

Due Diligence Checklist — Seed (Investor-Facing)

The investor's own checklist for what to verify before signing, by risk area.

Educational template — not legal or financial advice. Consult qualified counsel before use. Market terms vary by jurisdiction and by deal.

The investor's own working checklist — what to gather and verify before signing, organized by risk area. This is not the document handed to a founder; it's what an angel or lead investor uses to run their own process. 37 items across 5 risk areas.

1. Founder Risk

WHAT TO CHECK	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	RED FLAG	GREEN FLAG
Founder-market fit	Specific, verifiable prior exposure to this exact buyer or problem	Recent pivot into the space with no prior domain experience, no clear reason why this problem	Describes the buyer's workflow in granular detail unprompted
Founder references	Ask for two names, then ask each of those for one more — not a hand-picked list only	Reluctant to provide references beyond a very short curated list	References volunteer specific examples of judgment under pressure
Response under pushback	How the founder handles a direct, uncomfortable question in the room	Deflects, gets defensive, or answers a different question than the one asked	Says “I don't know” plainly rather than improvising
Co-founder relationship	How founders describe each other's roles and any friction, directly	Unclear or overlapping roles; founders contradict each other on basic facts	Clear, distinct ownership areas; can name each other's blind spots candidly
Founder's personal runway	How dependent the founder is on this exact raise closing to pay themselves	Unpaid for an extended period with no personal runway left	Enough personal runway to make a rational, not desperate, decision
Prior startup experience	How the founder describes what went wrong in a prior venture, if any	Blames external factors entirely, no self-reflection offered	Names specific decisions they'd make differently
Response to hard terms	Does the founder engage substantively with pushback on valuation or terms	Treats negotiation as adversarial or personal	Negotiates firmly but professionally, with specific reasoning

Full-time status	Confirm founders are actually full-time, not moonlighting elsewhere	Still formally employed elsewhere, or an active competing side project	Can name the specific date they went full-time and what they gave up
------------------	---	---	---

2. Market Risk

WHAT TO CHECK	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	RED FLAG	GREEN FLAG
Market size derivation	Bottom-up math, not a single cited industry report	TAM from one analyst report, no company-specific derivation	Founder walks through the math live, including its weak assumptions
Timing (“why now”)	A specific, credible reason this is possible now, not three years ago	Generic answer (“the market is growing”), no specific trigger	Concrete, checkable trigger — a regulatory shift, a technology or cost curve
Customer concentration	Revenue distribution across customers	Over 40% of revenue from one customer, no clear diversification plan	Revenue spread across accounts, no single point of failure
Actual vs. described buyer	Confirm who actually signs the contract, not just who uses the product	Founder describes an end-user as the buyer, but budget sits with a different role	Founder names the actual budget-holder and their approval process
Competitive response risk	Could an incumbent credibly copy this in 12–18 months	Differentiation is a feature, not a structural advantage (data, distribution, network effect)	Differentiation compounds over time; not easily fast-followed
Regulatory / macro sensitivity	Exposure to a plausible sector-specific regulatory or rate shift	Business model depends on a regulatory status quo never stress-tested	Founder has already modeled a plausible adverse scenario
Sales cycle reality	Actual, verified average cycle across the last several closed deals	Stated cycle is aspirational, contradicted by deals actually closed	Consistent across recent deals and matches what's stated

3. Product Risk

WHAT TO CHECK	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	RED FLAG	GREEN FLAG
Real usage data	Actual product analytics, not anecdote	“Engaged users” defined so loosely it includes a single login	Specific, meaningful engagement definition backed by real data
Technical founder involvement	Recent commit history, not just a historical technical claim	Hasn't meaningfully touched the codebase in months; core work outsourced	Still actively building, can speak to recent specific decisions

Architecture scalability	Has the system been tested near the volume the plan assumes	Never stress-tested beyond current small customer volume	Specific, credible plan for the next order of magnitude
Build vs. buy / vendor dependency	How much value is proprietary vs. a thin layer over a third-party API	Entire product is a UI over one API, no differentiation if terms change	Proprietary data or logic exists independent of any single vendor
Security proportionate to data	Does security posture match the sensitivity of data actually collected	Handling sensitive data (financial, health, PII) with no formal practice	Proportionate practices, described specifically, not just asserted
Roadmap credibility	Does the roadmap match the team's actual current capacity	Assumes hiring that isn't funded by this round	Explicitly sequenced against the hiring this round actually funds
Customer-reported gaps	Ask customers directly what's missing, not just what they like	Founder unaware of, or dismissive of, a gap customers raise unprompted	Names the same gaps customers raise, before being told

4. Legal / Cap Table Risk

WHAT TO CHECK	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	RED FLAG	GREEN FLAG
Cap table cleanliness	Does it reconcile to actual signed documents	Doesn't reconcile; instruments exist that aren't reflected	Matches every signed document exactly, no unexplained gap
IP ownership	Signed assignment from every contributor, including departed ones	A departed contractor or co-founder never signed an assignment	Complete, signed assignment chain with no gaps
Founder vesting status	Are shares actually subject to vesting, and how much has accelerated	Fully vested already, or accelerated with no clear justification	Standard 4-year vesting with a 1-year cliff, largely unvested
Prior investor rights	What rights (pro rata, information, protective, board) already exist	An existing right could structurally block this round from closing	Prior rights are standard, no structural blocker
Litigation / disputes	Any pending, threatened, or informally resolved dispute	An informally settled dispute never disclosed until asked directly	No material history, or fully disclosed and resolved
Related-party transactions	Contracts or payments between the company and a founder's other interests	An undisclosed related-party contract on non-arm's-length terms	None, or fully disclosed with arm's-length terms
Entity structure	Confirm the raising entity is the actual operating entity	Multiple entities with an unclear or undocumented relationship	Single clean entity, or a clearly documented standard structure

Regulatory licensing	Does the business require a license it doesn't yet hold	Operating in a regulated activity without confirming requirements	Requirements identified and satisfied, or on a credible path
----------------------	---	--	---

5. Financial Risk

WHAT TO CHECK	WHAT TO LOOK FOR	RED FLAG	GREEN FLAG
Revenue quality	Signed contracts vs. pipeline, verbal commitments, or pilots	Reported revenue includes unbilled pilots or verbal commitments	Reconciles exactly to signed, executed, billed contracts
Burn rate trend	Is burn accelerating, flat, or improving relative to plan	Quietly accelerating with no corresponding change in the stated plan	Matches or is more conservative than what's presented
Runway math	Recompute independently from the bank statement, not the deck	Independently computed runway is meaningfully shorter than stated	Independent computation closely matches the stated figure
Gross margin realism	Does it account for all true cost of delivery, incl. support and infra	Excludes a real, material cost of delivering the product	Fully loaded, founder can walk through what's included
Payment terms vs. collections	Contracted terms vs. actual cash collection timing	Contractually annual but paying late or in unreflected installments	Actual collections closely match contracted terms
Liquidation preference stacking	Cumulative preference from prior rounds vs. likely near-term exit scenarios	Aggressive prior terms (participating, multiple preference) affect this round's economics	Prior rounds carry standard, single non-participating preferred
Tax and compliance standing	Payroll tax, franchise tax, any lapsed corporate filings	A lapsed filing or unpaid tax the founder wasn't previously aware of	Filings current, founder can confirm directly, not just assume

Lengdon — lengdon.com — September 2026 template edition.