FINANCIAL PROBLEM ENGINEERING FRAMEWORK

FPEF

A methodology for decomposing real-world problems into Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and Risks and reconstructing them through Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer

Conceptual and Methodological White Paper

Version 1.0 | October 2026

Working document for academic, financial, technological, and regulatory review

Notice: this document presents an analytical methodology. It does not constitute financial, legal, accounting, tax, or investment advice, nor a recommendation of specific instruments. Application to real cases requires verifiable data, jurisdiction-specific analysis, and independent professional review.

Contents

- Executive Summary
- 1. Introduction
- 2. Definition and Positioning of FPEF
- 3. Theoretical Foundation and Literature Review
- 4. The Five Principles of FPEF
- 5. Financial Problem Engineering Framework
- 6. Scope, Limits, and Rejection Criteria
- 7. Application of FPEF
- 8. Cross-Case Findings
- 9. Discussion
- 10. Limitations
- 11. Conclusions
- 12. Future Research Agenda
- 13. References
- Methodological Appendices

Executive Summary

The Financial Problem Engineering Framework (FPEF) is a proposed methodology for determining whether a real-world problem can be transformed into an economically structurable problem and, when this is possible, for designing and evaluating alternatives capable of addressing it through Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer. Its purpose is not to financialize every problem or privilege a particular instrument, institution, or technology. Its purpose is to organize the analysis so that finance and technology are used when they add value and rejected when they do not.

FPEF begins with the problem, not with a product. The situation is decomposed into four dimensions: Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and Risks. Within Risks, derivability is incorporated as the exploration of whether an exposure has a sufficiently identifiable variable, asset, right, cash flow, indicator, or event to study mechanisms for retention, reduction, transfer, hedging, or structuring. This exploration does not by itself determine that a derivative exists as a matter of law or that using one is advisable.

Financial Engineering receives that decomposition and designs possible economic architectures. The Technology Layer determines how those architectures can be originated, financed, distributed, executed, verified, regulated, accounted for, governed, validated, operated, settled, and potentially scaled. Their combined output is a set of Possible FPEF Alternatives. These are compared with existing, traditional, and incremental options, as well as with the option of not intervening. Only an alternative selected after that comparison can be recognized as an FPEF Solution.

The framework maintains five principles: Integration over Reinvention; Solution Specificity; Replicable Methodology, Specific Solution; Modular and Progressive Implementation; and Self-Sustainability. Modularity is determined within Implementation, not as a separate phase. Self-sustainability, evolution, and the decision to scale are ultimately evaluated through Post-Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation.

The primary methodological test considered the expansion of a plant producing 30,000 units per year and proposing a USD 5 million investment to reach 18,500,000 units per year. FPEF showed that the problem was not simply obtaining capital: it involved a scale increase of more than 600 times, rights over the water source and assets, unproven commercial cash flows, and demand, execution, logistics, quality, regulatory, and working-capital risks. The methodology produced equity, debt, hybrid financing, modular expansion, purchase-contract, and platform-financing alternatives. The structuring gate was passed, while the original financial formulation required REDESIGN. This validated the diagnostic and design usefulness of the framework without asserting the project's ultimate viability.

Four additional conceptual cases—agriculture, energy and infrastructure, international trade, and a climate-driven operational interruption—show that the same methodology can lead to different solutions, including the selection of traditional instruments or the rejection of unnecessary complexity. The proposed contribution of FPEF therefore lies not in inventing its individual components but in integrating and ordering them around real-world problems through diagnosis, design, viability analysis, comparison, implementation, and post-implementation evaluation.

Central Thesis

The methodology is replicable; the FPEF Solution is specific to the problem that gives rise to it. The framework's success is measured by the quality of the decision, not by the amount of innovation produced.

1. Introduction

Modern financial systems offer a broad range of instruments, structures, markets, platforms, and technologies. The existence of these capabilities, however, does not guarantee that real-world problems are formulated correctly, that the selected instrument corresponds to the underlying economic exposure, or that the chosen technology adds value. Innovation processes can begin with a readily available answer—credit, tokenization, crowdfunding, blockchain, or a derivative—before establishing whether that answer actually fits the problem.

FPEF proposes to reverse that order. It first defines the problem and the desired outcome. It then determines whether there are sufficient relationships among Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and Risks to construct a coherent economic architecture. Only then does it employ Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer. The sequence is intended to reduce over-structuring, dependence on technology narratives, and the tendency to confuse installed capacity, liquidity, demand, rights, and economic value.

The research question is whether a problem-first methodology can systematically expand the solution space for economically structurable problems by integrating existing financial and technological knowledge without presupposing an instrument or technology. The hypothesis is that a common decomposition and an explicit separation between economic design and operationalization can generate more relevant, comparable, and verifiable alternatives.

This white paper is conceptual and methodological. The bottled-water plant test uses figures provided for the case to demonstrate the behavior of the framework; the remaining cases are conceptual tests grounded in representative problems and reference literature. None substitutes for financial, technical, legal, environmental, or commercial due diligence.

2. Definition and Positioning of FPEF

Official Definition

The Financial Problem Engineering Framework (FPEF) does not assume that every problem must be solved through a financial instrument or a particular technology. Its function is to establish whether a problem can be decomposed into capital, cash flows, rights, and risks; designing, through Financial Engineering, a coherent economic structure; determining, through the Technology Layer, how that structure could operate; and subjecting it to regulatory, accounting, operational, quantitative, and comparative filters before recognizing it as a solution.

2.1 Intellectual Positioning

FPEF is not presented as a substitute for Financial Engineering, Functional and Structural Finance, Structured Finance, FinTech, or risk theory. It recognizes that its viability depends on previously developed knowledge. Financial Engineering contributes instrument and process design; the functional perspective allows functions to be considered before institutions; Structured Finance contributes pooling, priority, and transfer mechanisms; FinTech and digital platforms expand origination, financing, and execution channels; and regulatory standards provide conditions for safety, governance, and enforceability.

The proposed contribution of FPEF is architectural. Its starting point is a real-world problem. Its intermediate language is Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and Risks. Its economic design engine is Financial Engineering. Its operationalization and viability layer is the Technology Layer. Its selection mechanism is Comparison. Its real-world test begins after Implementation through Monitoring and Evaluation.

This positioning avoids an excessive claim of originality. The individual components are not new in themselves. The proposition being tested is that their orderly integration can improve diagnostic quality and reasonably expand the alternatives available for structurable problems.

3. Theoretical Foundation and Literature Review

3.1 Financial Engineering

Finnerty defines Financial Engineering through the design, development, and implementation of innovative financial instruments and processes and the formulation of creative solutions to financial problems. This precedent encompasses debt instruments, options, futures, convertibles, and financial processes. FPEF adopts the discipline as its economic design engine and does not claim its instruments or techniques as original components of FPEF.

Within FPEF, Financial Engineering receives a representation of the problem that has already been decomposed. This changes the sequence, not the discipline: before designing an instrument, the framework requires identifying who needs Capital, which Cash Flows can support obligations, which Rights exist, and which Risks must be allocated.

3.2 Functional and Structural Perspective

Merton and Bodie propose analyzing financial systems by anchoring them in functions rather than institutions and treating institutional structure as endogenous. The approach applies to countries, regions, firms, and households and incorporates technological, regulatory, and accounting conditions. This precedent is close to FPEF and constrains any claim that FPEF invented the principle of function before institution.

The proposed distinction of FPEF lies in its initial operation: real-world problem, economic decomposition, and then selection of functions, structures, and technologies. The relationship is therefore one of continuity and integration, not competition.

3.3 Structured Finance and Risk Transformation

Structured Finance shows that assets and Cash Flows can be pooled and that Rights over them can be divided by priority. Securitization and tranching can transfer and transform exposures. The literature also shows, however, that complexity and estimation errors can be amplified in the resulting structure.

FPEF therefore adopts a conservative rule: structuring does not mean eliminating Risks. Each alternative must distinguish original, retained, transferred, transformed, newly introduced, and residual risk.

3.4 Financial Innovation and Counterfactual Analysis

Financial innovation can increase access, reduce costs, or create new possibilities, but its consequences must be evaluated against alternatives. Literature proposing counterfactual analysis supports the role of Comparison in FPEF: an architecture should be selected only when it is preferable to the current situation, traditional solutions, incremental improvements, or non-intervention.

3.5 FinTech, Platforms, and Crowdfunding

Studies by the BIS and FSB describe credit facilitated by electronic platforms, including models that connect borrowers and investors, use their own balance sheets, or access retail and institutional investors. Within FPEF, crowdfunding and platform credit are mechanisms of origination, financing, or distribution. They do not automatically change the economic nature of the underlying instrument.

Because regulatory perimeters vary across jurisdictions, the use of platforms is a viability question within the Technology Layer and not a conclusion derived solely from technical availability.

3.6 Tokenization, DLT, and Programmable Platforms

Tokenization can represent assets on programmable platforms and can integrate issuance, transfer, recordkeeping, custody, or settlement. IOSCO observes growing interest but also limited adoption, uneven efficiency gains, interoperability and settlement challenges, legal uncertainty, operational vulnerabilities, and cyber risks.

FPEF therefore treats blockchain, DLT, and tokenization as possible ecosystems rather than default solutions. They are incorporated only when they address an identified friction better than a conventional architecture.

3.7 Regulation, Accounting, and Governance

The CPMI-IOSCO Principles for Financial Market Infrastructures identify legal, credit, liquidity, operational, custody, investment, and general business risks, and require a clear and enforceable legal basis for material aspects of an infrastructure. In FPEF these considerations sit inside the Technology Layer because they determine how the economic architecture can operate.

Regulation is analyzed by activity, instrument, participant, and jurisdiction. Accounting determines recognition and measurement; governance allocates authority, responsibility, controls, and continuity mechanisms. An economically attractive alternative may be unviable if any of these dimensions fails.

4. The Five Principles of FPEF

Principle	Canonical Formulation
I. Integration over Reinvention	FPEF prioritizes existing knowledge, instruments, methodologies, financial structures, and technological capabilities, adapting or combining them when necessary before justifying the creation of new mechanisms.
II. Solution Specificity	Each FPEF Solution responds specifically to the problem, stakeholders, Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, Risks, and constraints that gave rise to it.
III. Replicable Methodology, Specific Solution	FPEF maintains a consistent methodology for analyzing different problems without presupposing that they will produce equivalent instruments, technologies, architectures, or solutions.
IV. Modular and Progressive Implementation	When appropriate, an FPEF Solution may be implemented through successive modules or phases that allow components to be validated, modified, expanded, or stopped as Implementation progresses.
V. Self-Sustainability	When the economics of the problem allow it, FPEF seeks a solution that generates or enables resources, capacities, efficiencies, Cash Flows, or infrastructure that contribute to sustaining its operation, evolution, and potential scaling.

5. Financial Problem Engineering Framework

1. Problem

↓

2. Decomposition

↓

3. Financial Engineering

↓

4. Technology Layer

↓

Possible FPEF Alternatives

↓

5. Comparison

↓

6. FPEF Solution

↓

7. Implementation

↓

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Phase 1. Problem

The first phase defines the real-world situation, stakeholders, impact, constraints, and desired outcome. Formulations that embed a solution as if it were the problem, such as “we need blockchain” or “we need a loan,” are not accepted. The problem must be formulated independently of the mechanism.

The output is an FPEF Problem Statement. The entry gate requires an identifiable situation, a definable outcome, and a material reason to intervene. If critical information is missing, the outcome is HOLD; if there is no coherent outcome or the alleged problem lacks sufficient materiality, the outcome is REJECT.

Minimum questions

- Who experiences the problem and who bears its cost?
- What outcome is sought and how will it be measured?
- What alternatives exist and why are they insufficient?
- What economic, legal, operational, or technological constraints exist?

5.2 Phase 2. Decomposition

Decomposition translates the problem into a common economic language without requiring the four dimensions to carry equal weight.

Dimension	Question	Output

Dimension	Question	Output
Capital	What resources are required, when, for how long, and who absorbs losses?	Amount, duration, priority, cost, and possible sources.
Cash Flows	Where is value generated, consumed, transferred, saved, or protected from loss?	Map of inflows, outflows, avoided costs, frequency, currency, conditions, and volatility.
Rights	Who may claim, use, transfer, participate in, or exploit economic value?	Matrix of holder, obligor, asset/cash flow, priority, transferability, and enforceability.
Risks	Which uncertain outcomes alter value and who bears the exposure?	Risk map, treatment, potential counterparty, and residual risk.

5.2.1 Risks and Derivability

Within Risks, the analysis determines whether an exposure can be retained, reduced, shared, transferred, hedged, transformed, or avoided. Derivability does not begin with a derivative; it begins with a variable or event that changes the exposure.

The sequence is: Risk → variable/asset/right/cash flow/event → measurability → exposure → potential trigger → potential payoff → counterparty → cost → residual risk. Only then can Financial Engineering select traditional instruments, insurance, guarantees, contingent contracts, or new structures.

An economically derivable exposure may not legally constitute a derivative, may have no market, may lack a counterparty, or may produce unacceptable basis risk. Derivability is therefore an exploratory test, not a conclusion.

Family	Examples	Possible Treatments
Market	Price, interest rate, currency, commodities	Retention, contracts, forwards, futures, options, swaps.
Credit and counterparty	Default, concentration, settlement	Guarantees, limits, insurance, collateral, diversification.
Liquidity	Mismatch, exit, lack of market	Reserves, facilities, staging, market making.
Operations and technology	Processes, cybersecurity, data, oracles	Controls, redundancy, audit, alternative providers.
Legal and regulatory	Enforceability, licenses, conflict of laws	Contractual redesign, authorized entity, jurisdiction.
Event	Weather, availability, interruption	Insurance, parametric instrument, contingent contract.

5.2.2 Structurability Gate

Structurability Rule

A problem is a candidate for FPEF when its decomposition identifies sufficient economic relationships among Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and/or Risks to formulate at least one coherent architecture capable of evaluation through Financial Engineering.

5.3 Phase 3. Financial Engineering

Financial Engineering designs economic architectures. It can select, combine, adapt, or structure equity, debt, hybrid instruments, funds, SPVs, guarantees, securitization, reserves, collateral, derivatives, contingent contracts, or other relevant mechanisms.

The phase assigns who contributes Capital, who receives Cash Flows, who holds Rights, who absorbs losses, which Risks are retained or transferred, what priority applies to each participant, and which conditions trigger payments or termination.

The output is not yet an FPEF Solution. It is one or more economic architectures that must pass through the Technology Layer.

5.4 Phase 4. Technology Layer

The Technology Layer is not equivalent to software. It is the operationalization and viability layer. It determines how an architecture can be originated, financed, distributed, executed, verified, regulated, accounted for, governed, validated, operated, settled, and potentially scaled.

It may incorporate platforms, crowdfunding, cloud infrastructure, APIs, automation, artificial intelligence, DLT, tokenization, smart contracts, or oracles, but only when they address a concrete friction. The absence of new technology is a valid outcome.

Component	Question	Test
Origination	How do participants, assets, projects, and data enter?	Identity, KYC/KYB, permits, data room.
Financing and distribution	How is capital connected to the structure?	Institutional channels, funds, platforms, crowdfunding.
Infrastructure	Which systems execute and record?	APIs, ERP, cloud, DLT, automation.
Regulation and accounting	Can it operate legally and how is it recognized?	Classification, licenses, contracts, measurement.
Governance	Who decides, controls, verifies, and is accountable?	Roles, conflicts, audit, continuity.
Validation	Does it work under real and adverse scenarios?	Financial model, stress tests, operations, security.
Settlement	How are obligations performed and reconciled?	Payments, custody, collateral, settlement.
Potential scalability	Can volume increase without losing control?	Capacity, interoperability, liquidity, costs.

5.5 Possible FPEF Alternatives

The combined output of Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer is a set of configurations that are sufficiently coherent and viable to be compared. They are not final solutions. Possible FPEF Alternatives may be traditional, hybrid, or technology-enabled; Comparison also considers the existing situation, incremental improvements, and non-intervention when relevant.

5.6 Phase 5. Comparison

Comparison determines whether an alternative should become the FPEF Solution. Depending on the problem, it considers non-intervention, the current situation, a traditional solution, an incremental improvement, and the Possible FPEF Alternatives.

Criteria may include effectiveness, cost, return, risk, liquidity, access, complexity, regulation, operations, resilience, transparency, sustainability, and self-sustainability. The decision for a candidate may be PASS, REDESIGN, HOLD, or REJECT.

5.7 Phase 6. FPEF Solution

The alternative selected after Comparison is recognized as the FPEF Solution. It is specific to the problem and may consist of a simple instrument, a contractual combination, a financial architecture, or an integrated financial-technological model. A fully conventional solution may also be an FPEF Solution when Comparison shows it to be preferable.

5.8 Phase 7. Implementation

Implementation converts the selected solution into operation. Modularity is defined only at this stage. It may use pilots, production modules, geographic stages, participant groups, instruments, or technology components.

Progressive implementation is not mandatory. It is used when the value of learning, reduced exposure, or potential self-sustainability compensates for possible losses of scale or costs created by phased execution.

5.9 Phase 8. Post-Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation

The final phase compares the design with actual results and the original Problem Statement and baseline. It evaluates economic performance, Cash Flows, Risks, Technology Layer performance, compliance, governance, and the effect on the original problem.

Self-sustainability is examined in three dimensions: economic, operational, and evolutionary. Based on evidence, the decision may be to maintain, adjust, expand, reduce, restructure, or terminate. Potential scalability identified before Implementation becomes actual scaling only when this phase justifies it.

Decision	Meaning
PASS	The proposal clears the gate.
REDESIGN	There is potential, but the proposal requires modification.
HOLD	Critical information or an objective condition is missing.
REJECT	The proposal is not structurable, viable, advisable, or superior.

6. Scope, Limits, and Rejection Criteria

Criterion	Description
Not structurable	There is no sufficiently coherent economic relationship among Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, and/or Risks.
Financial irrelevance	A financial structure can be constructed, but it does not materially contribute to solving the problem.

Criterion	Description
Unacceptable residual risk	Risk transfer or transformation creates an exposure incompatible with the expected benefits.
Non-viability	The architecture fails necessary legal, regulatory, accounting, operational, or technological requirements.
Over-structuring	Complexity, cost, or dependency exceeds the value created.
Superior alternative	The existing situation, an incremental improvement, or a traditional solution addresses the problem better.
Insufficient data	There is not enough evidence to assess Capital, Cash Flows, Rights, or Risks with reasonable confidence.
Capacity mistaken for economic realization	Technical capacity or asset availability is incorrectly treated as assured utilization, demand, cash flow, or monetization.

7. Application of FPEF

The cases are used to test the behavior of the framework. The bottled-water plant case uses the figures supplied for the case; the others are conceptual tests based on reference literature and are not investment studies.

7.1 Primary Case: Expansion of a Bottled-Water Plant

The plant produces 30,000 liters per year and proposes a USD 5 million investment to reach 18,662,400 liters per year. The target is 622.08 times current production. The proposed annual increase is 18,632,400 liters, and the stated investment equals approximately USD 0.268 per liter of incremental annual capacity.

The initial formulation treated the problem as a need for Capital. FPEF revealed that the critical issue was the coordination of production capacity, demand, distribution, permits, rights over the water source, quality, logistics, working capital, and execution risk. Installed capacity is not the same as production, volume sold, or volume collected in cash.

The decomposition identified assets and Rights over water, facilities, commercial contracts, and receivables; sales Cash Flows and packaging, energy, transportation, and labor costs; and demand, construction, input-price, currency, interest-rate, credit, logistics, concentration, and environmental-reputation Risks.

Financial Engineering produced alternatives involving full equity, full debt, use-specific hybrid financing, modular expansion, purchase contracts combined with financing, and crowdfunding as a complementary mechanism. The Technology Layer added a data room, permits, production systems, traceability, quality control, ERP, commercial validation, governance, and milestone-based disbursement.

The preliminary application identified a hybrid and modular architecture as particularly relevant, using equity or subordinated capital for initial risk, debt or leasing for identifiable productive assets, and a working-capital facility linked to inventory and receivables. Full disbursement should not be assumed automatically; it would depend on evidence relating to demand, permits, margin, production, and distribution.

Case Result

The structuring gate was passed (PASS), while the original financial formulation required REDESIGN. The test supports the diagnostic and design usefulness of FPEF, but does not establish the project's profitability, sufficiency of CAPEX, or bankability.

Variable	Data	FPEF Interpretation
Current production	30,000 L/year	Current operating scale is very far from the target.
Target	18,662,400 L/year	Capacity, production, sales, and collection must be separated.
Scale multiple	622.08x	The expansion represents a fundamentally different operating scale.
Stated CAPEX	USD 5 million	The amount must be decomposed by use, tenor, and risk.
CAPEX/incremental capacity	USD 0.268/L-year	Preliminary indicator; it does not establish total cost or profitability.

7.2 Agriculture: Financing and Climate Risk

A producer or aggregator needs Capital for a crop cycle while its Cash Flows depend on a future harvest and its Risks include weather, production, price, and credit. Rights may include the crop, purchase contracts, and receivables.

Derivability examines whether a rainfall, temperature, or other observable index reasonably reflects the exposure. Index-based weather contracts documented by the World Bank can pay when an index crosses a threshold, but they introduce basis risk: the actual loss may not match the index-based payment.

Alternatives may combine agricultural credit, offtake, insurance, price hedging, and an indexed structure. The methodological result is conditional PASS, subject to index quality, correlation with losses, cost, and regulation.

7.3 Energy and Infrastructure

Capital-intensive projects depend on future Cash Flows, contracts, concessions, and the allocation of construction, completion, performance, operating, demand, price, and counterparty Risks.

World Bank PPP risk-allocation guidance states that key risks should be identified, allocated, and managed and that allocation should place risk with the party best positioned to manage it cost-effectively. FPEF is consistent with this logic and connects it with Rights, the Technology Layer, and Implementation.

Alternatives may include sponsor equity, corporate debt, project finance, offtake contracts, guarantees, and milestone financing. The methodological result is PASS and shows that Risk allocation may be as important as the availability of Capital to project bankability.

7.4 International Trade

Exporter and importer face timing, documentation, credit, and currency differences. Capital appears as working capital; Cash Flows correspond to payment; Rights relate to goods, documents, and receivables; and Risks include credit, currency, country, logistics, and time.

FPEF can select traditional instruments such as letters of credit, factoring, forfaiting, guarantees, or hedges without requiring innovation. This case demonstrates Integration over Reinvention and confirms that an FPEF Solution may be an existing structure when it is superior.

7.5 Extension Test: A Problem Not Originally Framed as Financial

An operation loses the use of a productive asset when a climate event occurs. The problem is initially presented as an operational interruption. FPEF identifies lost Cash Flows, contingent Capital needs, contractual Rights, and a Risk that may be measurable through an index.

If the relationship between the index and the economic loss is sufficiently strong, insurance, parametric contracts, or index-based derivatives may be explored. If that relationship is weak or basis risk is high, the framework should reject that route. The case shows that a non-financial problem can contain an economically structurable exposure, but it does not imply that every operational interruption should be financialized.

8. Cross-Case Findings

Case	Capital	Cash Flows	Rights	Dominant Risk	Result
Bottled-water plant	CAPEX + working capital	Future sales	Water, assets, receivables	Demand and execution	PASS + REDESIGN
Agriculture	Crop-cycle capital	Harvest/sale	Crop and contracts	Weather, production, price	Conditional PASS
Infrastructure	Construction	Long-term revenues	Concession/contracts	Construction and operations	PASS
Trade	Working capital	Buyer payment	Goods/documents	Credit, FX, timing	PASS; existing solution may prevail
Interruption	Contingent liquidity	Lost revenues	Contracts/insurance	Climate event	PASS or REJECT depending on basis risk

The cases suggest that Capital is not always the dominant dimension. In infrastructure, Risk allocation may determine bankability; in trade, documentary and credit Rights can be central; in agriculture, the problem may depend on the correspondence between an index and the economic loss.

Derivability expands the space of questions but does not predetermine instruments. A risk may be measurable and still lack a market, counterparty, cost-effective hedge, or appropriate legal classification.

The Technology Layer may improve access, traceability, or automation, but it can also introduce costs, dependencies, and vulnerabilities. Technology must therefore follow economic design and pass validation and Comparison.

The primary test supports the methodological thesis of FPEF: the common decomposition produced problem-specific alternatives and exposed hidden assumptions. It does not demonstrate universality or automatic superiority.

Negative information is also a valid FPEF result. Finding that a problem is not structurable, that a technology does not add value, or that a traditional solution is superior strengthens decision quality rather than constituting failure of the framework.

9. Discussion

The usefulness of FPEF depends on disciplining the order of analysis. Beginning with a product creates a risk of reshaping the problem to justify the product. Beginning with the problem allows the decomposition to demonstrate that a traditional solution is sufficient, that a hybrid architecture is needed, or that no meaningful structurability exists.

Rights deserve particular attention. Many problems are described through assets or capital, yet financeable value may reside in receivables, concessions, licenses, contracts, or participation rights. Likewise, avoided Cash Flows—prevented losses or cost savings—may be economically relevant even when they are not direct revenues.

The separation between Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer is also material. An economic structure may be coherent in theory and fail because of regulation, operations, data, governance, settlement, or insufficient adoption. Conversely, a technically advanced platform does not repair a defective economic model.

FPEF is iterative. Monitoring and Evaluation can return the solution to earlier phases when the problem, Risks, regulation, or economics change. The methodology should not be used as a rigid sequence that ignores feedback.

10. Limitations

Data: The quality of the decomposition depends on reliable information. Incorrect assumptions about demand, costs, or Rights undermine the design.

Models: Valuation, correlation, volatility, and stress tests contain uncertainty. Structuring can amplify estimation errors.

Derivability: An identifiable exposure may lack a market, counterparty, appropriate regulation, or a sufficiently strong relationship with the economic loss.

Jurisdiction: Legal classification, licensing, tax, accounting, and participant protection vary by jurisdiction.

Technology: Technical feasibility does not establish economic superiority. Interoperability, settlement, cybersecurity, and dependencies must be evaluated.

Execution: Governance, adoption, operations, and counterparty performance can prevent a viable architecture from producing its intended results.

Generalization: Five cases do not establish universality. Broader empirical replication and longitudinal monitoring are required.

Design bias: FPEF has initially been formulated and tested by its own proponents. Independent validation is needed to reduce confirmation bias.

11. Conclusions

1. In the cases examined, FPEF passes an initial conceptual test of diagnostic usefulness and alternative generation. In the bottled-water case, it transformed a generic USD 5 million capital request into a problem involving scale, demand, Rights, Cash Flows, Risks, execution, and working capital.
2. The Capital + Cash Flows + Rights + Risks decomposition functioned as an intermediate language across the five cases. This does not establish that it is exhaustive for every problem; it establishes that it was sufficiently useful in the cases examined.
3. The separation between Financial Engineering and the Technology Layer reduces the risk of confusing the economic solution with its implementation mechanism and incorporates regulation, accounting, governance, and validation into viability rather than treating them as late-stage reviews.
4. Comparison before FPEF Solution is methodologically coherent: viable architectures remain alternatives until one is selected against relevant options.
5. Modularity can reduce exposure and generate evidence, but it is not always preferable. It can increase cost or destroy economies of scale, which is why it is determined within Implementation.
6. Self-Sustainability is a conditional objective, not a presumed property. Only Post-Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation can provide evidence of economic, operational, and evolutionary sustainability.

7. The proposed contribution of FPEF lies in integration and ordering: real-world problem, economic decomposition, design, operationalization, comparison, implementation, and evaluation.

Final Statement

FPEF does not seek to turn every problem into a financial product. It seeks to determine when a problem is economically structurable, what alternatives can be built, and which one deserves to become the solution.

12. Future Research Agenda

Empirical replication: Apply FPEF to a larger sample of real-world problems using verifiable data and comparable outcomes.

Non-conventional derivability: Develop statistical, legal, and economic criteria for exposures based on events, intangibles, indicators, and Rights.

Self-sustainability: Measure longitudinally whether FPEF Solutions finance or enable their maintenance, evolution, and scaling.

Modularity: Study when phased implementation reduces risk and when it increases cost or sacrifices scale.

Jurisdictions: Apply the same FPEF architecture under different regulatory frameworks to identify legal sensitivity.

Technology: Compare conventional infrastructure, platforms, DLT, and tokenization on cost, control, interoperability, and net value.

Governance: Study how different decision and control mechanisms affect performance and residual risk.

Independent validation: Have teams that did not participate in the development of FPEF apply and challenge the framework.

13. References

Bank for International Settlements. (2025). Next-generation monetary and financial system takes shape, based on a tokenised unified ledger. [Source]

Bank for International Settlements & Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures. (2024). Tokenisation in the context of money and other assets: Concepts and implications for central banks. [Source]

Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2014). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(5), 585-609. [Source]

Committee on Payments and Market Infrastructures & International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2012). Principles for financial market infrastructures. [Source]

Committee on the Global Financial System & Financial Stability Board. (2017). FinTech credit: Market structure, business models and financial stability implications. [Source]

Coval, J., Jurek, J., & Stafford, E. (2009). The economics of structured finance. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 23(1), 3-25. [Source]

Ehrentraud, J., Garcia Ocampo, D., & Quevedo Vega, C. (2020). Regulating fintech financing: Digital banks and fintech platforms. FSI Insights No. 27. [Source]

Fender, I., & Mitchell, J. (2005). Structured finance: Complexity, risk and the use of ratings. BIS Quarterly Review, June. [Source]

Financial Stability Board. (n.d.). Financial innovation. [Source]

Finnerty, J. D. (1988). Financial engineering in corporate finance: An overview. Financial Management, 17(4), 14-33. [Source]

International Financial Reporting Standards Foundation. (2026). IFRS 9 Financial Instruments. [Source]

International Organization of Securities Commissions. (2025). Tokenization of financial assets: Final report (FR/17/2025). [Source]

Lerner, J., & Tufano, P. (2011). The consequences of financial innovation: A counterfactual research agenda. Annual Review of Financial Economics, 3, 41-85. [Source]

Merton, R. C. (1995). Financial innovation and the management and regulation of financial institutions. Journal of Banking & Finance, 19(3-4), 461-481. [Source]

Merton, R. C., & Bodie, Z. (2005). The design of financial systems: Towards a synthesis of function and structure. Journal of Investment Management, 3(1), 1-23. [Source]

Schwarcz, S. L. (2011). Securitization and structured finance. In Encyclopedia of Financial Globalization. [Source]

World Bank. (2011). Weather index insurance for agriculture: Guidance for development practitioners. [Source]

World Bank. (2023). Index-based weather derivative: Product note. [Source]

World Bank Group. (n.d.). Risk allocation in public-private partnerships. PPP Resource Center. [Source]

Appendix A. FPEF Operating Canvas

Element	Minimum Content
1. Problem	Desired outcome, stakeholders, impact, constraints, baseline.
2. Capital	Amount, tenor, priority, cost, loss-bearing capacity.
3. Cash Flows	Origin, recipient, currency, frequency, volatility, condition, avoided costs.
4. Rights	Holder, obligor, transferability, enforceability, priority.
5. Risks	Cause, exposure, probability, impact, treatment, residual risk.
6. Derivability	Variable/event, measurability, trigger, payoff, counterparty, basis risk.
7. Financial Engineering	Instruments, waterfall, collateral, covenants, exit.
8. Technology Layer	Origination, platform, regulation, validation, operations, settlement.
9. Possible FPEF Alternatives	Configurations that move to Comparison.
10. Comparison	Criteria, baseline, trade-offs, decision.
11. FPEF Solution	Selected architecture.
12. Implementation	Milestones, modules, responsibilities, budget.
13. Monitoring	KPIs, Risks, Self-Sustainability, evolution, scaling.

Appendix B. Risk and Derivability Record

Field	Record
Risk and origin	
Exposed party	
Variable/underlying/event	
Data and source	
Historical evidence available	
Probability/impact	
Current treatment	
Retain/reduce/share/transfer/hedge/avoid	
Potential trigger and payoff	
Potential counterparty	
Exposure-variable correlation	
Independent verification mechanism	
Cost	
Basis risk	
Pending legal classification	
Residual risk	

Appendix C. Monitoring and Evaluation Template

Dimension	Baseline	Target	Evaluation Question
Results			Does the solution reduce the problem according to the agreed metric?
Finance			Cash Flows, returns, losses, liquidity, and debt-service obligations.
Risks			Expected, realized, new, transferred, and residual Risks.
Technology and operations			Availability, errors, security, exceptions, and costs.
Compliance			Regulation, accounting,

Dimension	Baseline	Target	Evaluation Question
			contracts, and governance.
Economic Self-Sustainability			Resources generated or enabled relative to costs.
Operational Self-Sustainability			Capacity to maintain people, processes, controls, and infrastructure.
Evolutionary Self-Sustainability			Data, Capital, capabilities, and infrastructure supporting evolution.
Decision			Maintain, adjust, expand, reduce, restructure, or terminate.

Editorial Note

This white paper consolidates the canonical FPEF version developed through the methodological design process. Before external publication, independent review is recommended across finance, law, accounting, regulation, technology, risk management, and research methodology, including an originality review of the methodological positioning and an audit of bibliographic sources.