



Monetization Playbook

Sample

Provably-Fair On-Chain Asset Synthesis (Commit, Burn, Reveal, Mint)

Holder: Confidential (identifying details withheld for this public sample), IP-only

Stage: Recently granted · 30 claims, 3 independent · term approx. 20-year statutory

Prepared: ProveClaim · 25 Fathoms LLC · September 2026

VERDICT: BUILD THEN MONETIZE (conditional)

Worth little asserted against today's market, materially more as a first-mover option once the mechanic is built and shown. Fund or partner a reference implementation, then license, sell, or partner strategically. Do not run an assertion campaign.

Not legal or financial advice. FTO is directional. Figures appear only where anchored.

Scope & basis note. This evaluates market positioning, enforceability, and risk-adjusted value based strictly on the issued claims. It is not legal or financial advice, and the author is not a valuation professional. FTO is directional, not a legal opinion. Dollar figures appear only where anchored; unanchored figures are marked "needs comp." Named people and orgs are public profiles, not contacted and not endorsements. Verify current roles.

Sample. This is a real ProveClaim analysis, reproduced as a public sample. The patent holder, patent number, application number, and identifying dates are withheld for confidentiality. Third-party companies and patents named below are public market context, not the holder.

1. Executive verdict & honest read

VERDICT: BUILD THEN MONETIZE (conditional). Asserted against today's market, this is a low-six-figure asset. Its real worth is a first-mover option, and that option firms up once the mechanic is built and shown. Fund or partner a reference implementation first. Then license, sell, or partner. Do not run an assertion campaign. If a build is not feasible, the honest fallback is **Hold defensively**, not an assertion spend.

Two-lens headline: *Asserted (Lens A): ~\$40k-\$200k as-is. The market for a single blockchain patent with no evidence of use is thin, and a dominant potential counter-asserter now holds a granted VRF patent (below). As a build/option asset (Lens B): a ~\$200k-\$400k cost-to-replicate floor and a ~\$0.6M-\$0.9M risk-weighted EV, with real category validation from 2025-26 funding and M&A.*

What would move the number (fastest levers): (1) ship a reference implementation or paid pilot of the full ordered chain; (2) file a continuation narrowing to observable on-chain events (firms §101/§112, hedges design-arounds); (3) PCT/foreign before ~Feb 7 2027; (4) a first field-of-use license; (5) diligence Pyth Entropy as prior art before any assertion.

The single best path: partner or fund a build in the provably-fair crafting lane, then convert it to a strategic license or sale. See §2 path 1 and §3 thesis A.

Practical inventor kit. Costs, deadlines, next moves, and how not to get fleeced live in §11.

Decision dashboard

Dimension	Score	Rationale
Market relevance	7/10	Real categories (NFT crafting, gaming loot, randomized redemption, cross-chain), cyclical market.
Claim breadth	6/10	Three independents; teeth are the exact ordered chain.
Novelty margin	5/10	Blocks are old; novelty = ordering + non-linear mapping + dual-input.
Obviousness resilience (§103)	3/10	Reads as a natural merge of commit-reveal + burn-to-mint +

Dimension	Score	Rationale
		NFT metadata. Primary risk.
Eligibility resilience (§101)	4/10	"Commit → wait → compute" invites Alice; mitigated by non-recoverable-state, circuit/TEE, non-linear mapping.
Detectability	6/10	On-chain artifacts publicly reconstructable for a single operator; hidden-seed ordering may need discovery.
Portfolio depth	2/10	Single U.S. patent; no continuation/foreign family.
Monetization readiness	4/10	Issued, but no EoU, no wrapper package, no chart; PGR window open to ~Apr 14 2027.

2. Your paths to cash: all viable, ranked, each resourced

These are ranked for an IP-only holder facing a market that has not formed yet. Each path carries its own resources: targets, partners, routes, terms. Names cross-reference §3–§4.

Path 1: Build the position, then sell/partner strategically. (RECOMMENDED)

- **\$ / basis:** firms Lens B toward the ~\$0.6M–\$0.9M EV; a strategic sale can exceed it if the mechanic ships (category comps: Orochi \$12M raise for verifiable-data/VRF infra [S9]; Chainlink's acquisition of Atlas to own an infra primitive [S12]).
- **Effort / timeline:** 6–18 mo (build first).
- **Who executes:** the holder plus a dev partner or studio (see §3 operator profiles), then a strategic buyer's corp-dev.
- **Resources:** build-lane theses, operators, studios, comps, roadmap, 90-day plan in §3.

Path 2: Exclusive option-to-buy through the PGR window.

- **\$ / basis:** upfront option fee (5–15% of an agreed risk-adjusted price) plus later exercise; best risk allocation today.
- **Timeline:** now → ~Apr 2027.
- **Who executes:** a strategic buyer plus IP counsel; escrow agent.
- **Resources:** deal-term table (§4); target buyers are the non-dominant randomness providers and gaming platforms in §4.

Path 3: Field-of-use license (gaming crafting, or cross-chain via Claim 30).

- **\$ / basis:** royalty on a live base. Software benchmark is **8–12%** of net sales (similar-tech 3–7%) [S13]; specific base = needs comp.
- **Timeline:** 6–12 mo; needs ≥1 public-code claim chart.
- **Who executes:** a gaming/NFT platform's BD/legal (§4 category 2), or a non-dominant randomness provider (§4 category 1).

Path 4: Vetted licensing agent / broker. Only after a clean wrapper plus ≥ 2 charts exist. Brokers are "ruthless about evidence," and most no-EoU patents never transact [S11]. Use this as a channel, not a first move.

Path 5: Defensive hold. If there is no build and no reachable clean target, hold. Keep the maintenance fees paid and file a continuation to preserve optionality. This is an honest fallback, not a cost sink.

AVOID: assertion campaign. Targets out-gun the holder on patents (Chainlink holds a granted VRF patent, §7), there is no litigation-grade chart yet, and outreach can provoke a PGR. Do not sign or send enforcement notices until title and a complete wrapper are in hand.

Deal-term table (recommended path 1/2):

Term	Provision
Form	Exclusive (field-limited) license with option-to-buy, or contingent assignment. Avoid a fixed-price sale before EoU + validity work.
Upfront	~20–35% of the agreed risk-adjusted price.
Holdback	20–40% in escrow through the PGR window (~Apr 14 2027) / resolution of any petition.
Milestone / earn-out	Tranche on counsel approving ≥ 2 target claim charts; earn-out on collected license revenue, not alleged covered revenue.
Reps	Sole/clean title; correct inventorship; no undisclosed licenses/liens; full prosecution/prior-art disclosure.
Indemnity	Escrow for title/inventorship/encumbrances; validity via milestones, not an unrealistic warranty.

Stage-tied monetization timeline

When	Move	Deadline / trigger
Now (issued; PGR open)	Clean title + wrapper; start a reference build; open quiet option-to-buy talks; diligence Pyth Entropy as prior art. Do NOT assert.	:
Before ~Feb 7 2027	Decide + file PCT / foreign if major gaming/developer markets matter.	12-mo priority deadline
Through ~Apr 14 2027	Withstand any PGR; hold deal money in escrow; file a continuation narrowing §101/§112.	PGR window close
After PGR clears	Pursue a field-of-use license or strategic sale with a live claim chart.	Post-grant-review clear

When	Move	Deadline / trigger
Mid-life	Pay maintenance fees; keep the continuation family alive.	3.5 / 7.5 / 11.5-yr windows

3. Build-a-company depth (the recommended path, fully resourced)

The claims support **four buildable theses** off one primitive. They are ranked by where the claims have teeth and the market is real. Named people are **illustrative public operator profiles**, not endorsements or contacts. Recruit someone who fits the profile, or approach them as a partner or advisor.

Thesis A: Provably-fair crafting / RNG infrastructure & SDK for blockchain games (LEAD).

- *Reads on:* Claims 1/24 (commit → burn → reveal → mint). *Wedge:* a drop-in "fair burn-to-craft" SDK, so studios can prove no one, not even them, set the result before the player committed. *ICP:* mid-size web3 game studios on Immutable/Ronin. *Why now:* burn-to-craft is live and shipping (Gods Unchained forge [S18]); Immutable's \$500M fund [S15] and Ronin Forge [S19] are funding exactly this layer. *Adjacent players (why they don't cover it):* most use *post-burn* VRF, which the patent's pre-commit ordering is built to beat.
- *Operator profile (illustrative):* Robbie Ferguson (Immutable) [S1]; Hilmar Orth / Luis Schliesske (Gelato, Gelato VRF + gaming RaaS) [S2]; Kevin Chou (Forte, game-economy SDKs) [S3].
- *Approach:* Immutable Ecosystem / IMX grants; Ronin Forge builder program.

Thesis B: Verifiable-randomness / anti-front-running primitive (VRF-adjacent).

- *Reads on:* Claim 1 core (hidden seed committed before reveal). *Wedge:* a commit-before-irreversible-event randomness primitive positioned *against* post-hoc VRF. *Why now:* demand is live. Pyth Entropy, Supra dVRF, and API3 QRNG are all shipping. **Caution:** this lane sits closest to the reverse-risk holder (Chainlink patent, §7) and to the prior-art analog (Pyth Entropy). Build here only with a validity read first.
- *Operator profile:* Mike Cahill (Pyth / Douro Labs, "Entropy") [S4]; Joshua Tobkin (Supra dVRF) [S5]; Heikki Vanttinen (API3 QRNG) [S6]; Phil Daian (Flashbots, anti-front-running) [S7].

Thesis C: Provably-fair mystery redemption / phygital & loyalty.

- *Reads on:* Claims 5/16 (second asset = access credential / physical-commodity interest). *Wedge:* verifiable "no rigged odds" mystery redemptions for brands and collectibles, framed as compliance-friendly and non-wagering. *Why now:* live analogs (Courtyard mystery packs; Sweet brand loyalty). *ICP:* collectible brands, sports leagues.
- *Operator profile:* Nicolas Le Jeune (Courtyard.io) [S8]; Tom Mizzone (Sweet) [S9b]; Vinay Gupta (Mattereum, asset passports) [S10].

Thesis D: Cross-chain deterministic asset migration.

- *Reads on:* Claim 30 (cross-chain relaying). *Wedge:* burn-on-A → verified reveal → deterministic mint-on-B, where destination traits derive from the burned source asset. *Why now:* burn-and-mint migration is now standard (LayerZero OFT, Wormhole NTT, Axelar ITS). **Caution:** Chainlink CCIP is a burn-and-mint standard from the same reverse-risk holder.
- *Operator profile:* Bryan Pellegrino (LayerZero) [S20]; Sergey Gorbunov (Axelar) [S21]; Arjun Bhuptani (Everclear/Connex) [S22].

"Deliberately NOT a thesis": a general-purpose VRF competitor head-on against Chainlink. A dominant incumbent plus their granted patent make it a losing first fight. Enter randomness only through a specific vertical (crafting), where the ordering is the differentiator.

Comparable exits & funding (what this category is worth to a funded player):

Deal	Amount	Relevance
Orochi Network raise (verifiable data / on-chain randomness) [S9]	\$12M (Feb 2025)	Category peer to the randomness primitive
Chainlink → Atlas (transaction-ordering infra) [S12]	undisclosed (Jan 2026)	"Buy the primitive to own it" behavioral comp
Alchemy → HeyMint (NFT minting/crafting tooling) [S14]	undisclosed (2025)	NFT-tooling consolidation
SuperGaming Series B [S16]	\$15M (2025)	Web3 gaming infra appetite
Immutable dev/venture fund [S15]; Animoca web3-gaming fund [S23]	\$500M; \$300M	Capital chasing exactly this layer

Prior comp still valid: Circle's Jul 2026 purchase of IBM's ~1,000-patent blockchain estate, a funded player buying foundational blockchain IP to own primitives.

Proof-point roadmap (12-18 mo): commit-reveal-burn-mint reference contract + public verifier → one studio pilot (Gods Unchained-style forge) → published "provably-fair crafting" spec → first integration. Each step turns "interesting claims" into "fundable company."

90-day first-move plan: (1) pick Thesis A as the lead; (2) build the one-page plus a minimal reference contract; (3) get a validity read on Pyth Entropy before touching the randomness lane; (4) line up the first 5 doors (IMX grants, Ronin Forge, Gelato, Supra, a16z crypto CSX); (5) open two studio pilot conversations. See §4 for the doors and scripts.

4. The action kit (across every lane)

These are named targets, claim-mapped, each with a posture, a warm-intro route, and a paste-ready opener that leads with the vertical proof and never the patent number. A litigation-grade chart needs each target's contract code, so treat these as directional reads.

Target (category)	Claim	Posture	Warm-intro route	Paste-ready opener
Chainlink (VRF/CCIP) [S17]	1/24; 30	⚠ REVERSE-RISK: do NOT naked-pitch. Holds granted VRF patent US 12,494,909.	Via IP counsel only; Chainlink BUILD ecosystem	: (engage only with counsel and a validity posture)
Pyth / "Entropy" [S4b]	1 core	Prime licensee and prior-art watch-item	Pyth Data Association grants; Jump/Multicoins	"We've built a provably-fair crafting flow where

Target (category)	Claim	Posture	Warm-intro route	Paste-ready opener
			ecosystem	the seed is committed <i>before</i> an irreversible burn: complements Entropy's commit-reveal for game-asset use. Worth 20 min on where it fits?"
Supra (dVRF) [S5b]	1/24	Clean license/partner (non-dominant)	Supra integration grants / dev-rel	"Front-running-resistant burn-to-craft that pairs with dVRF for studios: can I show the reference build?"
API3 (QRNG) [S6]	1	Clean license/partner	API3 DAO grants	"A commit-before-burn fairness primitive that could ride on QRNG: open to comparing notes?"
Immutable / Gods Unchained [S15/S18]	24 method (if pre-commit before burn)	License/partner; clearest claim-to-product	IMX Ecosystem grants → dev-rel; Fuel Games	"Players can verify no one: not even the studio: set the forge result before they committed. If you run burn-to-craft, there may be a fit. Demo?"
Sky Mavis / Ronin [S19]	24 method	License/partner	Ronin Forge builder program	"Provably-fair crafting/breeding for Ronin studios: worth a look for your Forge cohort?"
LayerZero / Wormhole / Axelar [S20-22b]	30	Conditional (source-burn → proof → dest-mint)	Ecosystem grants; shared investors (a16z)	"Deterministic cross-chain asset synthesis: destination traits derived from the burned source. If your migration path is burn→mint, worth comparing."

Target (category)	Claim	Posture	Warm-intro route	Paste-ready opener
Oasis / Phala / Turnkey / Fireblocks [S24-27]	20/26 (TEE/HSM reveal)	Implementation partner	Ecosystem grants / dev-rel	"A TEE-held seed that stays confidential until reveal: relevant if you build confidential asset workflows."
a16z crypto (CSX) / Animoca / Griffin [S28-30]	build/raise	Studio/ accelerator/ strategic	CSX application; Animoca corp-dev; portfolio referral	"Turning a granted provably-fair-crafting patent into a company: raising/partnering for the reference build."

Call-prep: objections you WILL get, with honest answers:

- *"Isn't this just burn-to-mint + commit-reveal?"* → The components are old. The novelty is the exact ordering plus non-linear plus dual-input (seed AND burned metadata). We chart only that combination.
- *"Isn't this Pyth Entropy?"* → Entropy is two-party commit-reveal randomness. Our claim adds the irreversible burn *before* reveal and derives the new asset from the burned asset's metadata. That difference is the patent, and we diligence Entropy as prior art out in the open.
- *"If detection is low, how is it worth anything?"* → On a single-operator flow the on-chain artifacts are publicly reconstructable, which is strong. The low-detectability clusters are exactly why the play is to build and own the category, not assert.
- *"What's built?"* → Honestly, the reference implementation is the next step. That is lever #1, and it is why this is build-then-monetize.
- *"Won't Chainlink bury us?"* → That is why we don't compete head-on in general VRF. We enter through crafting, and we treat Chainlink as counter-assertion risk, not a target.

Outreach kit: a redacted one-page teaser plus per-target intro emails can be drafted on request (proposed Full-tier / add-on).

5. Claim ownership & legal moat

Claim / cluster	Capability	Commercial impact
1 (system)	Full ordered pipeline w/ non-linear mapping of (revealed seed + burned metadata).	Strongest independent vs a \$103 combination; the differentiator.
19 (device)	Selects a commitment, issues sequestration, listens for reveal, computes new state.	Broadest/most operator-generic; most exposed on \$103/\$112.
24 (method)	Commit → sequester → reveal-	Clearest to chart against an end-

Claim / cluster	Capability	Commercial impact
	after-verify → mint; commitment finalized before the burn.	to-end operator; easiest to design around by moving a step.
2-4	Solvency/pre-fund; non-linear = immutable rule; one-to-one seed↔TXID binding.	Durable narrow fallbacks (Claim 4).
25-30	Burn-hash verify, oracle/HSM reveal, VDF synthesis, cross-chain relaying.	Claim 30 (cross-chain) independently relevant.

Detectability (real method, per cluster): 24 single-operator = Med-High (end-to-end on-chain artifacts reconstructable); 1 core = Medium (hidden-seed ordering may need code review); 30 cross-chain = Low-Med (divided infringement); 9-12 multi-node = Low (discovery-only). The Med-High single-operator score is what gives Lens A any teeth. **Core technical/enablement DD question (named first):** does the exact ordered combination add a security benefit beyond commit-reveal + burn-to-mint? Put plainly, is "hidden seed committed before an irreversible burn, revealed only after" doing real work that post-burn VRF does not? If yes, it is defensible. If no, §103 and every design-around get easier.

6. Valuation & monetization framework: two lenses (never merged)

Lens A: assertion/diligence value: ~\$40k-\$200k as-is. Anchors: median software patent ~\$77k, most \$100k-\$500k, no-EoU lone patents lower and many never transact [S11]; software royalty 8-12% for any feature license [S13]; independent third-party read of this patent landed ~\$40k-\$200k. **Sharpened downward** by the reverse-risk holder (Chainlink's granted VRF patent) and a live commit-reveal analog (Pyth Entropy). For a mechanic that hasn't shipped, this lens sits near the floor where it belongs. It is the assertion number, not the asset's value.

Lens B: build/option value: cost-to-replicate floor ~\$200k-\$400k (prosecution ~\$30-60k + protocol build/audit ~\$150-350k; cost approach, Tier 2); strategic band ~\$0.5M-\$3M anchored to funded players buying/holding foundational infra IP (Circle/IBM; Chainlink/Atlas [S12]) and category funding (Orochi \$12M [S9]); market-formation probability ~25% (stated). **EV ≈ floor + (0.25 × ~\$1.75M) ≈ \$0.6M-\$0.9M.** Single-buyer precision = needs comp, anchoring on the first of: a funded entrant shipping the mechanic, a first pilot, or SDK/standards adoption. **Decay:** term ~2046; value = remaining-term decay × validity-survival (PGR/§101) × market-formation probability. **Not SEP.** It is an alternative to post-hoc VRF, and alternative-to-standard is a novelty strength, not a rate multiplier.

7. Validity / prior-art / FTO (directional, not a legal opinion)

Ground	Risk	Why a challenger uses it	Holder's best response
§102 anticipation	MED (up from low)	Pyth "Entropy" ships two-party commit-reveal randomness; a challenger will argue it	Entropy lacks the irreversible-burn-before-reveal ordering AND the dual-input synthesis

Ground	Risk	Why a challenger uses it	Holder's best response
		(and cited Robinson/Kumar/Shower s) shows the commit/reveal core.	from burned-asset metadata; no single reference shows the full ordered chain. Keep Claims 1/4 as the core.
§103 obviousness	HIGH	Commit-reveal (Pyth Entropy / cited art) + burn-to-mint (Counterparty 2014) + ERC-721/1155 metadata; each performs its expected function.	No motivation to <i>delay</i> the reveal until after an irreversible burn, nor to use both seed and burned-asset metadata via a non-linear mapping.
§101 eligibility	MED-HIGH	"Commit, wait, compute" on generic ledgers/processors.	Non-recoverable state, circuit/TEE, concrete security improvement (rigid ordering; no front-running) as Alice step-two.
§112(a)/(b)	MED / MED-HIGH	Result-defined + functional nonce terms ("state-transition circuit," etc.).	Point to recited inputs/timing/outputs; hold a construction avoiding §112(f); narrow if pressed.
Inventorship / conduct	UNKNOWN	Fast prosecution + unlisted art warrant diligence (not an accusation).	Presume regularity; keep conception/RTP and disclosure records.

- **Reverse-risk (map before any assertion): Chainlink holds granted US 12,494,909** "verifiable randomness within a decentralized computing network" (inventor Nazarov, Dec 2025) plus 12,062,037 [S17]. The dominant randomness holder can counter-assert, so targets and reverse-risk overlap. **Pyth Entropy** is both the best licensee and the sharpest validity data point. Diligence it first.
- **Issued-over-the-field positive:** issued over a substantial cited field. A granted set beats pending, but IPR/§101 survival is live through the PGR window.

8. Standing red-team: "how a challenger would attack it now"

1. Claim construction: broad/functional readings to widen prior art and set up §112. 2. §103 mosaic: **Pyth Entropy** (commit-reveal) + Counterparty burn-to-mint (2014) + ERC metadata. 3. §101: ordering info "according to a rule" on generic components. 4. §112: functional nonce terms. 5. Real-world prior use: 2014–2025 NFT/gaming projects, archived Discord/GitHub, white papers, **and Pyth Entropy's deployment timeline.**

Is invalidation "easy"? No. There is no clean single-reference anticipation and there is a statutory presumption. **But** the §103 + §101 combination, now with a live commit-reveal analog in Pyth Entropy, is credible enough that a buyer should expect a serious PGR or court challenge if meaningful royalties are demanded. That cost and uncertainty is part of the asset's value even if the core claims survive.

9. Standards & compatibility · Portfolio / continuation

Standards: operates within existing envelopes (ERC-721/1155; standard ledger/oracle interfaces); best framed as an **alternative** to post-hoc VRF, which is a novelty strength and the reason not to argue SEP. Regulatory exposure = NFT/token + gambling-adjacency of "randomized redemption"; frame it as gaming/utility, not wagering. **Portfolio:** standalone today, with no continuation/PCT/foreign family; the holder's other patents are unrelated. **Continuations to file:** observable-event claims (firmer §101); explicit non-front-running security proofs; cross-chain synthesis (Claim 30); ZK-proof-of-fair-synthesis (Claim 17).

10. Decision support

Risk register

Risk	Likelihood	Mitigation
§103/§101 PGR (now with Pyth Entropy analog)	High if asserted	Build-then-monetize; escrow/milestones; continuation to observable events; diligence Entropy first.
Reverse-risk counter-assertion (Chainlink patent)	Medium-High if in VRF lane	Enter via crafting vertical, not general VRF; approach as partner not target; map blocking art.
Market never forms	Medium	Option-value framing; don't over-invest pre-pilot; keep term alive cheaply.
Single-country / single-patent discount	High (now)	PCT before Feb 7 2027; continuation family.
Key-person / build capacity (IP-only)	Medium	Partner a studio/dev for the reference build (see §3 operators).

Sources & methodology: claims read in light of the spec; no court/PTAB construction. This is a targeted validity screen, not an exhaustive one. Named people and orgs are public profiles, not contacted; verify current roles. Dollar ranges are scenario-based indications, not a formal valuation. Deadlines (PGR ~Apr 14 2027; priority ~Feb 7 2027) must be independently docketed. Two 2026-dated secondary items (Kraken/CCIP adoption; Animoca fund size) should be corroborated against a primary source before client send. Source list: S1 Immutable; S2 Gelato; S3 Forte/Chou; S4 Pyth Entropy (docs.pyth.network/entropy); S5 Supra dVRF; S6 API3 QRNG; S7 Flashbots; S8 Courtyard (YC); S9 Orochi \$12M (coinspeaker); S9b Sweet; S10 Mattereum; S11 patent-transaction benchmarks (ipiry.com, ipcg.com); S12 Chainlink→Atlas

(theblock.co); S13 royalty benchmarks (beyondelevation.com, upcounsel.com); S14 Alchemy→HeyMint (theblock.co); S15 Immutable \$500M fund; S16 SuperGaming \$15M (games.gg); S17 Chainlink US 12,494,909 (patents.justia.com/inventor/sergey-nazarov); S18 Gods Unchained crafting; S19 Ronin Forge; S20–22 LayerZero/Axelar/Everclear; S23 Animoca \$300M fund; S24–27 Oasis/Phala/Turnkey/Fireblocks; S28 a16z crypto randomness; S29 Griffin Gaming; S30 web3 accelerators.

11. For the inventor: costs, deadlines, next moves, and how not to get fleeced

Directional; costs are typical U.S. ranges, not quotes. Not legal or financial advice. Have counsel review.

Cost to pursue (out-of-pocket, typical ranges)

Move	Typical cost	Note
Record/confirm clean title	~\$40 USPTO fee	You can file the assignment recordation yourself.
Docket the deadlines	\$0	Do it today (table below).
Continuation application	~\$65–\$130 micro-entity filing fees pro se, or ~\$3k–\$8k with an attorney	You already prosecute pro se.
PCT / foreign priority	~\$4k–\$6k+ then national-phase per country	Only if major gaming/dev markets matter; decide before ~Feb 7 2027.
Independent prior-art search	~\$2k–\$5k	Firms the FTO story before outreach.
One target claim chart	~\$1k–\$3k	The gate to the diligence-ready value band.
Reference-implementation build	~\$150k–\$350k, or partner/grant-funded	The value-creating move; partner a studio to avoid self-funding.
Licensing agent / broker	20–35% of proceeds, success-based	Never a large upfront fee: see anti-scam below.
Maintenance fees	due at 3.5 / 7.5 / 11.5 yrs (micro-entity lowest)	Keep the patent alive.

Your deadline docket (put these in a calendar today)

Date	What	If missed
~Feb 7 2027	PCT / foreign-priority 12-month deadline	Lose foreign filing rights
~Apr 14 2027	Post-grant-review window closes	Validity-challenge risk window
3.5 / 7.5 / 11.5 yrs from grant	Maintenance-fee windows	Patent lapses if unpaid

Date	What	If missed
Now, while parent is alive	File a continuation	Lose the chance to add observable-event claims

Your next 5 moves (Monday morning)

1. Record/confirm clean title and pull your complete file wrapper.
2. Put the four dates above in your calendar with 60-day reminders.
3. Get a validity read on **Pyth Entropy** as prior art before touching the randomness lane.
4. Pick the lead thesis (A, provably-fair crafting) and write the one-pager.
5. Open two doors from §4 (e.g., IMX Ecosystem grants + Supra). Lead with the vertical proof, never the patent number.

How not to get fleeced (read before you pay anyone)

- **Never pay a large upfront fee** to an "invention-promotion" firm or a broker promising buyers. Legitimate licensing agents work mostly success-based.
- Red flags: guaranteed buyers; "we'll market your patent" for \$5k-\$50k upfront; pressure to sign fast; vague deliverables; no client references.
- A fair agent deal looks like this: little or no upfront, a 20-35% success fee, defined targets plus reporting, and you keep title until a real deal closes.
- You are pro se and capable. Do the cheap, high-value moves yourself (assignment recording, docketing, continuation) and hire out only the claim chart, the prior-art search, and any litigation-grade opinion.
- Keep your own records (conception, reduction to practice, prior-art disclosures). They protect you in diligence.

Talking to targets without giving it away (confidentiality)

- Lead with the vertical proof and a **redacted teaser**, not the full report or the patent number.
- Get a **mutual NDA** before sharing build details, the target/claim mapping, or unfiled continuation ideas.
- The issued patent is public. Your **unfiled continuation concepts and trade-secret build details are not**, so don't disclose those without an NDA.
- Avoid public disclosures that could bar a later foreign or continuation filing. When in doubt, say less.

Audience fork

Investors: two numbers: assertion ~\$40k-\$200k as-is; build/option ~\$200k-\$400k floor + ~\$0.6M-\$0.9M risk-weighted EV, category-validated by 2025-26 funding/M&A. This is an option on a market forming, with a ~19.5-yr term. Fund the reference build to firm the Lens-B comp.

Product leads: you own the *ordering*, not "burn-to-mint." Exposure shows up only if a competitor pre-commits a hidden seed before an irreversible burn and derives traits from seed + burned metadata. Most flows use post-burn VRF, which is a design-around, so chart the specific flow first.

IP heads (deepest): the strongest claim is 1; 19/24 are more exposed. Primary risk is §103, sharpened by **Pyth Entropy** as a live commit-reveal analog; §101/§112(b) are material; there

is no clean §102. **Reverse-risk: Chainlink's granted VRF patent (US 12,494,909).** PGR runs to ~Apr 14 2027. Diligence Entropy before any assertion.