Proceedings of ICFTBA 2026 Symposium: Strategic Management & Business Analytics: Data-Driven Performance Models
DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

Microsoft's Acquisition of VC-Backed Startups: A Case Study of Build-or-Buy Strategy in Cloud and AI

Minhui Ding

Flintridge Sacred Heart Academy, Los Angeles, USA
2210514945dingminhui@gmail.com

Abstract. This case study examines why Microsoft has acquired selected venture-capital-backed technology startups rather than developing comparable capabilities entirely through internal research and development. The analysis focuses on three transactions—Fungible, Minit, and Osmos—that span cloud infrastructure, process mining, and AI-assisted data engineering. Across the cases, four recurring strategic mechanisms emerge. First, acquisition can shorten time-to-capability by giving Microsoft access to an existing product, team, and knowledge base. Second, the startup and its venture investors have already financed and undertaken part of the early technological and market experimentation before acquisition, although this does not eliminate acquisition or integration risk. Third, acquisitions provide access to specialized human capital and technical knowledge. Fourth, the acquired capabilities can complement Microsoft's existing platforms, including Azure, Power Automate, and Microsoft Fabric. The paper also considers post-acquisition challenges, particularly talent retention, organizational integration, and antitrust scrutiny. The cases suggest that acquisition is best understood as a selective complement to internal R&D rather than a universally cheaper or superior substitute.

Keywords: Venture Capital (VC), Mergers and Acquisitions (M&A), Technology Startups, Corporate Innovation, Build-or-Buy Strategy

1. Introduction

Rapid advances in cloud computing and artificial intelligence have increased the importance of specialized infrastructure, data-processing capabilities, and technical talent. For a large technology company such as Microsoft, the strategic question is not simply whether to innovate, but how to obtain new capabilities quickly enough to remain competitive. Internal research and development is one route. Another is to acquire externally developed technologies, products, and teams through mergers and acquisitions (M&A). Prior research shows that acquisition and internal development can represent distinct modes of capability building and market entry, each with different trade-offs in speed, uncertainty, integration, and organizational fit [1, 2].

This paper studies Microsoft's acquisition of three venture-capital-backed startups—Fungible, Inc., Minit j.s.a., and Osmos—to examine a focused build-or-buy question: why might Microsoft choose to acquire these capabilities rather than develop them entirely from scratch? The cases cover three complementary areas. Fungible contributed data-processing-unit (DPU) technology for cloud

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

data centers; Minit contributed process-mining capabilities that could be integrated with Microsoft Power Automate; and Osmos contributed AI-assisted data-ingestion and cleanup capabilities for Microsoft Fabric.

The case evidence points to four recurring strategic mechanisms. First, acquisition can accelerate time-to-capability by providing access to an existing product and engineering team. Second, the target startup and its venture investors have already financed and conducted part of the early-stage experimentation before Microsoft enters, allowing Microsoft to evaluate a more developed technology than it would face at the earliest R&D stage. This should be interpreted as a reduction in some forms of early uncertainty, not as a complete transfer of innovation risk. Third, acquisition provides access to specialized human capital and organizational knowledge that can be difficult to reproduce quickly through hiring alone. Fourth, the acquired technology can complement existing Microsoft platforms, making the strategic value of the target greater inside Microsoft than as a stand-alone asset.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides the industry and conceptual background. Section 3 examines the three acquisition cases. Section 4 synthesizes the cases around the build-or-buy decision. Section 5 discusses post-acquisition integration risks. Section 6 concludes and highlights the limits of the case-study evidence.

2. Industry and conceptual background

2.1. Cloud and AI infrastructure

Cloud computing allows users to access computing, storage, and networking resources as services rather than owning and maintaining all physical infrastructure themselves. Common characteristics include pay-per-use pricing, elastic capacity, self-service access, and virtualization of underlying resources [3]. Major cloud platforms include Microsoft Azure, Amazon Web Services (AWS), and Google Cloud.

The expansion of large language models and enterprise AI has increased demand for GPUs, high-speed networking, data storage, data ingestion, and energy-efficient data-center architecture. As these systems become more complex, bottlenecks can arise not only in raw computation but also in data movement, workflow analysis, and the preparation of heterogeneous enterprise data. These pressures make the speed of capability development strategically important. In such an environment, acquisition can be attractive when an external firm has already developed a specialized capability that complements the acquirer's platform.

2.2. Acquisition as a complement to internal R&D

Acquisition should not be treated as automatically cheaper than internal R&D. Takeover premiums, integration costs, and organizational disruption can make acquisitions expensive. The more relevant economic comparison is whether acquisition gives the buyer a faster or more reliable path to a capability that would be costly, slow, or difficult to reproduce internally. The literature on acquisition versus internal development emphasizes differences in speed of entry, access to complementary assets, and organizational fit [1], while research on innovation and M&A highlights the role of technological relatedness and knowledge combination [2, 4].

Venture capital adds another layer to this build-or-buy setting. VC-backed startups typically use external capital to fund product development and market experimentation under high uncertainty. By the time an incumbent acquires such a startup, some technical and commercial learning has already

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

occurred outside the incumbent. This does not imply that venture investors bear all innovation risk or that later acquisition is risk free. Rather, it means that the incumbent can make its acquisition decision after observing a more developed product, team, and market response than would have been available at the earliest stage.

3. Microsoft acquisition cases

The three cases below illustrate two broad strategic clusters: cloud infrastructure and AI/data automation. The purpose is not to show that every Microsoft acquisition follows the same logic, but to identify recurring mechanisms across a small set of VC-backed technology targets. A summary of Microsoft's three VC-backed startup acquisitions is shown in Table 1.

3.1. Fungible, inc.: data-center infrastructure

Microsoft announced the acquisition of Fungible in January 2023 [5]. Fungible developed hardware and software for cloud data centers and specialized in data processing units (DPUs). S&P Global Market Intelligence reports substantial venture backing across several rounds, including Series A, Series B, and Series C financing [6].

A DPU is a specialized processor designed to handle data-centric tasks such as data movement, networking, storage, and security, thereby allowing CPUs and GPUs to concentrate more heavily on computation [7, 8]. For Microsoft, the strategic relevance of Fungible therefore lies less in the abstract definition of a DPU and more in the capability it provides to Azure and Microsoft's data-center engineering operations.

The case illustrates three build-or-buy mechanisms. First, DPU development requires specialized hardware, networking, and systems expertise that may be slow to reproduce internally. Second, the product and team had already progressed through multiple rounds of externally financed development, so Microsoft could evaluate a more advanced capability rather than beginning at the earliest experimentation stage. Third, Fungible's technology was complementary to Microsoft's existing cloud infrastructure. Acquisition therefore offered a potential shortcut to capability deepening, although Microsoft still faced the subsequent task of integrating the technology and retaining key personnel.

3.2. Minit j.s.a.: process mining and workflow automation

Microsoft acquired Minit in March 2022 to strengthen its process-mining capabilities [9]. S&P Global Market Intelligence reports that Minit had received venture and Series A financing before acquisition [10]. Minit developed enterprise process-mining software, a field that uses event data to reconstruct and analyze how business processes actually operate [11].

For Microsoft, the strategic value of Minit was its fit with Power Automate. Process mining can help organizations identify bottlenecks, deviations, and opportunities for workflow redesign. Microsoft had already developed automation capabilities, so the acquisition can be interpreted as capability deepening rather than entry into an entirely unrelated field. In this setting, buying an established specialist offered a faster route to integrating process-mining expertise into a broader automation platform.

The Minit case therefore highlights technological complementarity and time-to-capability. Venture financing had supported product development before Microsoft's acquisition, but that financing should not be interpreted as proof that the technology was fully mature or risk free. More

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

cautiously, it indicates that substantial development and external evaluation had already occurred. Microsoft could then acquire a developed product and specialized team and combine them with its existing distribution, platform, and customer relationships.

3.3. Osmos: AI-assisted data ingestion and engineering

Microsoft announced the acquisition of Osmos in January 2026 to accelerate autonomous data engineering in Microsoft Fabric [12]. S&P Global Market Intelligence reports that Osmos had raised $18 million in Series A financing [13]. Osmos focused on AI-assisted and agentic solutions for data ingestion, transformation, and cleanup.

Data ingestion is strategically important because enterprise AI systems depend on bringing heterogeneous data from multiple sources into usable and consistent formats. As data volume and variety increase, manual transformation becomes costly and slow, while traditional ingestion pipelines can become a bottleneck for applications that require timely analytics or AI-based decision support [14].

Osmos therefore offered Microsoft a capability that could be integrated directly into Microsoft Fabric. As in the other cases, the strategic benefit was not simply that acquisition avoided R&D expenditure. The stronger argument is that Microsoft obtained an existing team, product, and accumulated know-how that could shorten the path from acquisition to deployment. The case also illustrates the option value of waiting until a startup has conducted some development and market experimentation before deciding whether to bring the capability inside the firm.

Table 1. Summary of Microsoft's three VC-Backed startup acquisitions

Target	Acquisition Year	VC Funding / Stage	Core Technology	Microsoft Area	Strategic Rationale
Fungible, Inc.	2023	$32.5m Series A; $5.43m and $60m Series B; $200m Series C	Data processing units (DPUs)	Azure / data-center infrastructure	Specialized hardware and networking capability; platform complementarity; faster capability development
Minit j.s.a.	2022	$3.727m venture financing; $7.744m Series A	Process mining	Power Automate	Adds process-mining expertise to an existing automation platform; accelerates capability deepening
Osmos	2026	$18m Series A	AI-assisted data ingestion and cleanup	Microsoft Fabric	Adds data-engineering capability for heterogeneous enterprise data; shortens time-to-deployment

Note: Funding amounts are reported from the S&P Global Market Intelligence company profiles cited in the text.

4. Why acquire rather than build

Taken together, the three cases do not support a simple claim that acquisition is always cheaper or better than internal R&D. Instead, they point to four more specific reasons why acquisition can be attractive when the target has a specialized technology that fits the acquirer's existing platform.

4.1. Speed and time-to-capability

The most consistent advantage across the cases is speed. Building a DPU platform, process-mining product, or AI-assisted data-ingestion system internally would require recruiting specialists,

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

developing the product, testing it, and integrating it into existing systems. Acquisition can compress part of this sequence because the target arrives with an existing product, team, and development history. The economic value is therefore best described as faster time-to-capability and potentially faster time-to-market, rather than as guaranteed cost savings.

4.2. Learning after early-stage experimentation

VC-backed startups undertake substantial experimentation before acquisition. Their investors provide capital while the startup tests technical feasibility, develops the product, and obtains feedback from users or customers. An incumbent that acquires later can observe some of this learning before committing to ownership. This creates a form of staged decision-making: Microsoft can wait until a capability is more developed before deciding whether it is valuable enough to integrate. The acquisition does not eliminate risk—Microsoft still faces valuation, integration, and execution risk—but it may reduce the amount of uncertainty associated with the earliest development stage.

4.3. Specialized human capital and knowledge

Technology acquisitions can also function as acquisitions of knowledge and human capital. Fungible brought expertise in DPUs and data-center systems; Minit brought process-mining knowledge; and Osmos brought AI-assisted data-engineering expertise. These capabilities may be difficult to reproduce quickly through ordinary hiring because they are embedded in teams, routines, code bases, and accumulated experience. This is consistent with the broader view that M&A can combine related knowledge bases and technological capabilities [2].

4.4. Complementarity with existing microsoft platforms

The value of each target also depends on its fit with Microsoft's existing assets. Fungible is relevant to Azure and data-center infrastructure, Minit to Power Automate, and Osmos to Microsoft Fabric. This complementarity matters because a technology that is useful on a stand-alone basis may become more valuable when connected to a large platform, installed customer base, distribution network, and engineering organization. In this sense, Microsoft is not merely buying an isolated product; it is buying a capability that can be combined with existing assets.

The cases therefore suggest a more precise interpretation of the build-or-buy decision. Acquisition is attractive when speed, specialized knowledge, prior external experimentation, and platform complementarity are sufficiently valuable to justify the acquisition premium and integration costs. Internal development remains important, especially for core capabilities that Microsoft can build efficiently or where external integration would be difficult.

5. Post-acquisition integration risks

The benefits of acquisition are conditional on successful integration. One important challenge is retaining the founders and technical employees whose knowledge motivated the acquisition. Prior research shows that founder retention after acquisition can be difficult, particularly when founders place high value on autonomy or when the acquiring firm changes organizational structures and routines [1, 15]. If key employees leave, part of the expected knowledge transfer may be lost.

A second challenge is organizational and cultural fit. Startups often operate with different decision processes, incentives, and development routines from a large incumbent. Integration can

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

create frictions if the acquiring firm imposes structures that reduce the speed or autonomy that made the startup effective. For Microsoft, the strategic challenge is therefore to combine the acquired capability with its platform and scale while preserving enough of the target's technical knowledge and innovative capacity.

A third challenge is regulatory scrutiny. Large technology acquisitions increasingly attract attention from antitrust authorities because repeated acquisitions by dominant platforms can affect competition and the incentives of smaller firms and investors [16, 17]. This does not imply that the three transactions examined here are necessarily anticompetitive. It does mean, however, that regulatory risk is part of the acquisition decision and should be weighed alongside technological and strategic benefits.

These risks reinforce the central point of the paper: acquisition is not a costless substitute for internal R&D. Its value depends on whether the gains from speed, knowledge, and complementarity exceed the acquisition premium and the subsequent costs of integration, employee retention, and regulatory compliance.

6. Conclusion

This paper examines why Microsoft may choose to acquire VC-backed technology startups rather than develop comparable capabilities entirely through internal R&D. The cases of Fungible, Minit, and Osmos point to four recurring mechanisms. Acquisition can shorten time-to-capability, allow Microsoft to evaluate technologies after part of the early experimentation has occurred outside the firm, provide access to specialized teams and knowledge, and create value through complementarity with existing platforms such as Azure, Power Automate, and Microsoft Fabric.

The role of venture capital is important but should be stated carefully. VC investors and startups finance and undertake early-stage experimentation, which can produce information about technical feasibility and product-market fit before an incumbent decides whether to acquire. In this sense, VC-backed startups can operate as part of an external innovation ecosystem for large technology firms. However, this does not mean that all early-stage risk is transferred to venture investors or that acquisition is always superior to internal development.

The cases also emphasize the importance of post-acquisition execution. Retaining key talent, integrating different organizational cultures, and navigating regulatory scrutiny can determine whether the expected benefits are realized. The main strategic implication is therefore not "buy rather than build" in general. A more defensible conclusion is that acquisition can be an effective complement to internal R&D when the target offers a specialized, sufficiently developed capability that fits the acquirer's existing platform and when speed and knowledge access are especially valuable.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to sincerely thank Professor Chi for his valuable guidance, feedback, and support throughout this research.

References

[1] Lee, G. K., & Lieberman, M. B. (2009). Acquisition vs. internal development as modes of market entry. *Strategic Management Journal, 31*(2), 140–158. doi: 10.1002/smj.804

[2] Bena, J., & Li, K. (2014). Corporate innovations and mergers and acquisitions. *The Journal of Finance, 69*(5), 1923–1960. doi: 10.1111/jofi.12059

DOI: 10.54254/2754-1169/2026.LD38339

[3] Buyya, R., Broberg, J., & Goscinski, A. (2011). *Cloud computing: Principles and paradigms*. Wiley.
[4] Desyllas, P., & Hughes, A. (2010). Do high technology acquirers become more innovative? *Research Policy, 39*(8), 1105–1121. doi: 10.1016/j.respol.2010.05.005
[5] Bablani, G. (2023, January 9). Microsoft announces acquisition of Fungible to accelerate datacenter innovation. *The Official Microsoft Blog*. https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2023/01/09/microsoft-announces-acquisition-of-fungible-to-accelerate-datacenter-innovation/
[6] S&P Global Market Intelligence. (2026a). Fungible, Inc. company profile. https://www.capitaliq.spglobal.com/web/client?auth=inherit#company/profile?id=6599520
[7] Cisco. (2025). What is a DPU? https://www.cisco.com/site/us/en/learn/topics/networking/what-is-dpu.html
[8] Wu, L., Lottarini, A., Paine, T. K., Kim, M. A., & Ross, K. A. (2014). Q100. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News, 42*(1), 255–268. doi: 10.1145/2654822.2541961
[9] Graham, J. (2022a, March 31). Microsoft acquires Minit to strengthen process mining capabilities. *The Official Microsoft Blog*. https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2022/03/31/microsoft-acquires-minit-to-strengthen-process-mining-capabilities/
[10] S&P Global Market Intelligence. (2026b). Minit j.s.a. company profile. https://www.capitaliq.spglobal.com/web/client?auth=inherit#company/profile?id=7949614
[11] van der Aalst, W. (2012). Process mining. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems, 3*(2), 1–17. doi: 10.1145/2229156.2229157
[12] Crivat, B. (2026, January 5). Microsoft announces acquisition of Osmos to accelerate autonomous data engineering in Fabric. *The Official Microsoft Blog*. https://blogs.microsoft.com/blog/2026/01/05/microsoft-announces-acquisition-of-osmos-to-accelerate-autonomous-data-engineering-in-fabric/
[13] S& P Global Market Intelligence. (2026c). Osmos company profile. https://www.capitaliq.spglobal.com/web/client?auth=inherit#company/profile?id=113576115
[14] Meehan, J., Aslantas, C., Zdonik, S., Tatbul, N., & Du, J. (2017). Data ingestion for the connected world. https://people.csail.mit.edu/tatbul/publications/sstore_cidr17.pdf
[15] Seitz, N., & Lehmann, E. E. (2025). Does acqui-hiring pay off? An empirical investigation of founder retention. *Small Business Economics, 66*(1), 361–391. doi: 10.1007/s11187-025-01107-1
[16] Bryan, K. A., & Hovenkamp, E. (2020). Startup acquisitions, error costs, and antitrust policy. *The University of Chicago Law Review, 87*(2), 331–356. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26892414
[17] Parker, G., Petropoulos, G., & Van Alstyne, M. (2021). Platform mergers and antitrust. *Industrial and Corporate Change, 30*(5), 1307–1336. https://academic.oup.com/icc/article/30/5/1307/6365871