EXPOSE!: Failed due diligence metrics discovered in investigations

Sat, 15 Jun 2013 17:00:00, newstips66, [post_tag: corruption, post_tag: dept-of-energy, post_tag: diane-feinstein, post_tag: doe-corruption, post_tag: elon-musk, category: energy-dept-slush-fund, post_tag: gao-investigation, post_tag: iron-man, post_tag: john-doerr, post_tag: kleiner-perkins, post_tag: kleiner-perkins-lawsuit, post_tag: kleiner-perkins-sex-allegations, post_tag: matt-rogers, post_tag: mckinsey-corruption, post_tag: outsourcing, post_tag: sen-grassley, category: senator-insider-trading, post_tag: solyndra, post_tag: solyndra-scandal, post_tag: solyndramobile, post_tag: steve-spinner, post_tag: steve-westly, post_tag: steven-chu, post_tag: tesla, post_tag: tesla-finncials, post_tag: tesla-motors, post_tag: throw-them-all-out, post_tag: tsla, post_tag: wall-street-journal-investigation, post_tag: washington-corruption, post_tag: washington-corruption-investigation, category: worldnews]

EXPOSE!: Failed due diligence metrics discovered in investigations

As investigation results and journalism reports continue to emerge, and as FOIA data and third party releases are produced in the open, it has become clear that something was manipulated by DOE and Hill staff to create a theatrically staged process in which only favored insiders could win but which, at first, had the contrived appearance of fair opportunity.

One of the most profound elements of these investigations has been the telling evidence that now shows that due diligence items were failed by so called DOE “Winners”, yet those winners still got their money. A large number of applicant “losers” actually beat the “winners” in due diligence comparisons but the evidence was manipulated by certain DOE staff in order to steer resources to a provided pre-approved “short-list” .

Examples such as the fact that Solyndra and Abound’s solar panels catch fire on your roof-top were well known and documented prior to the award but ignored in the award review.

Fisker’s batteries were known to blow-up, catch fire and burn the car and your home to the ground if they get wet or have a wire short. This was well known because DOE funded the company that provided the batteries and the failures were documented by DOE’s own staff. Fisker, Enerdel and A123, all of whom got the same batch of DOE money, failed because of documented errors which were publicly reported in technical materials far in advance of the award of money to either Fisker, Enerdel or A123 (Marketed as the “premiere”, “eminent”, “SHOWCASE”, “best-of-breed companies” by DOE and Steven Chu in order to sell the market on them)

Tesla has batteries which blow up when they get wet, had a horrific debt metric and had a vast number of negative metrics compared to every other applicant, at the time of application, yet they still got a windfall without questions.
Thousands of comparative review metrics have now emerged that point to only one conclusion: Someone inside DOE ordered certain companies to get money and certain companies to not get money.

Steven Chu stated that the DOE was the largest, most powerful, most well-resourced energy agency “on Earth”.

How could the “most powerful, most well-resourced energy agency on Earth”, the organization with more money than any other agency anywhere, blow it so bad? How could they have made over 3000 technical and financial mistakes? Is that even possible?

The process of reviewing a company for funding is called “Due Diligence”.
Due diligence is the process for reviewing and documenting the technical and financial metrics of a loan investment. A bank or venture capitalist usually has a budget of $10,000.00 and about 5 people to do due diligence on each applicant. DOE staff had millions of dollars, thousands of people, hundreds of millions of dollars of equipment and multiple deeply resourced federal labs.

To Repeat” How could the “most powerful, most well-resourced energy agency on Earth”, the organization with more money than any other agency anywhere, blow it so bad? How could they have made over 3000 technical and financial mistakes? Is that even possible?

Steven Chu has said: “We did all of the usual due diligence”… “Failures just happen all the time”.

Do they?

In an analysis of 14 other industries and their financing, not so much.
It turns out that the DOE failures are the largest number of failures following the most resourced due diligence in global business history.

Let’s say that another way. No industry has had so much money provided, so much checking out of applicants and so many failures, ever!

What is the bottom line?:

If the due diligence was even performed at all, someone at DOE ordered it all tossed out. It isn’t possible to look at all of the available facts at the times of application and select the current “winners” based on the available information at the time. It isn’t possible to look at all of the available facts at the times of application and name the other applicants “losers” when their ACTUAL due diligence metrics beat most of the “winners”.

Why would someone do this?

To pay off certain investors for other favors.

Stay Tuned…

DG
Associate to the LA Times
Los Angeles, CA