sends you notifications.

DEAD MONEY

The whole ecosystem is designed to make you feel like standing still is falling behind.

Private investing is the opposite.

The goal of the DEALS framework is not to turn you into someone who evaluates deals every week. It is to give you a system so that when a deal does land on your desk, you can evaluate it quickly, thoroughly, and without emotional interference. And then, once you have built your portfolio, you step away.

Build a system. Develop an investment philosophy. Allocate your portfolio across different asset classes. Rebalance when necessary. And then get on with your life.

Once you know what you invest in, why you invest in it, and how you evaluate opportunities, you do not need to think about investing every day. You do not need to check prices. You do not need to watch the market. You do not need to react to headlines.

Your portfolio works in the background. You focus on your business, your practice, your family, your health, your life.

Remember the Fidelity study from Chapter 3. The investors with the best long-term returns were the ones who were dead, the ones who forgot they had accounts, and the ones who rarely traded. The lesson is the same here. The best investors are not the most active ones. They are the most disciplined. They make a few well-analyzed decisions per year, deploy into solid opportunities, and let compounding do the work over decades.

That is what it means to move from dead money to compounding capital. Your money is no longer sitting idle. It is no longer earning a fraction of what it could. It is deployed. Diversified. Working. And you are free.

Your 30-Day Action Plan

This is not theoretical. Here is what to do over the next four weeks.

Week 1: Quantify Where You Are

Go back to Chapter 1 and complete the Dead Money Audit if you have not already. Pull up every account. Every balance. Every return. Map your current holdings using the triangle exercise from Chapter 3. Plot each investment by return, risk, and liquidity.

The goal this week is clarity. You need to see, on one page, where your capital is deployed right now and what it is earning. For most readers, this exercise produces a mix of surprise and frustration. Surprise because they did not realize how much was sitting in low-yield vehicles. Frustration because the math makes the cost of inaction painfully visible.

That frustration is fuel. Use it.

Week 2: Source and Score Your First Opportunity

Find one deal memo. This could come from your network, a financial advisor, an investment platform, or an operator you have been watching. It does not need to be perfect. It just needs to be real.

Take the DEALS scorecard from Chapter 4 and run this opportunity through all five filters.

DEAD MONEY

- D: Can you explain how this investment makes money in three sentences? Are the revenue assumptions grounded in data?
- E: Is the deal conservatively underwritten? Is the fee structure fair? Is there a hurdle rate?
- A: Has the operator invested their own capital? Do they have a realized track record? How do they handle underperformance?
- L: What are the top risks, who bears each one, and does the deal still protect capital if two or three risks materialize?
- S: How does this deal fit your broader portfolio plan? Does it improve diversification or concentrate risk?

Score each filter. Write down where it passes and where it falls short. This exercise is valuable whether or not you end up investing in this particular deal. The purpose is to build the muscle of systematic evaluation.

Week 3: Go Deeper on the Operator and the Risks

Take the operator assessment checklist from Chapter 7 and the risk mapping exercise from Chapter 8. Apply them to the same deal.

Score the operator across every dimension. Track record. Skin in the game. Communication standards. How they have handled underperformance in the past. Can you speak to existing investors?

Map every risk the deal memo discloses and identify the ones it does not mention. For each risk, determine who carries it. Check the legal structure. Is your personal liability limited? Is the operator guaranteeing the debt, or are you exposed?

This is where most investors separate from the crowd. The majority of people who look at a private investment will review the pitch deck, look at the projected return, and make a decision based on how it feels. You are going deeper. You are asking questions that protect your capital before you commit it.

Week 4: Make a Decision

By now you have a scored deal, a vetted operator, a risk map, and a portfolio-level view of how this investment fits.

Make a decision. There are only three options.

One: Invest. The deal passes all five filters. The operator checks out. The risks are mapped and manageable. The deal improves your portfolio. You have done the work. Move forward with confidence.

Two: Pass. Something did not score well. The math is aggressive. The operator does not have a track record through a downturn. The risk allocation is tilted against you. The deal would concentrate your portfolio in ways you are not comfortable with. This is not a failure. This is the system working. You pass without regret because you know the next opportunity will come, and you will be ready for it.

Three: Request more information. The deal is promising but the analysis surfaced questions that need answers before you can commit. Go back to the operator with specific questions. If they can answer clearly and calmly, proceed to a final score. If they cannot, you have your answer.

The point of this week is not to force an investment. It is to force a decision. Indecision is the enemy. The DEALS framework gives you the

DEAD MONEY

tools to reach a clear yes, no, or not yet. Any of those outcomes is a win. The only losing outcome is the one where you do nothing and the capital goes back to sitting idle.

Beyond the First 30 Days

Once you have completed this first cycle, the framework becomes your permanent operating system for investment decisions. Every new opportunity that comes across your desk gets the same treatment. Scorecard. Checklists. Risk map. Portfolio fit. Decision.

Over the next two to four years, you build your portfolio one deal at a time. Your deployment calendar from Chapter 9 guides the timing. You are not rushing to fill every position. You are being selective, disciplined, and patient. You are investing the way institutional capital invests, just on your own terms and at your own scale.

Each deal gets easier to evaluate. The questions become second nature. The red flags become obvious. The scorecards fill themselves out faster. And with each allocation, the pressure on any individual deal drops because the portfolio is absorbing the variance.

That is the compounding effect that most people miss. Not just financial compounding, though that is happening too. The compounding of skill, confidence, and clarity. Each decision you make through this system makes you a better investor. Each deal you evaluate sharpens your judgment. Each time you pass on something that does not score well, you reinforce the discipline that separates serious investors from everyone else.

Let me tell you what the next year looks like if you follow through.

Within the first 30 days, you will have completed your Dead Money Audit and know, for the first time, exactly what inaction is costing you. That number will bother you. Good. It should. You will have scored at least one real deal through the DEALS framework. Whether you invest in it or pass on it, you will feel something unfamiliar. Clarity. A sense that you actually know how to evaluate an opportunity rather than guessing.

Within the first 90 days, you will likely have evaluated two or three opportunities. Your pattern recognition will be sharpening. You will notice things in pitch decks that you never would have caught before. Revenue assumptions that are too aggressive. Fee structures that favor the operator. Operators who cannot answer basic questions about their track record. You will also start recognizing the deals that do score well. The ones with conservative underwriting, aligned incentives, transparent operators, and risk profiles that match your portfolio plan.

Within six months, you may have made your first allocation. Maybe your second. The capital that was sitting in a savings account earning 4% is now deployed in a diversified position earning a projected low-teens return. You are receiving quarterly reports. You know exactly what you own, why you own it, and what the expected timeline looks like. The anxiety that used to come with investment decisions has been replaced by a process.

Within a year, you are no longer the person who feels stuck. Your portfolio has begun to take shape. You have a deployment calendar that guides your next moves. You have a scoring system that makes every new opportunity a structured evaluation rather than an emotional one.

DEAD MONEY

You have an investment philosophy that is yours, tested through real decisions, refined through real experience.

And here is the part that matters most. You are no longer thinking about investing every day. The deals are in place. The operators are managing. The capital is working. And you are focused on the things that matter to you. Your career. Your family. Your health. Your life.

That is the transformation this book was designed to deliver. From dead money to compounding capital. From paralysis to process. From anxious high earner to calm, confident investor.

The system works. You can do it. And the first step is small enough to take this week.

What Comes Next

If you have read this far and you want to go deeper, there are a few ways to continue building on what you have learned.

The first is to find reliable deal flow. The DEALS framework gives you the system to evaluate any opportunity. But a system without deal flow is like a filter with nothing to filter. The biggest challenge most high-income investors face after learning how to evaluate deals is finding quality opportunities to evaluate in the first place. You need access to institutional-quality deals that have already been vetted, underwritten conservatively, and structured with investor protection in mind.

Without that pipeline, the framework sits on a shelf.

The second is to join an investor network. Investing in private markets does not have to be a solo activity. Being part of a community of like-minded investors gives you access to shared knowledge, deal insights,

and the confidence that comes from knowing others are deploying capital through the same disciplined approach. An investor network also opens the door to deeper education, live deal evaluations, portfolio-level guidance, and direct access to operators you can trust.

You can do both by visiting decodedeals.com/call and submitting an application. We will review it and, if there is a fit, begin sending you curated deal flow you can evaluate using the exact framework you learned in this book. You will also gain access to our investor community, including education webinars, qualified investor conversations, and priority access to new opportunities as they become available.

The framework is in your hands. The scorecards are ready. The only thing left is the decision to start.

Your capital has been patient long enough. Put it to work.