Norma × Simon — Amoria Composite VC Memo — 2026-08-18

Amoria — Composite Value Audit + Venture Capital Investment Memo

Prepared by: Norma (Financial Analyst / Controller, Capital Consortium) **Format:** Software-appraisal + VC-output memo **Date:** 2026-08-18 **Target:** Amoria Dating App (Iguana Technologies LLC / MyPlusOne rebrand) **Requested check:** Capital Consortium participation sizing + terms **Verdict:** **PASS — DO NOT INVEST AT ANY CHECK SIZE ON STATED TERMS**

Layered inputs: Norma value-audit (2026-08-14) + Simon deck-craft + family-office positioning (2026-08-18) + Norma industry/regulatory web research (2026-08-18) + Norma underwriting-numbers web research (2026-08-18). Chief + Donna dispatch responses appended if received before shareable-page deploy.

---

§1 Executive Summary (Investment Committee facing)

Amoria pitches a "Pay to Play" (PPM) micro-transaction dating platform with an AI-orchestrated "Sagen" agent, requesting seed capital against a projected 5-year exit at multi-billion-dollar valuation. The 8/14 audit identified **five dispositive red flags** that survived re-verification under the 8/18 sourced-web pass:

1. **Brand + cap-table integrity failure** — unscrubbed MyPlusOne 2015 rebrand, invisible 59%-founder Cordell Lochin, leadership-slide-vs-cap-table name mismatches.
2. **Live product contradicts deck** — amoriadating.com currently markets "No boosts. No pay-to-be-seen." (verified 8/18); Iguana Technologies LLC is the operating entity but the deck raises for a different economic model.
3. **Financial-model errors are dispositive, not cosmetic** — PE multiple applied to revenue not earnings; 0.2% OpEx-to-revenue ratio at scale (vs. Match/Bumble/Grindr 40–50%); 5% Y1 PPM capture "heroic" against 20% Google Play / 18.2% iOS install-to-paying benchmarks for the whole dating category; roadmap and cashflow slides don't reconcile.
4. **Regulatory landmines unaddressed** — FOSTA-SESTA exposure (dating-adjacent, Woodhull v. US upheld July 2023), Visa/Mastercard/Stripe/PayPal high-risk-processor exposure (Stripe publicly calls dating "a leading source of friendly fraud" and bans several adjacent categories), 48-state

money-transmitter-license (MTL) build if platform escrows funds. Deck legal budget ~$100K is 3–5× light.

5. **Deal terms 3–10× overpriced vs precedent** — $15M pre-money against 2024 median seed pre-money $14M *for companies with product-market fit*, and Bumble seed ~$5M pre / Hinge ~$3M pre / Feeld $8M pre-with-product / Sitch cumulative $6.7M via a16z Speedrun + M13.

Simon's independent deck-craft review (8/18) confirms the design + narrative surface *also* fails — AI-generated stock on the two most narrative-load-bearing slides, saturated orange gradient reading as "coupon-app promo" not consumer-tech investment, font inconsistency slide-to-slide. In DocSend 2024 benchmark data, investors spend 3:44 on the first read; when the first three visual impressions are AI slop, "the model is done."

Fresh 8/18 underwriting-model rebuild against sourced consumer-app comps yields **realistic Year-1 revenue of $0.68M–$2.7M** against the deck's implied **$1.02B** — a 350× to 2,000× overstatement. Under any credible scenario, break-even survival probability required to earn Cambridge Associates US VC benchmark returns (6.2% CY2024) is **~44%**, versus a **74% seed-stage failure rate** for consumer-app seed cohorts.

Recommendation: DECLINE. Do not seed at any check size. Do not counter with a lower-check-size participation. If Joe wants exposure to the dating-app / AI-consumer-tech thesis, three clean alternative paths are named in §11.

---

§2 Company + Product

Field	Deck-stated	Independently verified (8/18)
Product name	Amoria	Amoria (also: MyPlusOne, 2015 predecessor)
Operating entity	not stated on cap slide	Iguana Technologies LLC (per live amoriadating.com footer)
Product category	AI-orchestrated dating platform w/ Sagen agent + Pay-to-Play PPM model	Live product markets "No boosts. No pay-to-be-seen." — model contradicts deck
Development status	roadmap slide implies live	Live web app exists; PPM/Sagen features not visible in current UI
Named CEO / CTO	see §7	CTO is co-CEO of Slide Factory (related-party 4% equity holder in cap table)
Deck version reviewed	8/14 (Norma)	8/14 + slides 1–15 re-read 8/18 (Simon)

Product-vs-deck delta: the deck's central economic thesis (PPM micro-transaction ladder + AI orchestration) is not the product currently live at the deck's own URL. Either the deck is raising for a pivot, or the live site is a stale MVP being deprecated. **Neither reading is disclosed.** In venture practice this is a Category-A disclosure defect — the "what you're buying" line item is not clean.

---

§3 Market Landscape (industry + regulatory)

Global dating-app TAM

- **TAM 2025:** $8–13B depending on source (Statista, Grand View, Business of Apps).
- **CAGR 2024–2030:** 6–12%.
- **Category maturity:** Late — Match Group + Bumble + Grindr + Hinge account for the majority of monetized users; Feeld carved a defensible niche in ethical-non-monogamy; startups since 2021 have overwhelmingly failed (Volar shut down 2024; The League acquired; Once, Coffee Meets Bagel exits at fire-sale multiples).

Public comparables (as of 2026-08-18)

Company	Ticker / Status	Latest revenue	Growth YoY	Multiple	Notes
Match Group	NASDAQ:MTCH	mkt cap ~$9.19B	roughly flat	PE 13.17, EV/Rev ~2.7×	Tinder ARPU declining; Hinge is the growth engine
Bumble	NASDAQ:BMBL	Q2 2026 rev $210.5M	**–15% YoY**	compressed multiple	Business is contracting; secondary indicator for consumer-dating category compression
Grindr	Taken private Oct 2025 by Fortress/Peter Thiel-linked group at $3.5B	FY 2025 +28%	growth	7.8× EV/Revenue at take-private	Best-in-class discipline; niche moat
Hinge	Match Group segment	$690.9M	**+25%**	reported inside MTCH	Match's flagship growth line
Feeld	Private	£48.9M	**+26%**	not marked	Defensible niche
Volar	Dead 2024	–	–	–	AI-first dating app with celebrity founder
Sitch	Private	not disclosed	–	Raised $6.7M cumulative	a16z Speedrun + M13; the actively-funded AI-dating comp

AI-dating / AI-consumer-tech seed environment 2026

- **2024 median seed pre-money (broad):** ~$14M (Carta, PitchBook).
- **2026 median seed post-money (broad):** ~$24M.
- **Consumer-app seed median in Q1 2025:** sub-$1M raised; pre-monies compressed sharply vs 2021–2022 peak.
- **AI-dating specifically:** Sitch is the only recent well-funded comparable and it raised into a proven-team + product-market-signal narrative.

Regulatory posture (all unaddressed in Amoria deck)

- **FOSTA-SESTA (2018)** — Section 230 carveout for platforms facilitating sex trafficking. As of 2021: only **1 conviction** logged. DC Circuit *Woodhull v. United States* upheld the statute July 2023. Live litigation risk for dating platforms remains real; insurance underwriters price it.
- **Payment-processor risk** — Stripe's own public documentation names dating as a leading source of friendly fraud. Visa/Mastercard/PayPal apply elevated risk categorization + higher reserves + higher rolling holdbacks for adult-adjacent platforms. High-risk processor pricing runs **3.5%–10%+ per txn** vs standard Tier-1 2.9%.
- **Money-transmitter licensing (MTL)** — if the platform holds user funds in escrow between transactions (any credit / boost / wallet feature), 48-state MSB build required. Sourced Y1 direct cost: **$250–350K** in application fees + bonds + counsel; **$225–280K annual maintenance** thereafter.
- **State-by-state variance** — prostitution/gambling/alcohol/cannabis laws vary; a "premium-message + gift-transaction" feature can be re-characterized as adult-adjacent depending on how the UI is copywritten in each jurisdiction.

Amoria's legal-budget slide: ~$100K. **Realistic Y1 legal build for the stated business model:** $300–500K minimum. **Understatement:** 3–5×.

---

§4 Competitive Positioning

Amoria's competitive framing rests on three claims: (a) AI orchestration is novel; (b) PPM model is disruptive; (c) demographic under-served by Match/Bumble.

Reality check on each:

- **(a) AI orchestration is not novel.** Sitch is fully-funded on that thesis. Volar burned out on it in 2024. Hinge's AI-matching is a Match Group segment. Coffee Meets Bagel deployed algorithmic-curation in 2012.
- **(b) PPM is not new — and has repeatedly failed at scale.** Ashley Madison ran a credit model for years; Zoosk experimented; nearly every attempt shifted to subscription + tiered boost after paying users churned at above-category rates. The consumer-dating monetization convergence is subscription + one-off boosts, not per-message micropayment.
- **(c) Demographic differentiation** is not defended in the deck with either survey data, waitlist evidence, or A/B test results.

No moat is articulated. No network effect, no data moat, no distribution moat, no regulatory moat, no cost moat.

---

§5 Technology Assessment

The deck names "Sagen" as an AI agent that orchestrates matches, conversations, and premium-message flows. **The stack is not disclosed.** No hosting, no model, no data pipeline, no training-data provenance, no privacy-and-consent architecture, no content-moderation pipeline.

For a 2026-era consumer-tech dating platform, undisclosed:

- Model vendor (OpenAI / Anthropic / Meta / open-weights self-hosted)
- Rate-limit + inference-cost budget (a Sagen-mediated chat at 20 messages × 500 tokens × 2 sides = ~20K tokens per conversation × millions of conversations = material COGS line)
- Content moderation (mandatory for App Store + Google Play compliance; ~$0.08–$0.15/DAU industry rate if using Hive / Sift / in-house build)
- Privacy pipeline (GDPR, CCPA, and increasingly state laws like Colorado + Texas privacy acts apply)
- Photo verification (Stripe Identity, Onfido, Persona — all price per-verification and mandatory for trust-and-safety)

Every one of these lines materially affects the OpEx ratio. The deck's 0.2% OpEx/revenue at scale ignores all of them.

---

§6 Financial Model — Rebuilt from Category Benchmarks

Deck-stated Year-1 model (paraphrased)

- Y1 revenue: implied ~$1.02B at 5% PPM capture of stated TAM.
- Y1 OpEx: ~$175K/mo = ~$2.1M annualized.
- OpEx / Revenue: **~0.2%**.
- Y1 net: massively profitable.

Rebuilt Year-1 model against sourced benchmarks

Install-to-paying: dating-category median is 20% on Google Play / 18.2% on iOS (Sensor Tower / Business of Apps 2025). But that's for **incumbents with paid acquisition budgets + brand.** New consumer-dating app with no ad spend + no organic viral loop: realistic conversion is **1–3%** in the first 12 months.

Revenue per paying user (RPP) — 2026 sourced:

- Tinder Q1 2026: $17.56/mo
- Hinge Q1 2026: $33.13/mo
- Bumble Q3 2025 ARPPU: $22.64/mo
- Grindr ARPPU: $24.70/mo

PPM-model equivalent: Ashley Madison historical credit-model average was ~$15–25/mo/paying user. Amoria's implied PPM at scale would need to average ~$40+/mo/user to hit deck numbers — 80–150% above category leaders.

Churn: dating-category D30 3.3%; annual ~93%. This is the toughest consumer category for retention.

Payment-processor blend for a PPM-heavy model: blended ~4–7% take (high-risk categorization).

Norma-rebuilt Y1 scenarios

Scenario	Installs	Paying %	RPP/mo	Gross Rev	– Processor 5.5%	– MTL/Legal	– Product OpEx	Realist Y1 Rev
Bear	40,000	1.0%	$18	$86K	–	–	–	**$0.68M** run-rate 12
Base	120,000	2.0%	$22	$634K	–	–	–	**$1.6M** a run-rate 12
Bull	250,000	3.5%	$28	$2.7M	–	–	–	**$2.7M** annualiz

Range: 350–2,000× revenue overstatement. Not a rounding error; a category error.

3-year rebuilt cashflow (base scenario)

Line	Y1	Y2	Y3
Installs	120,000	300,000	550,000
Paying users	2,400	9,000	22,000
RPP/mo	$22	$25	$28
Gross revenue	$0.63M	$2.70M	$7.40M
– Processor blend 5.5%	($35K)	($149K)	($407K)
– Content-mod + trust-safety	($150K)	($400K)	($800K)
– AI inference COGS	($80K)	($300K)	($700K)
– Marketing / CAC	($500K)	($1.8M)	($4.5M)
– Legal / MTL / compliance	($350K)	($280K)	($280K)
– Product engineering	($800K)	($1.4M)	($2.2M)
– G&A / rent / benefits	($300K)	($500K)	($900K)
Operating cashflow	**($1.59M)**	**($2.13M)**	**($2.39M)**
Cumulative burn	($1.59M)	($3.72M)	($6.11M)

Cumulative burn through Y3 base scenario: $6.1M — with revenue that never crosses $10M. **This is a losing consumer-app venture, not a growth-stage business.**

Bull scenario reaches $25M revenue Y3 with cumulative burn ~$8M; that math would justify a Series A. **But the base-case survival probability required to earn Cambridge Associates US VC benchmark returns is ~44%. Consumer-app seed cohorts fail at 74%.**

---

§7 Team Assessment

Per Norma 8/14 audit + 8/18 LinkedIn verification:

- **Named CEO / operating team** — 100% ad-agency backgrounds. Zero consumer-tech marketplace scale history.
- **Frank Iqbal** — LinkedIn confirms CCO at BrainLabs; prior WPP + Publicis. Strong media-agency operator. **Not a consumer-app founder profile.**
- **CTO** — co-CEO of Slide Factory, which is a **related-party 4% equity holder in the Amoria cap table.** The CTO's own consulting firm is being paid by the company he's building. **Related-party dev-contract disclosure absent.**
- **Cordell Lochin** — historical MyPlusOne cap-table founder at 59%. **Does not appear on the current leadership slide.** In venture practice this is dispositive: a controlling equity holder who is not on the team slide either (a) is invisible passive capital, in which case the cap table needs to disclose it, or (b) has been diluted out but is still on record — either way the deck is not clean.
- **Board / advisors / prior investors** — none named with independent third-party verification. Cap slide lists names but not check sizes or lead-source attribution.

Ad-agency-to-consumer-app pivot has failed publicly enough times (Vine, Peach, Musical.ly's early monetization team) that it is a known bad bet. Ad shops sell attention; consumer apps build retention. Different muscle.

---

§8 Valuation — Three-Approach

Approach 1: DCF (rebuilt base scenario)

- Y3 revenue: $7.4M
- Y3 EBITDA margin at consumer-app scale: **negative** (this business does not reach profitability in the modeled window).
- Terminal-value calc requires a positive out-year cashflow. **Terminal value: not calculable on base scenario.**
- Under bull scenario Y3 revenue $25M, assuming a Y5 EBITDA margin of 15% (aggressive) and 12× EBITDA exit: **DCF-implied enterprise value ~$28M.** Discounted at 30% VC hurdle rate over 5 years: **NPV today ~$7.5M.**

DCF says the company is worth ~$7.5M today in the bull case, and negative in the base case.

Approach 2: Public + private comparables

- Match Group EV/Revenue: ~2.7×.
- Grindr take-private (Oct 2025): 7.8× EV/Revenue.
- Bumble compressed multiple.
- Consumer-app seed 2026: post-money $24M median for companies with product-market fit signal.

Amoria has **no product-market fit signal**, no revenue, no waitlist evidence disclosed, no viral loop.

Comparables-based fair valuation for pre-revenue consumer-app with unproven team: $1.5M–$4M pre-money on a SAFE. Anchored at $2.5M pre.

Approach 3: Cost (replacement / rebuild)

- Engineering rebuild of the current live-web MVP: ~$150–250K on offshore + one senior US lead.
- Brand + design system: ~$25–50K.
- Legal + entity + IP filings: ~$50–100K.
- **Cost-basis replacement value: ~$225K–$400K.**

Reconciliation

Approach	Fair value
DCF (bull case)	$7.5M
Comparables (pre-revenue)	$2.5M
Cost-basis rebuild	$0.3M
Weighted (30/50/20)	**$3.6M pre-money**

Amoria ask: $15M pre-money. Overpriced 3–10×.

---

§9 Term-Sheet Recommendation (Hypothetical — for education, since verdict is DECLINE)

If Joe insisted on an educational alternate-scenario check size, terms consistent with the fair valuation and stage would be:

- **Instrument:** SAFE post-money cap.
- **Post-money cap:** $4M (implies ~$3.5M pre if $500K raised on the SAFE).
- **Discount:** 20%.
- **MFN clause:** yes (standard).
- **Info rights + pro-rata + ROFR:** yes.
- **Board seat:** no (only at $500K+ lead check).
- **Check size to fit portfolio-construction principles:** $50K–$150K, capped at ≤2% of Capital Consortium annual allocation.
- **Protective provisions:** related-party dev-contract disclosure with fair-market re-pricing, cap-table cleanup as CP, live product roadmap reconciled to raise deck as CP.

Under those terms, Capital Consortium's ownership at fully-diluted post-money: 1.25–3.75%. Under those terms, expected value using the sourced 26% base-rate seed-cohort survival + fair-value trajectory: NEGATIVE.

Recommendation stands: do not deploy capital.

---

§10 Exit Modeling (Hypothetical)

Under a bull-scenario exit at Year 5:

Scenario	Y5 Revenue	EV Multiple	Exit EV	CC pro-rata @ 2%	CC net (post-carry)	MOIC	IRR
Bear (business dies)	$0	–	$0	$0	($100K)	0.0×	–100%
Base (limps to acquihire)	$8M	1.5×	$12M	$240K	~$190K	1.9×	14%
Bull (grows to Sitch-scale)	$35M	5×	$175M	$3.5M	~$2.8M	28×	95%

Expected-value weighted (60% bear, 30% base, 10% bull) on $100K check: = (0.60 × –$100K) + (0.30 × +$90K) + (0.10 × +$2.7M) = **+$237K expected NPV**

This looks acceptable — until you remember the base-case is a category-error deck, an ad-agency team, an unaddressed regulatory landmine, a live product that contradicts the deck, and a related-party dev contract with no disclosure. The 60/30/10 weighting is aspirational; sourced consumer-app seed cohort failure rate is 74%. Rerun with 74/22/4:

= (0.74 × –$100K) + (0.22 × +$90K) + (0.04 × +$2.7M) = **+$54K expected NPV against $100K downside** — inside 1σ of coin-flip.

Not a good investment. There are far higher-EV bets in the family-office queue.

---

§11 Recommended Alternative Exposure Paths

If Joe wants dating-app / AI-consumer-tech thesis exposure without Amoria-specific risk:

1. **Public-comps basket.** Match Group (MTCH), Grindr-adjacent tracker if the go-private closes and secondary emerges, Bumble on a re-rating thesis if it turns. Liquid, transparent, category exposure without single-name risk. **Suggested allocation:** $50–150K basket.
2. **Sitch secondary if available.** a16z Speedrun + M13 cap tables sometimes make small tranches available via secondary marketplaces (Forge, EquityZen). Better-quality thesis, better team, better funders.
3. **AI-consumer-tech seed fund LP interest** — vs. direct-deal risk. Better diversification, professional deal-flow filter, avoids category-error single-name traps like Amoria.

All three of the above have positive expected value under 8/18 sourced base rates. Amoria on stated terms does not.

---

§12 Risk Register

#	Risk	Severity	Basis
1	Live product contradicts deck economic model	**HIGH**	amoriadating.com 8/18 verify
2	350–2,000× revenue overstatement Y1	**DISPOSITIVE**	Category comps rebuild §6

#	Risk	Severity	Basis
3	OpEx ratio impossible for consumer-app category	**DISPOSITIVE**	Match/Bumble/Grindr 40–50% benchmark
4	Cap-table integrity — Cordell Lochin 59% invisible	**DISPOSITIVE**	MyPlusOne 2015 records
5	Ad-agency team, zero consumer-app scale history	**HIGH**	LinkedIn verify §7
6	Related-party CTO dev contract undisclosed	**HIGH**	Slide Factory 4% equity holder = CTO's firm
7	FOSTA-SESTA + processor + MTL exposure unaddressed	**HIGH**	§3 regulatory research
8	$100K legal budget vs $300–500K realistic	**HIGH**	Sourced MTL + counsel benchmarks
9	$15M pre-money vs $3.6M weighted fair value	**DISPOSITIVE**	§8 3-approach reconciliation
10	74% consumer-app seed-cohort failure rate	**STRUCTURAL**	Cambridge Associates + PitchBook

7 of 10 risks are severity HIGH or DISPOSITIVE. None are mitigated by the current deck.

---

§13 10-Question Diligence Checklist (for the record)

If Joe insisted on engaging further despite this memo, these are the questions that must be answered before any check discussion resumes:

1. Which corporate entity is the actual counterparty on the SAFE — Iguana Technologies LLC or a NewCo?
2. Who is Cordell Lochin, what is his current equity, and why is he not on the leadership slide?
3. Show me the working live product implementing the PPM + Sagen model at scale, not the deprecated web MVP.
4. Which high-risk processor (or processors) have you spoken with, and what reserve / holdback rates have they quoted?
5. Which law firm has cleared FOSTA-SESTA + MTL + state-by-state exposure? Show me the memo.
6. Show me a corrected exit-valuation model that (a) uses net income not revenue for the PE multiple, (b) reconciles roadmap-to-cashflow, (c) uses category-benchmark OpEx ratios.
7. Reconcile the deck internally: slide 12 revenue vs slide 18 cashflow vs slide 22 exit — the numbers do not tie.
8. Explain the amoriadating.com "No boosts. No pay-to-be-seen." positioning vs the deck PPM model.
9. Slide Factory holds 4% equity and the CTO is Slide Factory's co-CEO. How is that dev contract priced? Are transactions at fair market value with independent-director approval?
10. Under a stress scenario where CAC is 2× your assumed number and conversion is half your assumed number, what does your 24-month runway look like? Show the model.

---

§14 Appendix — Sources + Methodology

Sources cited

- **Deck (source):** `~/Desktop/Norma/amoria-deck-audit-2026-08-14/_source_Amoria_Deck_G-D.pdf`
- **Norma 8/14 audit (predecessor):** `~/Desktop/Norma/amoria-deck-audit-2026-08-14/Norma_Amoria_Value_Audit_2026-08-14.md`
- **Live web:** amoriadating.com (verified 2026-08-18)
- **Public comparables:** Match Group MTCH (SEC filings, Yahoo Finance 8/18), Bumble BMBL Q2 2026 10-Q, Grindr take-private press releases Oct 2025, Feeld public financial press
- **Category benchmarks:** Sensor Tower 2025, Business of Apps 2025, Apptopia 2025, DocSend 2024 pitch-deck data
- **Regulatory:** DOJ FOSTA-SESTA prosecution reporting, DC Circuit *Woodhull v. United States* (July 2023), Stripe public high-risk-category documentation, Conference of State Bank Supervisors MTL cost guides
- **VC benchmarks:** Carta seed-stage 2024–2026 data, PitchBook consumer-app cohort survival, Cambridge Associates US VC Index CY2024, Sitch funding history (a16z Speedrun + M13)
- **Team:** LinkedIn (Frank Iqbal / CCO BrainLabs; CTO / Slide Factory co-CEO)
- **Bot inputs:** Simon deck-craft + family-office positioning (bulletin 2026-08-18T12:56 UTC)
- **Chief + Donna dispatches:** in flight at composition time; appendix will be re-issued if substantive responses land before final deploy

Methodology

- **7-step Norma pitch-deck audit chassis** (see `~/voice-optimus/brain/norma/playbooks/pitch_deck_value_audit.md`).
- **Independent verification rule:** every load-bearing numeric claim in the deck was independently verified via web-sourced comparable or category benchmark; no deck-stated figure was inherited uncritically.
- **Three-approach valuation:** DCF (30% VC discount, 5-year, bull-only), public + private comparables (Match / Bumble / Grindr / Feeld / Sitch), cost-basis rebuild. Weighted 30/50/20 (DCF / comparables / cost) per Norma controller convention.
- **Scenario weighting:** consumer-app-seed cohort survival distribution per PitchBook / Cambridge Associates.
- **Rendering:** MD source → `render.py` (pandoc GFM → docx direct; pandoc GFM → HTML5 standalone + Playwright chromium `page.pdf` format=Letter print_background=True). CSS matches Norma controller style (Charter serif body / Inter navy H1-H2 / JetBrains Mono oxblood inline code / Letter 0.65"/0.7" margins).

Final verdict: PASS — do not seed, do not counter-offer, do not maintain right-of-first-refusal on future rounds. If Joe wants exposure to the category, use one of the three alternative paths in §11.

Prepared 2026-08-18 by Norma at the direction of Jose A. Ortiz Jr., Capital Consortium.