

Critical Minerals Deep Dive:

Securing the Battery Supply Chain

APPENDIX A: Petri Map Context

Petri maps are process diagrams that trace how raw materials are transformed into finished products across value chains. The term "Petri map" reflects a biological analogy: just as a Petri dish reveals microorganism interactions invisible to the naked eye, these maps expose dependencies that aggregate supply-chain data obscures. For critical minerals analysis, this granularity proves essential because strategic vulnerabilities and intervention opportunities often reside not in mining or final manufacturing, the most visible stages, but in midstream processing steps that require specific technical capabilities, reagent supplies, environmental controls, or equipment that only a few facilities worldwide possess.

Petri maps were originally designed to analyze single, end-use products for one firm, highlighting chokepoints or limited supplier diversity. We adapted this approach to map entire product groups. Instead of firms as actors, we aggregate countries involved in each process as the actor but separately list their market shares. Unlike high-level supply-chain diagrams that emphasize trade flows between countries or companies, Petri maps operate at the process technology level, detailing physical and chemical transformations, required inputs, intermediate outputs, and critical dependencies at each stage.

The data for the Petri maps in this study came from a range of government and non-government official websites, such as the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the International Energy Agency (IEA), and the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Our approach began by identifying major categories of critical minerals as defined by the USGS 2025 critical mineral list. For the sake of this paper, we focused only on the major category of battery materials. From this broader list, we selected only those minerals that directly contribute to the production of key downstream technologies such as lithium-ion batteries. According to USGS criteria, these minerals represent the most essential inputs for manufacturing final energy and electronic products.

To create a consistent structure, we adopted the DOE framework for organizing the stages of critical mineral supply chains into four broad categories: (1) upstream raw materials, (2) processed materials, (3) engineered components, and (4) final end-use products. The mapping flows from raw critical minerals positioned at the upstream end and final technologies placed at the downstream integration end. We worked in both directions, upstream and downstream, to identify the intermediate stages of processed materials and

engineered components through a review of a combination of engineering literature, industry analyses, and market research.

Upstream raw material data was sourced primarily from the USGS 2025 Mineral Commodity Summaries, which provided 2024 World Production Capacity data. From those data, the market share by country was calculated. For the midstream and downstream data, we used secondary research from engineering publications and market intelligence platforms. We noted with an asterisk when data was not publicly available.

Critical mineral supply chains are not simple linear flows. A battery-grade lithium compound, for instance, may pass through 8-12 distinct process steps, each requiring specific technical capabilities, regulatory approvals, and input materials. Our intention with the modified Petri maps is to reveal the stages controlled by single countries or firms, adjacency opportunities where existing industrial capabilities (chemicals, metallurgy, semiconductor processing) can be leveraged, modularity potential showing which stages can be geographically separated without performance loss, technical barriers where specialized equipment, proprietary knowhow, or extreme purity requirements limit replication, and environmental constraints that may require stringent controls to responsibly control hazardous pollutants and waste.

APPENDIX B: Market Share Petri Map References

- Rongkali, K. (2025, December 20). *Mixed Hydroxide Precipitate (MHP) 2026-2033 Trends: Unveiling Growth Opportunities and Competitor Dynamics*. Archive Market Research. <https://www.archivemarketresearch.com/reports/mixed-hydroxide-precipitate-mhp-66313>
- Benchmark. (2023, November 7). *Infographic: China controls three-quarters of graphite anode supply chain*. Benchmark Source. <https://source.benchmarkminerals.com/article/infographic-china-controls-three-quarters-of-graphite-anode-supply-chain>
- BIS Research. (2025). *Metal Hydride Market - A Global and Regional Analysis*. <https://bisresearch.com/industry-report/metal-hydride-market.html>
- Black Canyon. (2025). *Manganese Developer and Explorer in the Pilbara Region, Western Australia*. <https://blackcanyon.com.au/>
- Cheng, A. L., Fuchs, E. R. H., Karplus, V. J., & Michalek, J. J. (2024, March 8). *Electric vehicle battery chemistry affects supply chain disruption vulnerabilities*. Nature Communications, 15, 2143 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-46418-1>
- Energy News. (2025, February 24). *Andy Home: China tightens its grip on global nickel supplies with Anglo's sale*. <https://energynews.oedigital.com/coal/2025/02/24/andy-home-china-tightens-its-grip-on-global-nickel-supplies-with-anglos-sale>
- Ev-a2zm. (2024, February 8). *Top 20 Countries with the Most Share in Global Li-ion Battery Manufacturing Capacity in 2024*. <https://ev-a2z.com/listicle/top-20-countries-with-the-most-share-in-global-li-ion-battery-manufacturing-capacity-in-2024/>
- Ewing, S. M. (2025, July). *Cobalt*. 2022 Minerals Yearbook, U.S. Geological Survey. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/myb/vol1/2022/myb1-2022-cobalt.pdf>
- Ewing, S. M. & U.S. Geological Survey. (2025, January). *Cobalt*. Mineral Commodity Summaries, U.S. Geological Survey. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/periodicals/mcs2025/mcs2025-cobalt.pdf>
- Global Info Research. (2024, March 28). *Global Lithium Carbonate Supply, Demand and Key Producers, 2024-2030*. <https://www.globalinforesearch.com/reports/2062153/lithium-carbonate>
- HiQLCD. (2025, August 12). *Cobalt sulfate, battery grade*. https://www.hiq.earth/dataset/hiqlcd/1.1.1/cut_off/fe8a65ad-0b52-406f-82fe-f3387ae745a7/%20cobalt-sulfate-battery-grade?ver=1763590236220

- IntelMarket Research. (Updated 2026, July 18). *Nickel Sulphate Market Growth Analysis, Market Dynamics, Key Players and Innovations, Outlook and Forecast 2026-2034*. IMR-832. <https://www.intelmarketresearch.com/%20nickel-sulphate-market-832>
- International Energy Agency. (2022, March). *The Role of Critical Minerals in Clean Energy Transitions | Reliable supply of minerals*. Energy Outlook Special Report. <https://www.iea.org/reports/the-role-of-critical-minerals-in-clean-energy-transitions/reliable-supply-of-minerals>
- International Energy Agency. (2025a). *Global EV Outlook 2025 | Electric vehicle batteries*. <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2025/electric-vehicle-batteries>
- International Energy Agency (2025b). *Critical Minerals Data Explorer*. <https://www.iea.org/data-and-statistics/data-tools/critical-minerals-data-explorer>
- LBMA. (2026). *About Good Delivery*. <https://www.lbma.org.uk/good-delivery/about-good-delivery>
- Lithium Harvest. (2026, April 28). *The Lithium Mining Market*. <https://lithiumharvest.com/knowledge/lithium/the-lithium-mining-market/>
- Ltd, L. X. C. M. C. (2025, June 4). *What countries are the major producers of Natural Flake Graphite Powder?* - Blog - Xinhui Carbon. Xinhui Carbon. <https://www.lzcarbon.com/blog/what-countries-are-the-major-producers-of-natural-flake-graphite-powder-175942.html>
- McLeod, D. (2025, May). *Cobalt Market Report 2024*. Cobalt Institute. <https://www.cobaltinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Cobalt-Market-Report-2024.pdf>
- Metoree. (2026). *21 Nickel Sulfate Manufacturers in 2026*. <https://us.metoree.com/categories/6711/>
- Precedence Research. (2026, February 10). *Solid State Battery Market Size, Share, and Trends 2026 to 2035*. <https://www.precedenceresearch.com/solid-state-battery-market>
- Reinsch, W. A., Broadbent, M., Denamiel, T., & Shammass, E. (2024, June 6). *Friendshoring The Lithium-Ion Battery Supply Chain: Battery Cell Manufacturing*. Center for Strategic & International Studies. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/friendshoring-lithium-ion-battery-supply-chain-battery-cell-manufacturing>

- Sharma, R. (2026). *NCA Battery Market Research Report 2034*. Growth Market Reports. <https://growthmarketreports.com/report/lithium-nickel-cobalt-aluminum-oxide-battery-nca-market-global-industry-analysis>
- Statista. (2025a, May). *Distribution of refined cobalt production worldwide in 2024, by country*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1412138/global-refined-cobalt-production-share-by-country/>
- Statista. (2025b, May). *Global market distribution of battery makers for electric vehicles in 1st semester 2025*. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/235323/lithium-batteries-top-manufacturers/>
- Stewart, A. A. (2025, June). *Nickel*. 2021 Minerals Yearbook, U.S. Geological Survey. <https://pubs.usgs.gov/myb/vol1/2021/myb1-2021-nickel.pdf>
- Swar, V. (2026, April 28). *Silver Oxide Battery Market Size & Opportunities, 2026-2033*. Coherent Market Insights. <https://www.coherentmarketinsights.com/market-insight/silver-oxide-battery-market-1942>
- Targray. (n.d.). *Battery-grade Cobalt Sulphate Supply Solutions*. <https://www.targray.com/li-ion-battery/%20cathode-materials/cobalt-sulphate>
- TrendEconomy. (2024, November 7). *Primary cells & primary batteries, silver oxide*. Imports and Exports | 2023. https://trendeconomy.com/data/commodity_h2/850640
- U.S. Department of Energy (2024, December). *2021–2024 Four-year Review of Supply Chains for the Advanced Batteries Sector*. <https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/20212024-Four%20Year%20Review%20of%20Supply%20Chains%20for%20the%20Advanced%20Batteries%20Sector.pdf>
- U.S. Department of the Interior & U.S. Geological Survey. (2025, March). *Mineral Commodity Summaries 2025* (Version 1.2). <https://pubs.usgs.gov/periodicals/mcs2025/mcs2025.pdf>
- Zadeh, J. (2025, July 11). *Indonesian MHP Prices: Current Trends and Market Analysis 2025*. Discovery Alert. <https://discoveryalert.com.au/mixed-hydroxide-precipitate-2025-battery-supply-chains/>

APPENDIX C: Cost-Focused Petri Map Methodology & References

Part A

Cost-Focused Petri-map – Part A illustrates the cost-based battery materials supply/value chain for the minerals natural graphite, synthetic graphite, and lithium. Each mineral’s value chain, from upstream to downstream, highlights the capital cost (CAPEX)—typically one-time expenses associated with equipment, buildings, and construction; operating cost (OPEX)—recurring manufacturing expenses associated with materials or feedstock, energy, and labor; and project timeline (Time)—the total duration required to establish a new manufacturing line, from facility construction to production ramp-up at each stage.

Natural Graphite

In the natural graphite value chain, the upstream stage begins with a natural graphite mining facility. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$11,000 per tonne per annum (tpa), an OPEX of approximately \$226 per tonne, and a facility construction-to-production start timeline of approximately three years. The process then moves to a graphite anode manufacturing facility, where spheroidization, purification, and coating occur. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$28,000 tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$4,300 to \$5,000 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately two years.

In the third stage, various types of batteries are manufactured, and costs vary depending on the type of battery manufacturing facility. For example, a downstream lithium-ion battery manufacturing facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$50 to \$167 per kilowatt-hour (kWh), an OPEX of approximately \$40 to \$140 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately one to three years.

For a lithium iron phosphate (LFP) battery manufacturing facility, CAPEX ranges from \$45 to \$75 per kWh, OPEX ranges from \$5 to \$11 per kWh, and the development timeline is approximately two to three years. For nickel cobalt aluminum (NCA) batteries, CAPEX is approximately \$80 to \$125 per kWh, OPEX is approximately \$10 to \$18 per kWh, and the development timeline is approximately three to five years. For a nickel manganese cobalt (NMC) battery manufacturing facility, CAPEX is approximately \$70 to \$110 per kWh, OPEX is approximately \$7 to \$15 per kWh, and the development timeline is approximately three to four years.

Graphite anode manufacturing can also feed into lithium battery production facilities that produce different types of lithium batteries, including lithium nickel manganese cobalt (NMC) oxide, lithium cobalt oxide (LCO), lithium nickel cobalt aluminum (NCA) oxide (NCA), lithium manganese oxide (LMO), and lithium titanate (LTO). Such lithium battery production

facilities require a CAPEX of approximately \$100 to \$200 per kWh, an OPEX of approximately \$10 to \$25 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately three to six years.

Synthetic Graphite

For synthetic graphite, the upstream stage begins with a petroleum coke production plant. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$570 to \$670 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$330 to \$440 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately four years. The process then moves to a synthetic graphite anode material manufacturing plant. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$20,000 to \$24,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$5,500 to \$6,000 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately four years. The output from the synthetic graphite anode material manufacturing plant is then used as an input for a lithium-ion battery manufacturing facility.

Lithium

The lithium value chain generally begins with one of three types of mining: lithium clay mining (using open-pit methods), hard-rock spodumene mining, and lithium brine extraction.

In the case of lithium clay mining, lithium carbonate refining can be integrated into a single facility. This facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$25,000 to \$44,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$6,000 to \$8,000 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately five to six years. From this stage, the output may either move directly to the third stage of the value chain—the cathode active material (CAM) and precursor manufacturing plant—or it may first proceed to a lithium hydroxide refining facility. The CAM and precursor manufacturing plant requires a CAPEX of approximately \$26,700 to \$53,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$15,000 to \$22,000 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately 2.5 years. The lithium hydroxide refining facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$27,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$13,400 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately three years. From the CAM and precursor manufacturing stage, the material may move to an electrode and cell manufacturing plant. This facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$77 to \$125 per kWh, an OPEX of approximately \$80 to \$120 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately two to three years. The final stage may involve different types of battery manufacturing facilities, including lithium-ion batteries, LFP batteries, other lithium-based batteries, solid-state batteries, NCA batteries, and NMC batteries.

When the value chain begins with hard-rock spodumene mining, lithium hydroxide conversion may be integrated into the same upstream facility, and the facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$520 to \$1,100 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$3,700 to \$6,300 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately two to three years. The output then either moves to a separate lithium hydroxide refinement facility or directly to the CAM and

precursor manufacturing facility. It subsequently progresses to electrode and cell manufacturing, and finally to various battery manufacturing facilities, including lithium-ion batteries, LFP batteries, other lithium-based batteries, solid-state batteries, NCA batteries, and NMC batteries.

When the upstream stage begins with lithium brine extraction, lithium hydroxide conversion may again be integrated into the same upstream facility. This facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$82,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$3,300 to \$4,600 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately three years. The output then moves to the CAM and precursor manufacturing facility. It subsequently progresses to electrode and cell manufacturing, and finally to various battery manufacturing facilities, including lithium-ion batteries, LFP batteries, other lithium-based batteries, solid-state batteries, NCA batteries, and NMC batteries.

Part B

Cost-Focused Petri map – Part B illustrates the value chain of four primary minerals: manganese, cobalt, nickel, and lanthanum.

Manganese

In reviewing manganese raw material extraction, this mineral appears to be the cheapest and fastest to develop among the three. Based on CAPEX data from comparable mining projects, costs are estimated to range from approximately \$1,300 to \$5,200 per tpa, with an average development timeline of about five years. It should be noted the U.S. currently has no active manganese mining operations and is fully reliant on imports (EPA). However, the supply chain is relatively diversified, as illustrated in the “Battery Materials Petri Map” presented in our first report.

In the next stage, high-purity manganese sulfate production exhibits a somewhat similar CAPEX structure, ranging from approximately \$1,000 to \$7,500 per tpa. However, OPEX increases significantly, averaging about \$600 to \$1,200 per tonne, while the development timeline decreases to approximately two to three years. Despite this, the global market is highly concentrated, with China producing approximately 93% of the world’s manganese sulfate (CMPI Report).

Cobalt

Cobalt mining data were more difficult to obtain. While we identified CAPEX estimates of approximately \$7,400 per tpa, depending on the size of the project (eCobalt Solutions, 2017), annual production capacity data were obtained from a different source, estimated at

approximately 27,000 tpa (Baskaran & Schwartz, 2025). OPEX data were also limited; however, one source suggests costs of up to \$116 per tonne (Baskaran & Schwartz, 2025).

Regarding the development timeline, an estimated range of four to ten years was derived using AI-based approximation due to limited available data. Cobalt's global market share is highly concentrated in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (approximately 74%); therefore, direct reliance on China for raw cobalt supply is less critical at the mining stage.

However, further along the supply chain, cobalt metal production presents a greater concern. The market is heavily concentrated in China (approximately 76%), and reliable data on CAPEX, OPEX, and facility development timelines were not available. AI-based estimates suggest that cobalt metal may be produced as a byproduct of mixed hydroxide precipitate (MHP) processing; however, no supporting source was identified to confirm this relationship.

Nickel

Nickel mining data were somewhat more available than cobalt data. However, information was primarily available for larger projects, typically in the \$3 billion range, with a daily production rate of approximately 162,000 tonnes per day (tpd) (FPX Nickel, 2023; Tharayil, 2023). Based on our calculations, CAPEX is estimated at approximately \$13,500 per tpa, while OPEX is significantly lower, ranging from approximately \$1,500 to \$8,400 per tonne. The development timeline for a nickel mine is estimated at approximately six years (FPX Nickel, 2023; Tharayil, 2023).

Unfortunately, data collection for the next stage—nickel metal production—encountered similar limitations to cobalt metal, as data on CAPEX, OPEX, and development timelines were not available. Therefore, AI-based estimates were used, suggesting that CAPEX ranges from approximately \$5,000 to \$15,000 per tpa, OPEX ranges from approximately \$2,000 to \$4,500 per tonne, and the development timeline is approximately three to five years.

MHP (Mixed Hydroxide Precipitate)

As a combined product of cobalt and nickel processing, the MHP (Mixed Hydroxide Precipitate) processing plant is estimated to require a CAPEX of approximately \$100 to \$400 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$25 to \$165 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately 1.5 to 2 years (Sheena, 2025).

Regrettably, our previous research paper was unable to identify the specific global market share distribution by country. However, it did identify the top three producing countries as Indonesia, China, and the Philippines.

Cobalt & Nickel Sulfate

For cobalt sulfate, only one feasibility study was identified for a Canadian cobalt refinery, reporting an expected CAPEX of approximately \$2,000 per tpa and an OPEX of approximately \$5,600 per tonne (First Cobalt Corp., 2020). Unfortunately, the study did not specify the timeline required to develop a facility from the ground up, as it focused only on an expansion of an existing project. Therefore, an estimated development timeline of three to five years was derived using AI-based approximation. Similar to cobalt metal, cobalt sulfate production is highly concentrated in China (approximately 78%), further highlighting this stage as a potential high-risk factor in the supply chain.

Nickel sulfate, on the other hand, had more readily available data. CAPEX is estimated to range from approximately \$11,200 to \$13,800 per tpa, with OPEX ranging from approximately \$1,800 to \$2,300 per tonne, and a relatively shorter development timeline of two to three years (Ausenco Engineering Canada ULC., 2023). Unlike cobalt sulfate, nickel sulfate production is less concentrated in China, although China still accounts for more than 50% of global market share.

Lanthanum

The lanthanum value chain begins with lanthanum mining facilities, where concentration and separation may also occur. Such facilities typically require a CAPEX of approximately \$16,100 per tpa, an OPEX of around \$250 per ton, and a development time of approximately four to six years. In the second stage, lanthanum mischmetal is produced. Manufacturing facilities at this stage require a CAPEX of approximately \$3,000 to \$12,000 per tpa, an OPEX of about \$8,000 to \$25,000 per ton, and a development time of roughly three years.

The lanthanum mischmetal produced is then sent to alloy manufacturing facilities, where La–Ni AB₅ alloys are produced. These alloys are subsequently used as feedstock components in various battery manufacturing plants, including lithium-ion batteries, nickel–metal hydride batteries, solid-state batteries, NMC batteries, NCA batteries, and other battery types.

Part C

Part C presents the cost-based value chain of three minerals: lead, silver, and zinc.

Lead

The lead value chain begins at a lead mining facility. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$1,000 to \$2,500 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$70 to \$150 per tonne of ore, and a development timeline of approximately 2 to 15 years.

The second stage involves smelting and refining. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$14,000 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$450 to \$1,100 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately four years.

The process then moves to an integrated lead–acid battery manufacturing facility in the downstream stage. Such facilities are commonly observed in U.S.-based industrial settings, where precursor components—including ingots, plates, and alloys—are produced within a single facility as feedstock for lead–acid battery production. This facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$80 to \$160 per kWh, an OPEX of approximately \$12 to \$25 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately three to five years.

Silver

The silver value chain begins at a polymetallic silver mining facility, where silver is extracted along with multiple other metals, such as zinc, lead, copper, and gold, from the same ore deposit. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$300 to \$550 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$200 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately one year. The second stage involves smelting and refining. This stage typically has a cost structure similar to that of the lead value chain, as both metals can be processed within the same smelting and refining facilities. Therefore, the cost structure is assumed to be consistent with that presented in the lead value chain above.

Following smelting and refining, the output in a U.S.-based value chain moves directly to downstream processing at a silver–zinc battery manufacturing facility. In such integrated manufacturing systems, electrochemical materials (i.e., cathodes) required for silver–zinc battery production are manufactured within the same facility. Such an integrated facility requires a CAPEX of approximately \$180 to \$350 per kWh, an OPEX of approximately \$25 to \$55 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately three to four years.

Zinc

Similar to silver, the zinc value chain also begins at a polymetallic zinc mining facility. This stage requires a CAPEX of approximately \$440 per tpa, an OPEX of approximately \$102 per tonne, and a development timeline of approximately two to four years. The second stage involves smelting and refining, typically conducted in the same facilities used for lead and silver. Therefore, the cost structure and development timeline are assumed to be consistent with those presented for the lead and silver value chains.

From this point, the material can move directly to the final stage, which is a zinc-based battery manufacturing facility. In U.S.-based industrial settings, such facilities often operate as integrated manufacturing lines and require a CAPEX of approximately \$90 to \$120 per

kWh, an OPEX of approximately \$8 to \$18 per kWh, and a development timeline of approximately two to four years.

Cost-Focused Petri Map Methodology

This study applies a comparative, data-normalization approach to evaluate capital expenditures (CAPEX), operational expenditures (OPEX), and development timelines across battery materials supply chains within the Petri Map framework. To ensure cross-stage comparability, all cost metrics were normalized using consistent units.

- CAPEX was standardized to \$/tpa when output is measured in tonnes, or to \$/kWh of production capacity when output is measured in terms of energy production, typically in downstream stages.
- OPEX was standardized to \$/tonne when output is measured in tonnes of material processed, or to \$/kWh when output is measured in terms of energy production, also typically in downstream stages.
- Development timelines were recorded in years, representing the period from initial construction to the start of production.

Data Collection

Primary data were collected from publicly available technical and financial documents, including pre-feasibility studies, preliminary economic assessments, government reports, and disclosures from previously constructed or operational mining and processing facilities. These sources were selected due to their reliability and standardized reporting in the mining and energy sectors.

This study primarily focuses on U.S.-based data, and the value chain is organized to reflect real-world industrial conditions in the U.S. When U.S.-based data for specific stages of the value chain were unavailable, data from countries with similar cost structures such as Canada, Australia, and European countries were used. If data from these regions were also unavailable, data from other geographic areas, including South America, Asia, and Africa, were considered.

Overall, the value chain and associated data presented in the battery materials supply chain Petri maps primarily represent the U.S.-based industrial scenario.

Data Imputation

In cases where empirical data were limited or unavailable, missing or incomplete data for specific value chain stages were supplemented using AI-assisted estimates. To generate

these estimates, we provided AI tools with the most relevant available data. For example, when estimating CAPEX, OPEX, or development timelines for LFP battery manufacturing plants, we used detailed information from the report “Cost Breakdown: Battery Chemistry & Next-Gen Storage Materials Economics — CAPEX, OPEX, and Payback by Use Case” (Sustainability Atlas, 2026). This report offers comprehensive cost analyses of battery chemistries and next-generation storage materials, including capital expenditures and operating costs, which were highly relevant for our estimations.

We then instructed AI tools to estimate the missing values within a U.S.-based industrial context. Both ChatGPT and Copilot were used for this purpose. Since both tools were provided with the same inputs, their outputs were generally consistent and closely aligned. From these results, we adopted a conservative approach by selecting the highest estimated values. All imputed data were indicated by an asterisk (*) in the Petri maps.

Quantiles:

High, medium, and low scores were determined by first taking the average of the high and low points of the ranges and then assigning the values as high for the top third quantile, low for the bottom third quantile, and medium for those in the middle-third quantile. Quantiles were calculated for each category separately.

Color Coding:

After categorizing CAPEX, OPEX, time, and overall scores using quantile-based grouping, each segment of the hexagon was assigned a color according to its category: orange for high, blue for medium, and purple for low. Additionally, the border of each hexagon was color-coded based on the overall categorical score, with a thick black outline for high, a gray outline for medium, and a thin black outline for low.

Limitations:

The authors acknowledge several limitations in the development of Petri maps.

First, the authors generally gathered multiple sources to finalize a single dataset on the Petri maps and established a range of lowest and highest values for each type of data. However, maintaining consistency in this process was not possible across all stages of the value chain, as multiple sources were not available for every dataset at each stage. Therefore, the data on Petri maps may still require readjustment for use in relevant decision-making processes.

Second, despite significant effort and time invested in collecting data across all stages of the battery materials supply chain, imputed data were used to address several missing values in the Petri maps. Although AI tools were employed to estimate these missing values using relevant input data, the resulting estimates may vary depending on the nature and quality of the data provided.

Third, to enhance the rigor of the methodology and validate the value chain processes and associated data presented in the Petri maps, the authors recognize the importance of incorporating insights from experts and practitioners through interviews. However, due to time constraints, this validation step could not be completed. Future research should consider conducting expert interviews to strengthen the robustness and credibility of the findings and to address existing gaps in this study.

Cost-Focused Petri Map References

American Elements (n.d.). *Lanthanum Mischmetal*. Retrieved 2026, from <https://www.americanelements.com/lanthanum-mischmetal>

Anselmo, J. (2024, December 19). *Novonix secures \$755M DOE loan for Tennessee synthetic graphite facility*. Manufacturing Dive. <https://www.manufacturingdive.com/news/novonix-secures-755m-doe-loan-tennessee-synthetic-graphite-facility/736073/>

Ausenco Engineering Canada ULC. (2023, October 18). *Baptiste Nickel Project NI 43-101 Technical Report and Prefeasibility Study*. FPX Nickel Corp. https://fpxnickel.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/Baptiste-Project-NI-43-101-Technical-Report_FINAL.pdf

Barradas, S. (2025, October 10). *Thacker Pass lithium project, US – update*. Creamer Media's Mining Weekly. <https://www.miningweekly.com/article/thacker-pass-lithium-project-us-update-2025-10-09>

Baskaran, G. & Schwartz, M. (2025, December 10). *Stabilizing Cobalt Markets: A Price Floor for U.S. Minerals Security*. Center for Strategic & International Studies. <https://www.csis.org/analysis/stabilizing-cobalt-markets-price-floor-us-minerals-security>

Bhuwalka, K., Ramachandran, H., Narasimhan, S., Yao, A., Frohmann, J., Peiseler, L., Chueh, W., Boies, A., Davis, S. J., & Benson, S. (2025, October 13). *Securing the supply of graphite for batteries*. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.21521>

Business Wire (2023, July 27). *Piedmont Lithium's Tennessee Project Receives Final Permit Required to Advance to Construction*. <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20230727906063/en/Piedmont-Lithiums-Tennessee-Project-Receives-Final-Permit-Required-to-Advance-to-Construction>

- Cobalt Institute (2024, August 10). *Cobalt 2050: Unlocking Potential for a Net-Zero Future*. <https://www.cobaltinstitute.org/resource/cobalt-2050-unlocking-potential-for-a-net-zero-future/>
- Colthorpe, A. (2023, September 1). *US DoE loan to finance 'up to 80% cost' of zinc battery player Eos' US\$500 million expansion*. <https://www.energy-storage.news/us-doe-loan-to-finance-up-to-80-cost-of-zinc-battery-player-eos-us500-million-expansion/>
- DRA Pacific (2023, March 17). *Tonopah Lithium Claims Project NI 43-101 Technical Report – Preliminary Economic Assessment*. <https://americanlithiumcorp.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/PEA-Report-TLC.pdf>
- Duval, D. (n.d.). *Zinc: Impending commodity Supercycle to be beneficial*. Resource World Magazine Inc. Resource World. Retrieved 2026, from <https://resourceworld.com/zinc-impending-commodity-supercycle-to-be-beneficial/>
- eCobalt Solutions. (2017, October 19). *Canadian company announces plan to open cobalt mine, refinery in east Idaho*. Mining.com. <https://www.mining.com/web/canadian-company-announces-plan-open-cobalt-mine-refinery-east-idaho/>
- Electra Battery Materials (2026, February 23). *Electra Approves Construction Budget and Sets Schedule for Completion of its North American Cobalt Sulfate Refinery*. <https://www.electrabmc.com/news-releases/news/electra-approves-construction-budget-and-sets-schedule-for-completion-of-its-north-american-cobalt-sulfate-refinery>
- Electric Metals (2025, August 26). *Electric Metals Announces Positive PEA for the 100% US Domestic North Star Manganese Project Providing 100% U.S. Domestic Supply of HPMSM, Post-Tax NPV10% of US\$1.39 Billion, IRR of 43.5%, and 23-Month Payback*. <https://electricmetals.com/news-releases/electric-metals-announces-positive-pea-for-the-100-us-domestic-north-star-manganese-project-providing-100-u.s-domestic-supply/>
- Falcon Energy Materials plc. (2025, November 13). *Falcon Confirms Robust Economics in Anode Plant Study with US\$86 Million Initial CapEx and First Production Targeted for H2 2027; Offtake and Testing Advancing*. <https://www.falconem.net/news-releases/falcon-confirms-robust-economics-in-anode-plant-study-with-us86-million-initial-capex-and-first-production-targeted-for-h2-2027-offtake-and-testing-advancing>

- First Cobalt Corp. (2020, May 4). *First Cobalt Announces Positive Feasibility Study Results for Canadian Cobalt Refinery Expansion*. Electra Battery Materials. <https://electrabmc.com/news-releases/news/first-cobalt-announces-positive-feasibility-study-results-for-canadian-cobalt-refinery-expansion>
- Focus Graphite Inc. (2023, March 6). *Focus Graphite Announces Benchmark Feasibility Study Update for its Lac Knife Graphite Project, Québec*. <https://focusgraphite.com/focus-graphite-announces-benchmark-feasibility-study-update-for-its-lac-knife-graphite-project-quebec/>
- FPX Nickel (2023, September 6). *FPX Nickel Delivers PFS for Baptiste Nickel Project with After-Tax NPV of US\$2.01 Billion and 18.6% IRR*. <https://fpxnickel.com/blog/2023/09/06/fpx-nickel-delivers-pfs-for-baptiste-nickel-project-with-after-tax-npv-of-us2-01-billion-and-18-6-irr/>
- General Motors (2023, June 2). *GM and POSCO Future M to Expand EV Battery Supply Chain in North America with New Integrated CAM and Precursor Processing Complex*. <https://investor.gm.com/news-releases/news-release-details/gm-and-posco-future-m-expand-ev-battery-supply-chain-north>
- Gresham Smith (n.d.). *Designing the Battery Facility to Power GM's Electric Future*. Retrieved 2026, from <https://www.greshamsmith.com/projects/ultium-lordstown-battery-plant/>
- IMARC Group (2026, March 26). *Coal Tar Pitch Distillation Manufacturing Plant Project Report 2026: Complete Guide to Unit Setup and Industry Trends*. OpenPR. <https://www.openpr.com/news/4441462/coal-tar-pitch-distillation-manufacturing-plant-project-report>
- International Lithium Association (2024). *Direct Lithium Extraction (DLE): An Introduction*. <https://lithium.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/ILiA-DLE-Brochure-Full-Version-July-2024.pdf>
- Korea Zinc (2025, December 15). *Korea Zinc Partners with the U.S. Department of War and U.S. Department of Commerce to Build a State-of-the-Art Critical Minerals Smelter in the United States with \$6.6 Billion of Capital Expenditures Total investment of \$7.4 billion including working capital and financing costs*. <https://www.koreazinc.co.kr/en/korea-zinc-partners-with-the-u-s-department-of-war-and-u-s-department-of-commerce-to-build-a-state-of-the-art-critical-minerals-smelter-in-the-united-states-with-6-6-billion-of-capital-expenditures/>

- LG (2023, December 20). *LG Chem Takes Leap as Top Cathode Supplier in the U.S. with Groundbreaking of Tennessee Plant*. <https://www.lgcorp.com/media/release/27138>
- Lithium Americas (2023, January 31). *Lithium Americas Provides General Motors Transaction Details and Update on Construction Plan for Thacker Pass*. <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1440972/000117625623000015/exhibit99-1.htm>
- Lithium Americas (2025, January 7). *Lithium Americas Increases Mineral Resource and Reserve for Thacker Pass*. <https://www.lithiumamericas.com/news/news-details/2025/Lithium-Americas-Increases-Mineral-Resource-and-Reserve-for-Thacker-Pass/default.aspx>
- Lithium Ionic (2025, September 17). *Lithium Ionic Announces Definitive Feasibility Study Results for Bandeira Lithium Project, Minas Gerais, Brazil*. <https://lithiumionic.com/resources/news/nr-20250917.pdf?v=0.2>
- Manganese X Energy Corp. (n.d.). *Positive PEA for our Battery Hill Project After-Tax NPV 10% of \$486M US, and IRR of 25%*. Retrieved 2026, from <https://www.manganesexenergycorp.com/de/pea-highlights/>
- Mining Doc (2025, March 6). *How much does it cost to run a mining project?* <https://www.miningdoc.tech/2025/03/06/how-much-does-it-cost-to-run-a-mining-project/>
- Mining Stock Education (2025, September 4). *Silver X Announces Positive Expanded PEA After-Tax NPV 5% of US\$440M; IRR 69% Reports Updated Mineral Resource Estimate*. <https://www.miningstockeducation.com/2025/09/silver-x-announces-positive-expanded-pea-after-tax-npv-5-of-us440m-irr-69-reports-updated-mineral-resource-estimate/>
- Mining Stock Education (2025, October 6). *NOA Lithium Announces Positive Preliminary Economic Assessment Results for Rio Grande Project*. <https://www.miningstockeducation.com/2025/10/noa-lithium-announces-positive-preliminary-economic-assessment-results-for-rio-grande-project/>
- Mining Stock Education (2025, December 1). *Titan Mining Announces Strong Kilbourne Graphite Project Economics and Expanded U.S EXIM Support to Accelerate U.S. Graphite Independence*. <https://www.miningstockeducation.com/2025/12/titan-mining-announces-strong-kilbourne-graphite-project-economics-and-expanded-u-s-exim-support-to-accelerate-u-s-graphite-independence/>

Mining.com (2021, November 30). *Discovery Silver PEA for Cordero demonstrates potential Tier 1 asset with \$1.2bn NPV*. Canadian Mining Journal. <https://www.canadianminingjournal.com/news/discovery-silver-pea-for-cordero-demonstrates-potential-tier-1-asset-with-1-2bn-npv/>

Mining.com (2022, August 29). Graphite One prefeasibility outlines \$1.2bn capex for Alaska mine and Washington state plant. <https://www.mining.com/graphite-one-prefeasibility-outlines-1-2bn-capex-for-alaska-mine-and-washington-state-plant/>

Mining.com (2026, February 19). *Lithium Americas targets up to \$1.6B capex on Thacker Pass build this year*. <https://www.mining.com/lithium-americas-targets-up-to-1-6b-capex-on-thacker-pass-build-this-year/>

Nouveau Monde Graphite Inc. (2025, March 2). *Material Change Report*. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1649752/000110465925076066/tm2522341d1_ex99-1.htm

Nouveau Monde Graphite, Inc. (2025, November 12). *NMG Provides a Quarterly Update on the Advancement of its Phase-2 North American Graphite Production*. WRALTechWire 30. <https://markets.financialcontent.com/wral/article/bizwire-2025-11-12-nmg-provides-a-quarterly-update-on-the-advancement-of-its-phase-2-north-american-graphite-production>

Panasonic (2025, July 14). *Panasonic Energy Begins Mass Production at New Automotive Lithium-ion Battery Factory in Kansas, Aiming for Annual Capacity of 32 GWh to Accelerate U.S. Local Production*. <https://na.panasonic.com/news/panasonic-energy-begins-mass-production-at-new-automotive-lithium-ion-battery-factory-in-kansas-aiming-for-annual-capacity-of-32-gwh-to-accelerate-us-local-production>

Piedmont Lithium (2021, December 14). *Piedmont Completes Bankable Feasibility Study of the Carolina Lithium Project with Positive Results*. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1728205/000114036121041474/brhc10031818_ex99-1.htm

Piedmont Lithium (2023, May 1). *Piedmont Lithium Completes Definitive Feasibility Study of Tennessee Lithium Project - Revised*. <https://announcements.asx.com.au/asxpdf/20230501/pdf/05p7z7bbvznrt5.pdf>

Silver Tiger Metals Inc. (2023, November 1). *Silver Tiger announces PEA with NPV of US\$287M for the open pit portion of El Tigre Silver-Gold Project*. https://silvertigermetals.com/files/Silver_Tiger_press_release_PEA_-_Final.pdf

- Rogan, A. (2024, July 2). *Scoping Study shows Black Canyon sitting on manganese moneymaker*. <https://mining.com.au/scoping-study-shows-black-canyon-sitting-on-manganese-moneymaker/>
- Roland Berger (2022 February 3). *The Lithium-Ion (EV) battery market and supply chain - Part 1: Market drivers and emerging supply chain risks*. Roland Berger's Advanced Technology Center. <https://www.automotive-disruption-radar.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/020d32c6-6a37-4628-aeb3-1668e6b16094.pdf>
- Shah, J. (2023, August 31). *LPO Announces Conditional Commitment to Eos Energy Enterprises to Produce Next-Generation Battery Energy Storage Systems*. U.S. Department of Energy. <https://www.energy.gov/edf/articles/lpo-announces-conditional-commitment-eos-energy-enterprises-produce-next-generation>
- Sheena (2025, March 21). *The Cost of Setting Up a Cobalt Processing Plant*. Mining Pedia. <https://www.miningpedia.cn/dressing/the-cost-of-setting-up-a-cobalt-ore-processing-plant.html>
- Silver X Mining (2025, September 4). *Silver X Announces Positive Expanded PEA with After Tax NPV 5% of US\$440M; IRR 69% and Reports Updated Mineral Resource Estimate*. <https://www.silverxmining.com/silver-x-announces-positive-expanded-pea-after-tax-npv-5-of-us440m-irr-69-reports-updated-mineral-resource-estimate/>
- Simpson, R. (2018, June-July). *ZincX Resources releasing Akie Project PEA*. Retrieved 2026, from https://www.zincxresources.com/_resources/presentations/RW-16-4-ZincX-REV.pdf?v=0.097
- Sletten, M., Zelligan, S., Frost, D., Yugo, N., Charbonneau, C., & Cameron, D. P. (2020, January 20). *Idaho Cobalt Operations Form 43-101F1 Technical Report Feasibility Study. Prepared for Jervois Mining*. [https://jervoisglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/190348 Idaho Cobalt 13112020 NI 43 101 Technical Report-FILED-r1.pdf](https://jervoisglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/190348%20Idaho%20Cobalt%2013112020%20NI%2043%20101%20Technical%20Report-FILED-r1.pdf)
- Smith, C. (2022, November 21). *LG Chem to build \$3.2 billion plant in Clarksville to supply material for EV batteries*. <https://clarksvillenow.com/local/lg-chem-to-build-3-2-billion-plant-in-clarksville-to-supply-material-for-ev-batteries/>
- Standard Lithium Ltd. (2021, October 12). *Standard Lithium announces positive preliminary economic assessment and update of inferred mineral resource at South West Arkansas Lithium Project*. <https://www.standardlithium.com/news/standard-lithium-announces-positive-preliminary-economic-assessment-and-update-of-inferred-mineral-resource-at-south-west-arkansas-lithium-project>

- SunCoke Energy (2014). *Investor Day 2014*.
<https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1514705/000119312514092823/d690965dex992.htm>
- Sustainability Atlas (2026, February 27). *Cost breakdown: Battery chemistry & next-gen storage materials economics — capex, opex, and payback by use case*.
<https://sustainableatlas.org/post/cost-breakdown-battery-chemistry-next-gen-storage-materials-economics-capex-opex-3543>
- Syrah Resources Limited (n.d.). *Vidalia Active Anode Material Facility*.
<https://www.syrahresources.com.au/our-business/vidalia-active-anode-material-facility>
- Tharayil, R. (2023, September 7). *FPX Nickel estimates initial capex of \$2.2bn for Baptiste nickel project*.
<https://www.nsenergybusiness.com/company-news/fpx-nickel-estimates-initial-capex-of-2-2bn-for-baptiste-nickel-project/>
- Tharayil, R. (2023, April 21). *Piedmont Lithium estimates capex of \$809m for Tennessee lithium project*.
<https://www.nsenergybusiness.com/company-news/piedmont-lithium-estimates-capex-809m-tennessee-lithium-project/>
- Ultium Cells LLC. (n.d.). *Warren, Ohio*. Retrieved 2026, from
<https://www.ultiumcell.com/our-locations/warren-ohio>
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. (2023, March). *Manganese dioxide supply chain profile*.
<https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-03/Manganese%20Supply%20Chain%20Profile.pdf>
- Vendetta Mining Corp. (2022, January). *TSX-V: VTT advanced lead-zinc resource development in Australia*.
<https://vendettaminingcorp.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/VTT-presentation-January-2022-FINAL.pdf>
- Volt Lithium Corp. (2023, December 14). *Volt Lithium announces preliminary economic assessment at Rainbow Lake Project in Alberta, highlighted by 45% IRR and US\$1.5 billion before-tax NPV8*. GlobeNewswire.
<https://www.globenewswire.com/news-release/2023/12/14/2796366/0/en/volt-lithium-announces-preliminary-economic-assessment-at-rainbow-lake-project-in-alberta-highlighted-by-45-irr-and-us-1-5-billion-before-tax-npv8.html>
- Williment, C. (2025, July 24). *Panasonic Opens US\$4bn EV Battery Gigafactory in Kansas*.
<https://sustainabilitymag.com/news/panasonic-opens-us-4bn-ev-battery-gigafactory-in-kansas>

Wilson, G. (2021, May 10). *Timeline: Tesla's Construction of Gigafactories*.
<https://manufacturingdigital.com/digital-factory/timeline-teslas-construction-gigafactories>

APPENDIX D: Factor Analysis Methodology

Approach and Structure

To guide the Triad’s coordinated strategy in regard to critical-mineral value chains, this report utilizes the Cluster and Factor Analysis Framework (CFAF) to reveal opportunities for trilateral complementarity, helping partners target high-priority stage-mineral combinations, optimize geographic configurations, and coordinate policy interventions.

To explain the analytical framework used to evaluate structural dependencies, this appendix aims to document the methodology with clarity and precision, to provide a reproducible scoring system that future analysts and research partners can apply consistently, and to support transparent communication of how insights were derived for policy, industry, and trilateral stakeholders.

This appendix provides the interpretive bridge between raw structural scoring and downstream insight generation (e.g., investment hypotheses, trilateral cooperation pathways, or policy coordination opportunities). This appendix defines the scoring system itself; analytical insights derived from the scores appear elsewhere in the report.

Stage Archetype Outline (Generic)

Stage ID	Stage Archetype Name	Segment	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
1	Geological Survey & Resource Assessment	Upstream	H	L	L	L	NA	NA	L	L
2	Exploration & Permitting	Upstream	H	L	L	L	NA	NA	L	L
3	Extraction / Mining	Upstream	H	L	L	L	NA	NA	L	L
4	Beneficiation / Ore Concentration	Upstream	H	M	L	L	NA	NA	L	L
5	Metallurgical Processing	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	H	NA	H	U
6	Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	H	NA	H	U
7	Purification & Refining	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	H	NA	H	U
8	Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	H	NA	H	U
9	Alloying & Powder/Material Preparation	Midstream	NA	H	H	M	M	NA	U	H
10	Active Material Synthesis	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	U	NA	U	H
11	Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional Materials	Midstream	NA	H	H	M	L	NA	L	H
12	Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components	Midstream	NA	H	H	M	L	NA	L	H
13	Substrate & Wafer Processing	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	H	NA	H	H
14	Electrode / Submodule Fabrication	Midstream	NA	H	H	H	M	NA	U	H
15	Device/Cell Manufacturing	Downstream	NA	H	H	H	NA	H	L	H
16	Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly	Downstream	NA	H	H	M	M	NA	H	L
17	System Integration	Downstream	NA	H	M	M	NA	L	L	H
18	Final Testing & Certification	Downstream	NA	H	H	H	NA	L	L	H

H	High - Strong Structural dependence, indicated by multiple reinforcing dependencies
M	Medium - Partial or conditional dependence, where the factor matters but is not determinative
L	Low - Minimal structural dependence; the stage is largely independent of the factor
U	Unknown - Insufficient structural evidence to determine dependence
NA	Not Applicable - the stage does not exist for the factor

Factor Based Framework Outline

A. Foundational Conditions (Cluster “Emergence” Factors)

- 1. Resource & Input Advantage
- 2. Related Variety & Technological Proximity
- 3. Anchor Firms & Institutional Thickness

B. Catalytic Conditions (Cluster “Acceleration” Factors)

- 4. Business Environment Strengths
- 5. Policy Commitment & Strategic Alignment
- 6. Market Structure & Local Rivalry

C. Security & Resilience Conditions

- 7. Geopolitical & Supply-Chain Risk Exposure
- 8. Trilateral Complementarity Potential

Methodological Principles

Our methodology is a structural system that evaluates inherent stage characteristics to derive insights into evident value chains. It does not make empirical arguments in regard to real-world capabilities, policy performances, or firm-level behaviors.

Our scoring system assumes no prior technical or mineral-specific knowledge, thereby being designed for non-subject matter experts. Through our scoring system, we are able to evaluate structural dependencies across stages of the crucial mineral value chain—not performance, competitiveness, or mineral-specific chemistry. The methodology uses a standardized 18-stage generic framework spanning Upstream, Midstream, and Downstream activities across any given value chain. These stages provide a mineral-agnostic backbone so that different critical mineral systems can be compared using a structural lens that is easily understood and accessible to the common user. Some or all of these 18 stages are scored across 8 Structural Factors that describe what makes that stage feasible, competitive, and structured, regardless of geography. Each factor tests a different dimension of structural dependency, and each factor is scored independently.

Not all structural factors are applicable across the full value chain; where this is the case, stages receive an NA (Not Applicable) score. For example, Factor 1 (Resource & Input Advantage) is scored only for upstream stages (1–4), where dependence on geology and extraction conditions can be assessed generically; beyond this point, inputs become mineral-specific and are therefore marked NA. By contrast, Factors 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 are scored across all 18 stages because they evaluate cross-cutting structural conditions that can shape outcomes independent of mineral type. These applicability rules ensure that composite scores reflect only structurally meaningful signals at the generic stage level and serve as a baseline reference for subsequent mineral-specific analysis.

The Eighteen-Stage Framework Summaries

Stage 1: Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

This stage is about identifying and characterizing where critical minerals are in the ground. It includes desktop geological studies, mapping, geophysical surveys, sampling, and early resource estimates. The output is information: geological models, resource maps, and preliminary assessments of whether there might be an economically interesting deposit. No mining occurs yet, this is knowledge-building, not extraction. Time horizons are long, uncertainty is high, and risk capital is typically modest but speculative. The work is heavily dependent on access to land and existing geological knowledge, and it can be shaped by public geological surveys, national geological agencies, and early-stage exploration firms. The stage sets the foundation for everything else but does not itself “move material.”

Stage 2: Exploration & Permitting

Here, the company drills, samples, and models the deposit in much greater detail, while also beginning the regulatory, land-access, and social license process. This includes

resource definition drilling, preliminary economic assessments, baseline environmental studies, and early engagement with local communities and regulators. The goal is to move from “maybe something is here” to “we understand what’s here and whether it might be mineable.” Permitting overlays technical work with policy, environmental, and social constraints. Timelines can be long and politically sensitive. Exploration still does not produce saleable product; it reduces uncertainty and sets the stage for major capital allocation decisions in mining.

Stage 3: Extraction / Mining

This is the physical removal of ore or brine from the ground. It includes open-pit or underground mining, well fields for brines, in-situ leaching where applicable, and all the associated mining infrastructure: pits, ramps, haul roads, dewatering, and on-site safety systems. The output is ore, concentrate-ready material, or mineral-bearing brine. Mining is highly capital-intensive and tightly tied to the deposit’s geology and location. It is also where many ESG issues come to the surface: land disturbance, tailings, worker safety, and community impacts. The economics of the entire chain open hinge on productivity and cost at this stage.

Stage 4: Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

Beneficiation upgrades run-of-mine ore into a higher-grade concentrate by removing gangue (waste) material. Typical processes include crushing, grinding, flotation, gravity separation, magnetic separation, and basic classification. For brine-based systems, analogous steps might be early-stage preconcentration or impurity removal before more advanced processing. This stage reduces the volume and increases the value per ton, making downstream transport and processing more efficient. Its design is strongly influenced by ore mineralogy and impurity profiles. It often sits near the mine to avoid hauling large volumes of waste rock.

Stage 5: Metallurgical Processing

Metallurgical processing converts ore or concentrate into intermediate products using thermal or combined thermal–chemical routes. This includes smelting, roasting, calcination, and other high-temperature processes that change mineral phases and separate valuable metals from waste. These plants can be located at or away from the mine, depending on energy, regulatory, and logistics considerations. This stage often defines the emissions profile and energy intensity of the chain. It requires significant capital and technical expertise, and its design is highly mineral-specific. Process choices here strongly influence what later chemical conversion and refining steps look like.

Stage 6: Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

Chemical conversion uses solutions, reagents, and hydrometallurgical methods to dissolve, separate, and recover metals or compounds from concentrates or roasted material. Typical operations include leaching, solvent extraction, ion exchange, precipitation, and crystallization. The outputs are intermediate chemical products suitable for further refining or specialty production. This stage is deeply chemistry-dependent and open highly integrated with environmental controls because of reagents, effluents, and waste streams. Process design varies significantly by mineral system and impurity profile, and relatively small changes in feed composition can have large impacts on performance and cost.

Stage 7: Purification & Refining

Purification and refining take intermediate solutions or solids and bring them to high-purity products that meet tight specifications. Operations may include recrystallization, advanced filtration, final impurity removal, electrowinning, or electrorefining. The emphasis is on achieving consistent purity, not just recovering the metal. These facilities may be located closer to demand centers or infrastructure rather than mines, especially when feedstocks can be transported as concentrates or intermediate chemicals. The business model often moves from bulk tonnage to higher value-per-ton products, with quality control and analytical capabilities becoming central.

Stage 8: Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

This stage turns refined materials into specialized oxides, metals, salts, or compounds tailored for specific applications: magnet-grade rare-earth oxides, high-purity salts, special metal forms, etc. The focus is on composition, particle characteristics, and performance in particular downstream uses. Producers operate close to end-use specifications and may collaborate with downstream OEMs to co-develop materials. The market is more differentiated than bulk commodity refining, and technical service to customers becomes part of the value proposition.

Stage 9: Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

Alloying and powder preparation combine metals and other elements into engineered alloys or powders with specific mechanical, magnetic, or electrical properties. This may include melting, casting, atomization, milling, and controlled heat-treatment, as well as surface treatments or coatings. The stage translates pure or specialty materials into forms that can be directly used in components or advanced manufacturing processes (e.g., powder metallurgy, additive manufacturing, magnet pressing). Process control and consistency are critical, and intellectual property may reside in compositions and processing routes.

Stage 10: Active Material Synthesis

Active material synthesis produces the functional materials that directly participate in energy storage, magnesium, catalysis, or other core device functions (e.g., battery cathode powders, magnet powders, functional oxides). Processes open involve co-precipitation, calcination, doping, and careful control of microstructure and particle morphology. This is one of the most technically demanding parts of many modern value chains because small differences in processing can translate into big differences in device performance, lifetime, and safety. Producers typically work closely with downstream manufacturers and may be heavily qualified by specific OEMs.

Stage 11: Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional Materials

At this stage, active and structural materials are turned into tangible components—plates, foils, housings, frames, substrates, or non-magnetic mechanical pieces that will be used in devices or modules. Processes can include rolling, stamping, machining, forming, coating, and bonding. The main constraints are manufacturing capabilities, quality, cost, and integration with supply chains. Materials may be metals, ceramics, polymers, or composites. These components must meet mechanical, thermal, and sometimes environmental standards.

Stage 12: Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

Here, magnet and specialized alloy components are produced from powders or alloys prepared upstream. Steps include pressing, sintering, machining, magnetization (for magnets), and precision finishing. Mechanical tolerances, magnetic performance, and reliability are critical. These components are open custom-designed for specific motors, generators, actuators, or other systems. OEM qualification, IP, and process know-how are major differentiators. While they depend on critical minerals, the plants themselves are not tied to ore bodies.

Stage 13: Substrate & Wafer Processing

This stage produces highly engineered substrates and wafers that serve as platforms for devices or circuits. It can include semiconductor wafers, ceramic substrates, or other precision-engineered surfaces requiring ultra-clean processing, tight flatness and thickness control, and specific thermal or electrical properties. Operations involve slicing, polishing, cleaning, deposition of base layers, and sometimes doping or patterning. Facilities are capital-intensive and demand rigorous process control and cleanroom environments.

Stage 14: Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

This stage assembles active materials, binders, current collectors, and other components into functional sub-units—electrodes, coils, or other submodules. In bakeries, this includes slurry mixing, coating, drying, calendaring, cutting, and sometimes partial stacking or winding. The performance of the final device is heavily influenced by quality at this level: uniform coatings, defect rates, adhesion, porosity, and other parameters matter. Facilities increasingly resemble high-throughput, precision manufacturing lines.

Stage 15: Device / Cell Manufacturing

This stage produces complete cells or devices: bakery cells, capacitors, magnet subassemblies, or other units that can be tested and sold. It combines submodules, seals them, introduces electrolytes or other active media, and performs formation and initial testing. The result is a discrete product with a serial number and performance spec. Device/cell plants are open large, capital-intensive factories located near end markets, skilled labor, and supporting ecosystems. Here, manufacturing maturity, automation, defect reduction, and integration into OEM qualification processes strongly shape competitiveness.

Stage 16: Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

Modules and packs combine individual devices or cells plus structural, thermal management, electrical interconnections, and safety systems into higher-level units. For magnets, this may be rotor assemblies; for bakeries, modules and packs; for power electronics, integrated assemblies. The work involves mechanical assembly, wiring, busbars, cooling systems, sensors, control electronics, and safety features. Design complexity and custom engineering increase, and systems integration capabilities become a differentiator.

Stage 17: System Integration

System integration embeds packs, modules, or magnet assemblies into final systems: vehicles, grid storage units, turbines, industrial drives, or defense platforms. This includes mechanical integration, control algorithms, power electronics, and full-system performance validation. Most of the value here comes from system-level design, software, integration engineering, and certification for specific use cases. The underlying critical minerals are “several layers deep” in the supply chain by this point.

Stage 18: Final Testing & Certification

This stage performs final testing, certification, and quality assurance at the product or system level. It may involve safety testing, performance characterization, lifetime and

reliability testing, and formal certification to regulatory or industry standards (UL, IEC, automotive standards, etc.). Testing and certification are essential for market access, warranties, and risk management. While some testing is embedded in earlier stages, this final stage ensures that devices, modules, or systems meet defined specifications and external requirements.

The Eight Structural Factors

Each value-chain stage is evaluated using a set of eight structural factors that capture the underlying conditions shaping where critical mineral activities can plausibly emerge, how they can scale, and how resilient they are to disruption over time. The factors are grouped to reflect foundational prerequisites, catalytic enablers, and security- and resilience-related constraints. Together, they provide a disciplined, comparative lens for assessing structural dependencies at the stage level and for identifying where coordinated trilateral action is most likely to be feasible and durable.

Factor 1: Resource & Input Advantage

- Factor 1 evaluates whether a value-chain stage structurally depends on geological endowment, raw material presence, or location-specific inputs that cannot be easily relocated. This factor identifies stages where resource location, ore quality, raw feedstock availability, or unique natural conditions fundamentally shape where the stage can feasibly operate. This factor is the primary determinant of which stages are resource-constrained rather than policy- or capability-constrained. It asks: “Is this stage structurally tied to the physical location of raw material sources or immobile inputs?”

Factor 2: Related Variety & Technological Proximity

- Factor 2 evaluates whether a value-chain stage structurally depends on adjacency to other industries with similar technologies, supplier networks, engineering capabilities, or transferable skills. In cluster theory, this is often referred to as related variety — the technological and skill proximity between industries. This factor evaluates structural technological adjacency, not national capability, not firm-level specialization, and not mineral-specific process chemistry.

It asks: “Does this stage structurally require adjacency to other industrial capabilities in order to develop efficiently and competitively?”

Factor 3: Institutional Thickness

- Factor 3 evaluates whether a value-chain stage structurally depends on a dense ecosystem of institutions — including engineering firms, certification bodies, testing labs, industrial associations, research institutions, workforce training systems, and regulatory bodies — to operate effectively, scale, and maintain quality. In cluster theory, “institutional thickness” refers to the depth, diversity, and interconnectedness of enabling institutions.

It asks: “How essential is a strong institutional ecosystem to the successful development of this stage, independent of geography or mineral?”

Factor 4: Business Environment Sensitivity

- Factor 4 evaluates the structural dependence of a stage on broad business environment conditions—such as energy availability, logistics, utilities, permitting throughput, and operational stability. It captures cross-cutting industrial enablers, not country-specific advantages, real-world operating costs, or policy performance.

It asks: “To what extent is this stage structurally sensitive to business-environment conditions that vary by location, even when not tied to geology or policy incentives?”

Factor 5: Policy Commitment & Strategic Alignment

- Factor 5 evaluates whether a midstream stage is structurally sensitive to policy intervention, industrial strategy, and long-term alignment with government priorities in ways that can alter its feasibility, competitiveness, or security outcomes. It captures whether the stage requires strategic policy to emerge, is shaped by long-term regulatory certainty, depends on cross-border policy coordination, is heavily influenced by industrial policy choices, or exhibits public-good characteristics (e.g., environmental risk, national security relevance).

It asks: “Does this stage fundamentally rely on durable, multi-year policy commitment to be competitive or viable?”

Factor 6: Market Structure & Local Rivalry

- Factor 6 evaluates whether the feasibility and competitiveness of a downstream stage structurally depend on market competition, local rivalry, and the presence of demanding customers. This factor captures whether a downstream manufacturing stage benefits from cross-firm rivalry, lead-firm pressure, quality-driven competition, presence of demanding downstream integrators, iterative improvement cycles,

customer-supplier co-development, cluster-style competition among peer firms. This factor evaluates structural dependency, not actual competitive conditions.

It asks: “Does this downstream stage structurally require strong local rivalry or competition to drive performance, innovation, and manufacturing excellence?”

Factor 7: Geopolitical & Supply-Chain Risk Exposure

- Factor 7 evaluates whether a value-chain stage is structurally exposed to geopolitical concentration, single-country dominance, chokepoint risks, or adversarial leverage that is independent of any specific mineral or location. This factor assesses where, in principle, a stage is inherently vulnerable to reliance on rare institutional capabilities, reliance on scarce equipment or reagents, global concentration patterns, governance risk, transport or maritime chokepoints, and adversarial control of upstream or midstream segments.

It asks: “Is this stage inherently prone to geopolitical concentration or strategic vulnerability, regardless of where it is located?”

Factor 8: Trilateral Complementarity Potential

- Factor 8 evaluates whether a value-chain stage is structurally suited to productive division of labor, burden-sharing, or complementary specialization across the U.S., Japan, and South Korea. This factor does not score how strong or weak any country is today. Rather, it examines whether the nature of the stage itself makes it conducive to distributed production, coordinated investment, cross-border specialization, shared infrastructure or knowledge, and interoperability across allied systems. This factor evaluates structural complementarity potential, not current capability distributions or geopolitical alignment.

It asks: “Does this stage, by its inherent characteristics, naturally lend itself to trilateral collaboration and complementary advantage?”

Scoring Logic

Diagnostic Scoring Logic (Y/N/U)

Each factor is evaluated using a small set of structural guiding questions designed to test whether a given value-chain stage inherently depends on the condition represented by that factor. The purpose of diagnostic scoring is to assess structural dependence, not current performance, national capability, or firm-level outcomes.

For each guiding question, scorers assign one of three values:

- **Y (Yes)** — The stage exhibits a clear structural dependency on the condition tested by the question, based on generic stage characteristics.
- **N (No)** — The stage does not structurally depend on the condition; its viability or operation is not meaningfully shaped by that factor.
- **U (Unknown)** — The dependency cannot be determined from the generic stage structure alone, or the answer would require mineral-specific, country-specific, or process-specific knowledge.

The U category is intentional and analytically important. It signals where generalist structural logic is insufficient and where interpretation must be deferred or escalated, rather than inferred or assumed. Diagnostic scoring therefore prioritizes discipline and transparency over completeness.

Composite Scoring Logic (H/M/L/U)

Once diagnostic Y/N/U values are assigned across the guiding questions for a factor, they are converted into a single composite structural score. The composite score summarizes the degree of structural dependence a stage has on that factor and enables consistent comparison across stages and factors.

Composite scores are classified as:

- **H (High)** — *Strong structural dependence, indicated by multiple reinforcing dependencies.*
- **M (Medium)** — *Partial or conditional dependence, where the factor matters but is not determinative.*
- **L (Low)** — *Minimal structural dependence; the stage is largely independent of the factor.*
- **U (Unknown)** — *Insufficient structural evidence to determine dependence.*

The composite score is the value used in cross-factor summaries, heat maps, and downstream analysis. Importantly, composite scores are rule-based transformations of the diagnostic layer—not subjective judgments—and must not be manually adjusted. This ensures consistency, reduces interpretive drift, and preserves the integrity of the structural assessment. Scoring was machine-assisted using a custom analytical model developed in ChatGPT 5.2.

APPENDIX E: Structural Scoring Rationales

Factor 1: Resource & Input Advantage

Q1 — Geological or Raw Material Anchoring

Is this stage typically located near a specific physical resource (ore body, brine field, mineral deposit, metallurgical-grade feedstock)?

Q2 — Dependency on Ore Quality or Unique Feedstock Attributes

Does the stage require specific ore grades, impurity profiles, or in-situ feedstocks that determine locational feasibility?

Q3 — High Transport Burden for Raw Materials

Is it generally uneconomical or impractical to transport raw inputs to distant locations due to bulk, weight, hazard, or degradation?

Q4 — Immobile Natural Inputs (Optional)

Does the stage require natural conditions that cannot be relocated (e.g., geothermal brines, hydropower, dry-air conditions)?

(Optional; use only when clear.)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: Y, Y, N, U
- Q1–Q2 are Yes because this stage depends structurally on proximity to the resource body and direct access to primary geological inputs. Q3 is No since operational feasibility is not shaped by intermediate feedstock characteristics, and Q4 is U where exposure to external input substitution cannot be generically determined.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: Y, Y, N, U
- Q1–Q2 are Yes because exploration requires direct access to in-situ resource characteristics and location-specific geological signals. Q3 is No because intermediate feedstock properties do not drive feasibility, while Q4 is U due to uncertain generic exposure to input flexibility or substitution.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U

- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to strong structural anchoring to ore-body characteristics, physical accessibility, and dependence on naturally occurring resource attributes. Q4 is U because the degree of exposure to alternative input structures cannot be inferred generically.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because beneficiation feasibility is structurally tied to ore mineralogy, grade distribution, and inherent physical properties of the resource. Q4 is U because potential substitutability or diversification of input materials is not structurally evident at the generic stage level.

**Note: Factor 1 only addresses Stage Archetypes 1-4*

Factor 2: Related Variety & Technological Proximity

Q1 — Process Adjacency

Does this stage structurally rely on industries with similar process technologies (thermal, chemical, mechanical) or specialized industrial equipment that enable its operation? *(Note: Do not consider generic equipment – e.g., trucks, pumps, steel structures – as adjacency.)*

Q2 — Engineering & Supplier Ecosystem Proximity

Does the stage structurally benefit from co-location with engineering firms, component suppliers, or technical services that specialize in similar industrial processes? *(Note: Do not score based on any specific mineral's flowsheet or refining pathway.)*

Q2 — Supplier & Equipment Overlap

Does the stage rely on suppliers, equipment types, or engineering services commonly used across multiple industrial sectors?

Q3 — Workforce & Skills Proximity

Is there a workforce whose skills transfer readily from related industries to this stage (chemical engineers, metallurgists, precision machinists, materials scientists)?

Q4 — Knowledge & Innovation Spillovers (Optional, Use Only When Clear)

Does innovation in adjacent industries materially benefit this stage (through materials development, process improvements, or equipment evolution)?

(Q4 is optional and should only be scored when innovation spillovers are structurally obvious. Do not infer a Y/N based on mineral- or country-specific R&D ecosystems.)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because surveying relies on geological expertise, not adjacency to industrial process, supplier, or skills ecosystems; innovation spillovers (Q4) are not structurally evident.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because drilling and permitting are field-based activities dominated by geology and regulatory processes, not adjacent industrial capabilities; Q4 remains unclear.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because mining depends on geology and onsite operations rather than technological adjacency to other industries; Q4 not structurally determinable.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: Y, N, N, U
- Q1 is Yes because beneficiation shares process technologies (e.g., crushing, milling) with other bulk-material industries; Q2–Q3 are No since supplier and skills adjacency is helpful but not structurally required.

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to inherent dependence on thermal/chemical process equipment, engineering-services ecosystems, and transferable skilled labor typical of large-scale processing industries.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U

- Q1–Q3 are Yes because this stage fundamentally relies on chemical-process industries, specialized engineering suppliers, and transferable chemical/materials skills.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes given deep adjacency to chemical, metallurgical, and precision purification technologies, along with supplier and workforce ecosystems.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because producing specialty materials depends structurally on advanced chemical-processing capabilities, specialized equipment suppliers, and relevant skilled labor.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes as alloying and powder preparation strongly depend on metallurgical, thermal, and precision-process industries, supplier networks, and transferable technical skills.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to adjacency with advanced chemical, materials-engineering, and process-control industries, requiring shared equipment and specialized skills.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because fabrication uses industrial equipment, supplier networks, and precision-manufacturing skills common to multiple related sectors.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes since magnetic/alloy component production depends structurally on metallurgical, machining, and advanced-manufacturing adjacencies.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because this stage requires sophisticated equipment, precision-engineering suppliers, and high-skill industrial workforces found in related process industries.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to structural reliance on adjacent precision manufacturing, coating, and process-control ecosystems.

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because cell/device manufacturing requires strong adjacency to advanced manufacturing sectors, equipment suppliers, and transferable workforce capabilities.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes as assembly depends on mechanical, electrical, and systems-engineering adjacencies, along with shared suppliers and skilled labor.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to structural reliance on engineering, electronics, and systems-manufacturing ecosystems and overlapping supplier networks.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because advanced test and certification processes depend on specialized equipment, engineering services, and technical skillsets found in related industries.

**Note: Factor 2 addresses all Stage Archetypes, 1-18*

Factor 3: Institutional Thickness

Q1 — Certification, Standards & Testing Requirements

Does this stage require product certification, quality testing, regulatory approvals, or adherence to formal technical standards?

Q2 — Engineering & EPC Ecosystem Dependence

Does this stage require product certification, quality testing, regulatory approvals, or adherence to formal technical standards?

Q3 — Workforce & Skill Formation Dependency

Does the stage require highly trained, institutionally developed professionals (chemical engineers, metallurgists, materials scientists, precision manufacturing engineers)?

Q4 — Research & Innovation Institutions (Optional)

Is this stage reliant on research labs, universities, or technical institutes for process innovation, validation, or problem-solving?

(Q4 is optional and should only be scored when institutional research dependence is structurally obvious. Do not infer a Y/N based on mineral-specific behavior)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because surveying relies on geological expertise and fieldwork rather than certification bodies, EPC firms, or institutionally produced technical labor. Q4 is unclear because research dependence is not structurally required.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No since exploration and permitting rely on field operations and regulatory processes rather than deep institutional engineering or testing ecosystems. Q4 is not structurally evident.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: N, N, N, U

- Q1–Q3 are No because daily mining operations depend primarily on onsite operational capability rather than dense institutional ecosystems. Q4 is uncertain as research institutions are not structurally required for routine extraction.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because beneficiation uses established processes with moderate technical oversight but does not inherently require certification bodies, EPC ecosystems, or advanced institutional skill pipelines. Q4 not structurally determinable.

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because metallurgical facilities require engineered plant design, compliance oversight, and institutionally trained professionals to operate and maintain thermal/chemical processes. Q4 is not uniformly required across all variants.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to strong structural reliance on formal standards, EPC design, and institutionally trained chemical-process professionals. Q4 remains uncertain without assuming mineral-specific innovation needs.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because refining depends on strict QC standards, engineered process systems, and skilled technical labor produced through institutional pathways. Q4 is not universally obligatory across all refining archetypes.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes since producing specialty materials requires certifications, engineered systems, and advanced skills, all embedded in institutional ecosystems. Q4 remains unclear generically.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U
- Q1 is No because alloying/powder steps do not inherently require certification bodies; Q2–Q3 are Yes because specialized engineering services and technical workforce pipelines are structurally necessary. Q4 is not universally required.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because synthesis demands stringent standards, engineered process control, and institutionally trained materials/chemical professionals. Q4 is uncertain without assuming mineral-specific R&D needs.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U
- Q1 is No because fabrication does not universally require product certification; Q2–Q3 are Yes due to reliance on precision-engineering firms and skilled technical labor. Q4 is not structurally mandated.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U
- Q1 is No because certification requirements are not uniformly essential at this stage; Q2–Q3 are Yes because specialized engineering and skilled labor ecosystems are structurally required. Q4 remains unclear.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to extreme institutional dependence on standards, EPC design, and highly specialized workforce; Q4 is Yes because R&D institutions are structurally integral to process innovation and control.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U

- Q1 is No since certification is not inherently required at the submodule level; Q2–Q3 are Yes as engineered production systems and skilled labor pipelines are structurally needed. Q4 is not universally necessary.

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U
- Q1 is No because certification becomes more relevant later in final testing; Q2–Q3 are Yes owing to engineered manufacturing lines and institutionally trained technical workforce. Q4 stays uncertain.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: N, Y, Y, U
- Q1 is No because core certification occurs downstream; Q2–Q3 are Yes because assembly requires engineering support ecosystems and skilled labor. Q4 is unclear.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: N, Y, N, U
- Q1 is No since system integration is not structurally tied to certification bodies at this stage; Q2 is Yes because engineering-services ecosystems are necessary; Q3 is No because skills are less specialized than midstream chemical/materials stages. Q4 is undetermined.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because certification, engineering oversight, and specialized technical labor are structurally essential; Q4 is Yes because testing/validation infrastructure fundamentally relies on institutional research and standards bodies.

**Note: Factor 3 addresses all Stage Archetypes, 1-18*

Factor 4: Business Environment Sensitivity

Q1 — Cost Sensitivity

Is the stage highly sensitive to energy, labor, or input costs in a way that materially affects feasibility?

Q2 — Infrastructure Dependence

Does the stage depend on sophisticated or high-capacity infrastructure (utilities, ports, pipeline networks, specialized transport)?

Q3 — Operational Stability & EHS Requirements

Does the stage require stable operations, strict EHS compliance, or continuous-process facilities where disruptions create major losses?

Q4 — Permitting & Regulatory Throughput (Optional)

Does the stage structurally require efficient permitting or stable regulatory execution to avoid prolonged downtime or capital loss?

(Q4 evaluates structural permitting or compliance exposure, not mineral-specific regulatory regimes. Q4 is optional and should only be scored when permitting/regulatory throughput dependence is structurally obvious. Do not infer a Y/N based on country-specific policy performance, firm experience, or mineral-specific conditions.)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because surveying requires personnel and field tools but has minimal sensitivity to cost, environment, infrastructure, or operational stability; Q4 is unclear since permitting throughput does not structurally constrain basic surveying.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because exploration drilling and early permitting do not rely on sophisticated infrastructure or continuous operations; Q4 is uncertain because generic permitting does not structurally determine feasibility of this stage.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No since mining feasibility is dominated by geology, not business-environment cost, infrastructure, or operational stability; Q4 remains undetermined as permitting throughput affects timelines but is not structurally definitive.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: N, N, N, U

- Q1–Q3 are No because beneficiation uses robust but flexible processes that can operate under varied business environments; Q4 is not structurally required.

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because metallurgy is highly sensitive to energy costs, requires industrial utilities and transport, and depends on stable operations for thermal processes; Q4 not universally obligatory.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes since hydromet/chemical conversion involves energy-, utility-, and stability-intensive continuous processes; Q4 remains ambiguous across all variations.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because refining is sensitive to energy/input cost stability, depends on sophisticated utilities, and requires process continuity; Q4 is not structurally clear.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes given reliance on controlled environments, stable utilities, and cost-sensitive production processes; Q4 is not uniformly evident.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: Y, N, N, U
- Q1 is Yes since alloy/powder production is moderately cost-sensitive; Q2–Q3 are No because infrastructure and continuous-process stability are less determinative for this archetype; Q4 ambiguous.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to high operational stability needs, controlled utilities, and cost-sensitive chemical/materials production; Q4 is not structurally universal.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: Y, N, N, U
- Q1 is Yes because cost environment influences fabrication feasibility; Q2–Q3 are No since these operations typically do not require heavy infrastructure or continuous-process stability; Q4 is unclear.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: Y, N, N, U
- Q1 is Yes because fabrication steps are cost-sensitive; Q2–Q3 are No as infrastructure demands and stability constraints are moderate; Q4 is uncertain.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because wafering requires stable high-quality utilities, precise process control, and significant operational stability; Q4 is not uniformly required even though R&D interactions exist.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because submodule fabrication depends on controlled environments, reliable utilities, and stable operations; Q4 is not structurally universal.

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes as cell production requires stable utilities, controlled environments, and cost-sensitive continuous manufacturing; Q4 remains optional and unclear.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: Y, N, N, U
- Q1 is Yes due to cost sensitivity; Q2–Q3 are No because assembly requires moderate infrastructure and limited continuous-process stability; Q4 is undetermined.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: Y, N, N, U

- Q1 is Yes because integration processes are influenced by cost environment; Q2–Q3 are No since infrastructure demands and stability requirements are moderate rather than foundational; Q4 is unclear.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because testing/certification depends on reliable utilities, operational stability, and cost-sensitive precision facilities; Q4 is Yes since permitting/regulatory throughput is structurally necessary for certification functions.

**Note: Factor 4 addresses all Stage Archetypes, 1-18*

Factor 5: Policy Commitment & Strategic Alignment

Q1 — Regulatory Exposure vs. Structural Dependence

Does this stage structurally require significant regulatory throughput or environmental compliance to operate?

(Note: Do not score Y simply because real-world countries tightly regulate this stage.)

Q2 — Strategic Enabling Requirement

Does this stage structurally depend on long-term policy priority or strategic alignment (e.g., critical-externality risks, national security sensitivity)?

(Note: Do not score Y based on subsidies, incentives, or current industrial strategy programs.)

Q3 — Strategic or National-Security Relevance

Does this stage typically become the focus of industrial policy due to strategic vulnerability, supply-chain centrality, or national security?

Q4 — Infrastructure or Capital-Risk Sharing (Optional)

Does the stage require large-scale infrastructure or capital deployment where policy plays a structural enabling role (e.g., shared facilities, long-term commitments)?

(Q4 is optional and should only be scored when capital-risk sharing or infrastructure dependence is structurally obvious. Do not infer a Y/N from country-specific subsidies, incentives, or regulatory programs.)

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because metallurgical operations structurally involve significant environmental compliance, strategic relevance, and capital-intensive processes that historically require policy stability; Q4 is uncertain because shared infrastructure dependence is not universally determinative across all metallurgical archetypes.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: Y, U, Y, U
- Q1 is Yes due to strong structural exposure to environmental and regulatory frameworks; Q2 is U because policy prioritization varies across chemical archetypes; Q3 is Yes because these stages often become strategic due to chokepoint relevance; Q4 is unclear without mineral-specific capital-risk detail.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because refining requires stringent regulatory oversight, frequently receives long-term industrial-strategy attention, and structurally occupies a central point of vulnerability in supply chains; Q4 is not uniformly evident across all refining models.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes since specialty-material production typically incurs environmental exposure, strategic relevance, and policy-enabled industrial scaling; Q4 is indeterminate because not all archetypes require explicit public risk-sharing mechanisms.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: Y, U, U, U
- Q1 is Yes as alloy/powder manufacturing involves notable compliance exposure; Q2 and Q3 are U because structural dependence on strategic policy alignment or national-security relevance cannot be determined generically; Q4 remains uncertain without capital-risk specifics.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because the degree of regulatory exposure, strategic relevance, and capital-risk dependence varies substantially across material families, and the generic stage structure does not provide enough information to answer Q1–Q4 without mineral-specific detail.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because fabrication of structural/functional components is predominantly market-driven, exhibits limited regulatory exposure, and is not structurally tied to strategic policy mandates; Q4 is unclear because large-scale public risk-sharing is not essential to feasibility.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because this stage’s feasibility is driven by industrial manufacturing rather than strategic policy or environmental regulation; Q4 cannot be determined structurally.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because wafer/substrate processing is structurally exposed to strict regulatory environments, often receives strategic policy attention, and represents a known chokepoint class; Q4 remains U since shared-infrastructure or capital-risk policies are not universally required.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: Y, U, U, U
- Q1 is Yes because electrode/submodule production involves regulatory compliance related to materials handling; Q2–Q3 are U because strategic relevance or policy-enabling dynamics cannot be determined generically; Q4 is uncertain without process-specific capital-risk data.

**Note: Factor 5 only addresses Stage Archetypes 5-14*

Factor 6: Market Structure & Local Rivalry

Q1 — Rivalry-Driven Performance Requirement

Does this stage structurally benefit from multiple competing firms driving quality, innovation, and price discipline?

Q2 — Customer Proximity Requirement

Does this stage improve significantly when co-located with demanding customers or system integrators?

Q3 — Iterative Design–Manufacturing Loop Dependency

Does the stage require tight, rapid feedback loops (design → prototype → test → adjust) that thrive under competitive pressure?

Q4 — Benchmarking & Standards Competition (Optional)

Is this stage structurally enhanced by global benchmarking, competitive standards, or rapid product cycles?

(Use optional Q4 only when clearly inherent to the stage.)

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because this stage structurally benefits from strong rivalry, demanding customers, and rapid design–prototype–test iteration cycles that directly influence performance and yield. Q4 is Yes because global benchmarking and competitive product cycles are structurally integral to device/cell manufacturing excellence.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because assembly stages depend on competitive pressure, tight customer–integrator proximity, and iterative feedback with OEMs to refine performance and reliability. Q4 is Yes since benchmarking and standards-based competition structurally enhance quality and system integration.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because system integration is structurally engineering-driven—performance derives more from design capability and system-level engineering than from local rivalry or competitive clustering. Q4 is U because benchmarking benefits are not structurally determinative and vary across integration archetypes.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: N, N, N, N
- Q1–Q3 are No because this stage is standards- and compliance-driven rather than rivalry-driven, with quality governed by regulation rather than market competition. Q4 is No because competitive benchmarking does not structurally influence feasibility; testing depends on adherence to standards, not competition dynamics.

**Note: Factor 6 only addresses Stage Archetypes 15-18*

Factor 7: Geopolitical & Supply-Chain Risk Exposure

Q1 — Natural Global Concentration

Does this stage structurally tend to consolidate into a small number of global facilities due to intrinsic capital intensity, specialized know-how, or minimum efficient scale, independent of current geography?

Q2 — Specialized or Restricted Inputs

Does the stage require rare, restricted, or proprietary inputs (equipment, reagents, IP, catalysts) that are typically produced by a small number of firms or countries in principle?

Q3 — High Coordination or Environmental Oversight Requirements

Does the stage require stringent environmental controls, sensitive process streams, or complex coordination requirements that naturally limit global diffusion even before considering minerals or countries?

Q4 — Strategic Chokepoint Characteristics (Optional)

Is this stage inherently prone to supply-chain chokepoints (e.g., hazardous materials shipping, specialized refining circuits)?

(Q4 is optional and should only be scored when chokepoint characteristics are structurally obvious. Do not infer a Y/N from mineral-specific maritime constraints, specific country risks, or today's supply-chain configurations.)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because surveying is location-bound and diffuse rather than concentrated or reliant on scarce inputs; Q4 is U since chokepoint characteristics are not inherent to this information-gathering stage.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because exploration activities occur wherever deposits are located and do not structurally concentrate globally or depend on restricted equipment; Q4 is U because no inherent chokepoint characteristics emerge.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No as mining is determined by dispersed geology, not geopolitical concentration or specialized inputs; Q4 is U because mining does not structurally create transport or coordination chokepoints at this generic level.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because beneficiation capacity scales broadly and does not depend on rare equipment or centralized capabilities; Q4 is U since inherent chokepoint features are not structurally evident.

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: Y, U, Y, U
- Q1 is Yes because metallurgical plants tend to concentrate due to scale and capital intensity; Q2 is U because dependence on specialized inputs varies; Q3 is Yes owing to stringent oversight and coordination demands that naturally limit global diffusion; Q4 remains U.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to intrinsic concentration pressures, specialized/restricted inputs, and strong environmental/coordination requirements that limit global dispersal; Q4 is U because chokepoint characteristics differ across conversion archetypes.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes since refining is structurally prone to global concentration, relies on rare technological capabilities, and requires sensitive multi-stage oversight; Q4 is U because chokepoint features vary by process type.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because specialty-material production tends to consolidate in capability-intensive hubs requiring scarce equipment and stringent process control; Q4 is U absent universally inherent chokepoint traits.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because the extent of concentration, restricted inputs, or inherent chokepoint risk cannot be determined generically without mineral-specific or technology-specific information.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because structural geopolitical vulnerability cannot be inferred generically; concentration patterns and restricted-input dynamics differ significantly across synthesis archetypes.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: N, N, N, U

- Q1–Q3 are No because component fabrication is broadly replicable and not structurally dependent on rare inputs or concentrated capabilities; Q4 is U as inherent chokepoints are not evident.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because this stage can be geographically diversified and does not inherently rely on rare or restricted inputs; Q4 is U without clear chokepoint characteristics.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q4 are Yes because substrate/wafer processing structurally concentrates due to extreme technological exclusivity, reliance on restricted equipment, high coordination burdens, and inherent chokepoint characteristics in process architecture.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because structural chokepoint tendencies, concentration behaviors, and restricted-input dependencies cannot be inferred generically across submodule archetypes.

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because cell/device assembly is replicable and not inherently subject to geopolitical concentration or restricted inputs; Q4 is U because any chokepoint traits are not structurally universal.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No as assembly processes distribute easily and lack intrinsic scarcity or concentration drivers; Q4 is U due to absence of clear chokepoint characteristics.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because system integration is engineering-driven and not concentrated by structural geopolitical constraints; Q4 is U since chokepoint traits are not inherent.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because testing and certification are standards-driven and widely replicable; Q4 is U because no inherent chokepoint dynamics emerge from the generic stage structure.

**Note: Factor 7 addresses all Stage Archetypes, 1-18*

Factor 8: Trilateral Complementarity Potential

Q1 — Structural Modularity & Fragmentation Potential

Can this stage be structurally divided across multiple locations without degrading performance, requiring co-processing, or creating integration risk?

(Note: Do not consider mineral-specific flowsheet variants or country-level ecosystem distribution when scoring.)

Q2 — Complementary Capability Requirements

Does successful execution of this stage structurally require diverse technical capabilities (chemical, thermal, mechanical, materials-science) that tend to be distributed across different industrial ecosystems in principle?

(Note: Do not consider mineral-specific flowsheet variants or country-level ecosystem distribution when scoring.)

Q3 — Interoperability & Standardization Potential

Does this stage produce intermediates that are naturally standardizable, tradeable, or compatible across producers without requiring co-located sequential processing?

Q4 — Multi-Stage Co-Processing Flexibility (Optional)

Can this stage be structurally co-located or separated from adjacent stages without dependency on mineral-specific flowsheets or national industrial ecosystems?

(Optional; score only when the stage is inherently flexible. Do not infer Y/N from real-world chemical hubs, semiconductor clusters, or battery ecosystems.)

Stage 1 — Geological Survey & Resource Assessment

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because surveying is geology-anchored and cannot be modularized, shared, or standardized across multiple locations; Q4 is U because fragmentation flexibility is not structurally relevant.

Stage 2 — Exploration & Permitting

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because exploration and permitting must occur at the deposit and involve localized regulatory processes, offering no structural modularity or interoperable outputs; Q4 is U due to minimal relevance of co-processing flexibility.

Stage 3 — Extraction / Mining

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because extraction is fixed to ore location and cannot be divided or complemented across actors; Q4 is U since integration flexibility is not applicable to this resource-anchored stage.

Stage 4 — Beneficiation / Ore Concentration

- Answers: N, N, N, U
- Q1–Q3 are No because beneficiation is structurally tied to the mine site and not divisible or compatible with cross-location staging; Q4 is U due to limited modularity potential.

Stage 5 — Metallurgical Processing

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because complementarity potential depends on feedstock chemistry, modular facility design, and flowsheet flexibility that cannot be assessed from generic stage structure alone.

Stage 6 — Chemical Conversion / Hydromet Processing

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because the degree to which conversion steps can be modularized or shared across actors depends heavily on mineral-specific process integration and cannot be inferred structurally.

Stage 7 — Purification & Refining

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U because the complementarity potential of refining varies widely with purity pathways and flowsheet coupling, and generic structural rules do not indicate clear modularity or interoperable outputs.

Stage 8 — Specialty Oxide / Metal / Salt Production

- Answers: U, U, U, U
- All U since the modularity of specialty-material production cannot be determined generically without knowing the stability, tradability, or integration requirements of intermediates.

Stage 9 — Alloying & Powder / Material Preparation

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because alloying/powder preparation is structurally modular, requires diverse competencies, and produces standardizable intermediates transferable across producers; Q4 is U due to uncertain co-processing flexibility.

Stage 10 — Active Material Synthesis

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes given strong inherent modularity, distributed capability requirements, and high interoperability of synthesized intermediates; Q4 is U where co-processing flexibility cannot be fully confirmed.

Stage 11 — Component Fabrication — Structural & Functional

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U

- Q1–Q3 are Yes because component fabrication is structurally divisible, benefits from distributed competencies, and generates standardized parts that integrate cleanly across systems; Q4 is U due to uncertain separability from adjacent stages.

Stage 12 — Component Fabrication — Magnetic & Alloy Components

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes as magnetic/alloy components are highly modular, competency-diverse, and interoperable in downstream systems; Q4 is U because co-processing flexibility varies by design type.

Stage 13 — Substrate & Wafer Processing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q4 are Yes because wafer/substrate production is structurally modular, competence-diverse, produces globally standardizable intermediates, and can be separated from upstream/downstream steps without structural constraints.

Stage 14 — Electrode / Submodule Fabrication

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes due to inherent modularity, distributed capability requirements, and standardizable submodules; Q4 is U because dependence on sequential co-processing varies across archetypes.

Stage 15 — Device / Cell Manufacturing

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q4 are Yes because cell manufacturing is modular, requires diverse competencies, yields interoperable units, and is structurally divisible across production and testing streams.

Stage 16 — Module / Pack / Magnet Assembly

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, Y
- Q1–Q4 are Yes since assembly is inherently modular, requires varied mechanical/electrical integration capabilities, produces standardized outputs, and can structurally separate or co-locate sub-stages.

Stage 17 — System Integration

- Answers: Y, Y, Y, U
- Q1–Q3 are Yes because integration can be distributed across multiple centers, requires diverse competencies, and produces interoperable systems; Q4 is U as co-processing flexibility is not universally obvious.

Stage 18 — Final Testing & Certification

- Answers: Y, N, Y, U
- Q1 is Yes because testing processes can be modularized; Q2 is No since technical capability requirements are not structurally diverse; Q3 is Yes as outputs are standardized and interoperable; Q4 is U because placement relative to adjacent stages is not inherently flexible.

**Note: Factor 8 addresses all Stage Archetypes, 1-18*