LrrK Letters

Vol. 1 · Issue 5 · February 2026

Low Cost per Effect Meets High Financial Expectation

Private Valuation, Public Orders, Litigation, and the New Political Economy of Drones

Dateline: February 27, 2026

Abstract

Drone policy now speaks in two price languages: inexpensive operational effects and substantial expectations about the companies supplying them. February's record places a pending billion-dollar business combination beside European efforts to develop cheaper defenses, a large American delivery order, a legal challenge to market exclusion and Ukrainian production abroad. These developments belong to different institutions, but each distributes the gains and risks of a changing defense economy. This essay examines what financial value can reveal, what it cannot establish about delivered capability, and why politically connected investment deserves process scrutiny without invented allegations. It argues that public demand should be judged through the capabilities and choices it creates. Affordable equipment and profitable suppliers can coexist; the difficult question is whether the public retains dependable supply, useful alternatives and an intelligible account of what it purchased.

Two different prices for the future

A defense buyer looking for a cheaper way to defeat an incoming drone and an investor valuing a drone company are pricing different things. The buyer wants a useful outcome at a sustainable cost. The investor wants a claim on future returns. Those interests can reinforce each other. A company that solves an expensive public problem may earn a durable business. They can also diverge if the financial opportunity rests more on restricted competition, privileged access or recurring dependence than on lower costs for the mission.

February makes the distinction unusually visible. On February 17, JFB Construction Holdings announced an agreement to combine with XTEND in an all-stock transaction. The release describes an implied acquisition value of $1.5 billion, derived from the concurrent private-placement share price, and names Eric Trump among the strategic investors. Closing was expected in the middle of the year. This is a transaction valuation attached to a pending combination, not $1.5 billion of fresh cash already placed on a factory floor.[1]

Three days later, the United Kingdom and its European Group of Five partners announced LEAP, a program intended to develop lower-cost air-defense capabilities. On February 26, AeroVironment announced a $186 million Army delivery order for specified Switchblade variants. Meanwhile DJI sought judicial review of the American restriction on new-model market access. The record moves between financing, development intent, procurement and litigation. Its common subject is how governments influence the value of supplying drones and defenses, but the events should not be translated into one undifferentiated claim of industrial success.[2][3][4]

The low-cost promise deserves attention because it addresses a real problem of endurance. A defense that works once but consumes resources faster than they can be replenished may be strategically inadequate. The financial expectation deserves attention because capital can help establish the factories, engineering teams and inventories that make endurance possible. Neither number answers the other's question. A favorable valuation does not establish a favorable operational cost exchange, and an inexpensive device does not establish a company able to supply it reliably at scale.

This is where political economy becomes more useful than either celebration or suspicion. Who pays to develop a capability? Who receives the upside if it succeeds? What happens when public institutions become dependent on one supplier? What evidence distinguishes an order from its fulfillment? These are ordinary questions about responsibility in a market heavily shaped by public authority. They become sharper when national-security decisions can restrict entry at the same time that public purchasing encourages investors to anticipate growing demand.

The objective should not be to make every defense company unprofitable or every government decision commercially neutral. Neither is realistic, and neither would necessarily serve the public. The objective is to make the relationship legible enough to judge. A supplier can earn substantial returns by doing difficult work well. The public should be able to distinguish that achievement from a return created mainly by a policy position it cannot inspect or a dependency it cannot escape. Financial success is relevant evidence about a business. It is not the final measure of the capability supplied.

What the valuation does and does not buy

The JFB announcement presents the combination as a way to expand American production and bring XTEND's software-centered robotics business into public markets. Its language joins industrial location, operating software, manufacturing expansion and defense demand. The announced valuation refers to the company as a prospective business, including expectations about those relationships. It should not be read as an appraisal of a single aircraft, an independent test result or proof that a particular manufacturing target has been met.[1]

There is a legitimate capital problem for firms in this sector. A producer may need to commit to equipment, staff and suppliers before the buyer can specify every future order. A software developer may need years of support capacity whose costs are not recovered in the first hardware shipment. Investors can make those commitments possible. Public markets can broaden financing options and give owners a route to liquidity. A transaction can therefore contribute to capability without its headline value being a direct measure of money spent on development.

The difference between value and usable resources still matters. An exchange of shares changes ownership claims. Financing supplied alongside it may provide cash, but the amount and conditions must be examined separately. A high valuation can help a company transact and recruit; it can also place demanding expectations on future revenue and margins. Whether those expectations encourage productive investment, acquisition of competitors, aggressive selling or some combination is a question for subsequent evidence. The announcement establishes a strategy, not the path every management decision will take.

Political prominence adds another responsibility. Eric Trump's participation is a disclosed fact in the issuer's release, while Reuters also reports investment by Unusual Machines, which has an advisory relationship with Donald Trump Jr. Those relationships make transparent procurement and conflict-handling procedures especially important. They do not, by themselves, establish improper influence or explain any particular government award. A serious analysis should avoid replacing evidence with insinuation while refusing the opposite shortcut, in which the absence of a proven violation makes governance questions unnecessary.[1][5]

The relevant inquiry concerns decisions. Which officials participate in a procurement? What disclosures and recusals apply? Can competing firms understand the criteria and contest an adverse outcome? Does a buyer have independent evidence of the product's suitability? These questions would matter for any politically connected investor. Their value is greatest before a disputed award, when clear procedures can protect both the public and an applicant with a legitimate product. Process integrity is a productive asset because it makes success less vulnerable to the belief that access, rather than performance, determined the result.

A company should also benefit from keeping its claims distinct. A completed test can be presented as a completed test. A signed customer commitment can be identified on its actual terms. A pending transaction can explain its dependencies. Precision need not drain ambition from a business narrative. It can make the ambition more credible by showing readers where uncertainty lies and how management expects to resolve it. A valuation becomes easier to assess when the business has preserved the steps between its current position and the future used to justify the price.

The public cannot reasonably demand access to every negotiation or internal projection. It can demand that public institutions use their own judgment rather than inherit an investor's confidence. The person buying equipment with public funds is responsible for a different decision from the person buying a security. A defense requirement should not become more urgent merely because a company has promised growth to its owners. Nor should a useful system be dismissed because its financing attracts attention. The task is to prevent the two judgments from quietly substituting for one another.

The denominator in low cost per effect

LEAP gives the operational price language a specific policy form. The February 20 British announcement names France, Germany, Italy, Poland and the United Kingdom as participants in the Low-Cost Effectors and Autonomous Platforms initiative. It describes an initial focus on an affordable surface-to-air weapon and a first project intended for delivery by 2027. It emphasizes speed, adaptability and proposals from established manufacturers as well as smaller firms. These are program objectives and an invitation to industrial effort, not a published result showing the eventual cost of defending a target.[2]

The phrase cost per effect is useful if effect is defined carefully. Purchasing a relatively inexpensive interceptor can improve an unfavorable exchange, but the mission is not complete when the interceptor leaves its storage case. A defensive system must find the relevant object, distinguish it from other activity, make a decision, act within authority and establish what happened. Equipment, staff, maintenance, training and the cost of unsuccessful attempts contribute to that system. A low unit price can be important without carrying the whole economic argument.

The denominator matters as much as the numerator. A cost divided by attempts produces a different measure from cost divided by threats actually defeated. Neither necessarily describes the economic value of the assets protected. A defense can be worth sustaining even when it uses an expensive response, if the avoided harm is sufficiently large. It can also become unsustainable if repeated inexpensive threats consume scarce inventory or attention. Useful analysis must preserve these distinctions instead of assuming that the price of the attacking device determines what a defender should spend.

This is a procurement issue rather than a demand for one universal formula. Different missions require different comparisons. A buyer defending a fixed facility faces a different problem from one supporting a moving force. A system whose components can be reused may have different recovery and maintenance needs from an expendable device. A manufacturer may quote a price that excludes the services needed to operate the item. The evaluator

should understand what is included, what remains outside the contract and how the calculation changes under realistic demand.

An illustrative case makes the problem plain. Suppose a lower-priced system needs substantially more operator attention or generates alerts that require expensive investigation. Another costs more to acquire but reduces the burden in the relevant setting. The first item may still be the right choice, but its catalogue price alone will not establish that. The comparison needs operating evidence and a description of the task. This example is not a judgment about a LEAP proposal. It identifies the question that a program built around affordability must eventually answer.

The benefits of industrial scale should receive equally careful treatment. Larger orders can spread fixed costs, support supplier investment and reduce interruptions. They can also make a mistaken choice expensive to reverse. The purpose of a development program is partly to learn which configuration deserves that commitment. A government moving quickly should preserve opportunities to change course as the evidence improves. An early choice should not become an obligation to purchase the same assumptions indefinitely simply because the production line has been financed around them.

There is room here for an honest agreement between public and private interests. Investors may accept early technical uncertainty in return for a chance to earn through useful production. Governments may accept some development cost in return for a stronger industrial option. The agreement is strongest when the intended public return is explicit: reliable equipment, reproducible performance, support and alternatives. If affordability becomes only a slogan for obtaining demand while the full operating burden remains opaque, the policy can succeed in creating a valuable business without delivering the economic advantage it promised to the mission.

A delivery order is a different kind of number

AeroVironment's February 26 disclosure supplies a more concrete demand event than a proposed development initiative. The company says the Army issued a $186 million delivery order for Switchblade 600 Block 2 and Switchblade 300 Block 20 systems under an existing five-year, $990 million indefinite-delivery framework. That distinction matters. The larger framework amount and the specific delivery order describe different commitments. Neither figure, on its own, establishes accepted quantities, production yield or performance of delivered equipment.[3]

An order can be a powerful industrial input. It helps a supplier schedule work, secure components and decide whether added capacity is justified. It also gives the government a more specific obligation to manage than an abstract requirement. Scope, timing, quality and acceptance become practical questions between the parties. The order's value is meaningful because it connects demand to a defined procurement action. Treating it as though the entire operational outcome has already occurred would make that connection less informative, not more impressive.

The product variants named in the release also matter. A family name can make a new configuration appear continuous with an established reputation. Some continuity may be real: experience, components and manufacturing knowledge can carry over. A revised system can nevertheless change the basis on which earlier performance should be understood. The buyer needs to know which evidence supports the delivered version, what has changed and how acceptance will establish that the change meets the requirement. A history of use is valuable when it remains attached to the relevant configuration.

Scaling production adds another test. A demonstration unit can receive personal attention that cannot be repeated for every item in a large lot. Suppliers, processes and staff may change as output rises. Quality has to become reproducible. This is not an allegation that a named manufacturer has failed to achieve it. It is part of the work an

order commissions and the reason that a procurement announcement cannot stand in for acceptance. The business receives demand; the public needs the demand converted into dependable output.

Capital markets may understandably respond to such a demand signal. The temptation is to let that reaction validate the procurement in return: investors believe the order is valuable, therefore the capability must be established. That reasoning is circular. Investors can be pricing future demand, margins or competitive position as well as technical merit. The buyer's evaluation and the market's judgment can inform one another, but they answer different questions. A government should retain an independent account of what the equipment is expected to do and what evidence will show it has done so.

The same discipline should govern disappointing news. A delayed shipment can reveal a temporary input problem, an unrealistic schedule or a deeper manufacturing weakness. The difference matters to both the contract and the industrial objective. Punishing every disclosed difficulty may encourage concealment; excusing every one as the normal cost of growth undermines accountability. Good contract administration establishes the consequence and the route to correction in a way that protects the mission. It also leaves an intelligible record for the next purchasing decision.

The public return should include learning about the supply base. Which inputs constrain output? Which improvements make quality more consistent? Can another qualified source supply a critical part? Some details may remain confidential, but the responsible institutions should be able to answer. An order used only to count spending misses part of its value. An order used to understand and improve the system of production can support resilience even before a crisis reveals which dependency was more fragile than everyone assumed.

Market boundaries go to court and across borders

DJI's challenge adds a legal clock to the commercial one. Reuters reported on February 24 that the company had petitioned the Ninth Circuit over the FCC decision restricting new-model access. The report records DJI's objections and the continuing availability of existing versions. Filing a challenge places an argument before a court. It does not establish that the restriction is unlawful, supply a favorable judicial finding or suspend the policy merely through the act of filing. The eventual legal outcome remains open at this dateline.[4]

The challenge nevertheless matters now because investment and purchasing occur before litigation is resolved. A producer must decide whether to develop a model for a market whose access rules it contests. An alternative supplier must decide how much demand will remain protected if the policy changes. An operator must plan around actual availability rather than a hoped-for judgment. Legal uncertainty is one of the costs distributed by industrial policy. It affects more than the named litigant, even when the underlying restriction serves a defensible security objective.

Judicial review can also clarify the kind of explanation public power owes. A national-security determination may rely on information not properly disclosed in full. That does not make every procedural or statutory question disappear. Nor does a company's disagreement establish that no qualifying review occurred. A useful analysis distinguishes the government's authority, the process followed, the record supporting its conclusion and the breadth of the resulting rule. Those distinctions permit scrutiny without requiring an outsider to pretend that it has inspected secrets it has not seen.

The worldwide production category makes the commercial implications especially complicated. A domestic brand and a foreign brand do not necessarily describe wholly separate supply networks. A country seeking greater resilience may benefit from allied manufacturing as well as local manufacturing. Decisions about production location affect exposure to attack, export restrictions, workforce availability and logistics in different ways. The

case for a particular boundary should explain which of those risks it addresses. Otherwise a national label can conceal the continued international dependencies of the product expected to replace the excluded one.

The February 25 British production report illustrates that tension. Reuters attributes to Ukrainian Ambassador Valeriy Zaluzhnyi the announcement that a Ukrspecsystems drone plant had begun operating in Britain. The stated rationale is continuity under threats to production in Ukraine, with engineering expertise remaining there. This is a report of an allied production expansion and its declared purpose. It does not provide the output rate, qualification record or delivered product mix needed to evaluate the additional capacity independently.[6]

The strategic logic is nevertheless substantial. Concentrating all production where it is vulnerable can make industrial courage an operational liability. Moving some production can preserve supply and create opportunities to learn with partners. It can also introduce new dependencies in components, quality practices and control of future improvements. A design that succeeds in one factory is not automatically identical in another. Transfer requires practical work, and the ability to preserve the original engineering knowledge should be part of the account rather than an assumption hidden behind the word partnership.

This offers a more useful conception of sovereignty than a simple contest between national flags. The question is what choices a public institution retains when conditions worsen. Can it sustain production, alter a supplier relationship, obtain necessary knowledge and keep equipment working? Domestic production can contribute decisively to those abilities. Allied production can contribute differently. A serious industrial strategy should be able to explain their relationship without treating either foreign involvement or local assembly as a complete answer about control.

What high expectations should owe

The strongest case for high financial expectations is that a difficult transformation needs people willing to commit resources before the return is certain. A society cannot demand new factories, skilled staff and rapid technical development while assuming that the organizations financing them should receive no reward. Patient capital can absorb risk that ordinary procurement does not carry well. The public benefits when a firm becomes capable enough to deliver reliably and attractive enough to sustain the work after an initial program ends.

The strongest concern is that financial expectations can become detached from that productive purpose. A market shaped by restrictions and concentrated purchasing can reward access and anticipation. Firms may acquire a premium because they appear positioned to receive public demand, while the public has little ability to compare the promised outcome with an alternative. Political connections can intensify the perception of unfairness even where a product has genuine merit. Ignoring that concern is not a service to capable suppliers. Clear processes make legitimate success more defensible.

The relationship calls for reciprocal obligations. A company receiving public demand should identify what it has undertaken to provide, preserve support and report material changes relevant to that commitment. The purchasing institution should define acceptance, recognize real progress and disclose enough about its decisions to make them intelligible. Public policy should examine whether it is widening the field of capable suppliers or merely increasing dependence on a different small group. These obligations should follow the actual advantage conferred, rather than appear as a general sermon about corporate virtue.

Different records can then be allowed to mean different things. A financing agreement records a transaction and its conditions. A valuation describes the price placed on ownership under those conditions. A delivery order establishes a procurement action. An acceptance record describes what the buyer received. Operational evidence concerns what happened in use. Maintaining these distinctions is not hostility to ambition. It gives ambition a path

on which progress can be recognized and failure can be repaired before every institution has invested its reputation in the same oversized claim.

The measures should also be specific enough to reveal who bears a shortfall. A delayed production line can affect a buyer differently from an investor. A purchasing requirement designed around one supplier can affect smaller rivals without appearing in the contract price. A system with inexpensive hardware can impose costly dependence through services. An adequate account of public value should follow those effects rather than stop at the sum announced. The return is a capacity to act and sustain action, not simply an expenditure that can be attached to a national-security slogan.

There should be room to recognize a modest success accurately. A supplier that produces a reliable component, repairs a recurring fault or establishes a second qualified source may contribute something less spectacular than a new corporate valuation and more useful to an operator. Those achievements deserve measures that can survive changes in market fashion. If public attention follows only the largest transaction or order, the less visible work that makes production dependable can be undervalued. Industrial policy should help make that work financeable and give purchasers a reason to reward it.

The reverse is equally necessary. A celebrated company should not be protected from a specific finding that a delivered product falls short. A criticism should identify the requirement, configuration and evidence at issue, rather than become an indiscriminate attack on the firm's national or political identity. This discipline protects the public from unsupported claims in both directions. It allows a successful delivery to count as a successful delivery without requiring the reader to accept every larger narrative built around the company that supplied it.

As February ends, the two price languages remain capable of telling a constructive common story. More affordable effects could create valuable businesses, and valuable businesses could finance more dependable supply. The link has to be earned through production, acceptance and use. It cannot be inferred from a merger headline, a program name or an order total alone. High expectations are most useful when they finance work that survives inspection. The public should insist that the industrial future being priced is eventually available in the form it needs, on terms it can understand and with choices it can still exercise.

Notes and sources

1. JFB Construction Holdings, February 17, 2026, original XTEND business-combination announcement. Describes an all-stock agreement, implied $1.5 billion acquisition value based on private-placement pricing, named investors and expected midyear closing. Future production benefits remain issuer expectations. Original release.
2. UK Ministry of Defence, February 20, 2026, LEAP announcement. Establishes participating E5 countries, initial focus and intended 2027 project delivery, not realized cost effectiveness. Government announcement.
3. AeroVironment, February 26, 2026, disclosure of a $186 million delivery order under the earlier $990 million framework for specified Switchblade variants. An issuer account of the order, not an independent acceptance or operational report. Original disclosure.
4. David Shepardson, Reuters, February 24, 2026, report of DJI's Ninth Circuit challenge and its objections. Used for filing status and attributed claims; no court disposition is inferred. Contemporaneous report.
5. Reuters, February 17, 2026, reporting Eric Trump's investment and the disclosed Unusual Machines relationship. Used for the named participation, without attributing a procurement outcome to political influence. Contemporaneous account.
6. Anna Pruchnicka and Olena Harmash, Reuters, February 25, 2026, reporting the ambassador's statement on Ukrspecsystems production in Britain. Operational start and strategic rationale are attributed; no independent output or qualification measure is claimed. Industrial report.