What Is a Core Technology? A Plain-Language Guide for R&D Companies

04/06/2026 11:48 am IST

Most companies doing meaningful R&D have a clearer sense of what they make than what they know. They can describe their products and services in detail, but struggle to articulate the specific areas of applied science and engineering they are systematically advancing — the knowledge base that makes those products and services possible, and that competitors cannot easily replicate.

That knowledge base is what the Core Technologies framework is designed to surface, name, and manage.

Defining core technologies

Technology, at its most precise, is the practical application of science. A core technology is a specific area of applied science or engineering that is central to a company's commercial success and sustained competitive advantage — one that the company advances through systematic R&D, and that underpins its products, services, and intellectual property.

Core technologies are not products. A precision engineering company's product might be a machined aerospace component. Its core technologies are the specific areas of manufacturing science it has developed to produce that component to a standard competitors cannot match — subtractive manufacturing processes, additive manufacturing techniques, the digitalisation of production workflows.

Core technologies are not departments or teams either. They exist independently of organisational structure, and persist beyond individual projects and the people who worked on them. A well-managed core technology accumulates knowledge over time — every investigation, experiment, and technical decision contributes to a documented compendium of what the company has learned in that area.

In ReaDI Watch's experience working with R&D-active companies across manufacturing, software, MedTech, and engineering, most identify between three and nine core technology areas when they apply the framework rigorously. Fewer than three often indicates the exercise hasn't been taken to sufficient granularity. More than nine typically means the company has listed activities or sub-tasks rather than the underlying technologies — though the right number will always depend on the company's size, sector, and strategic scope.

How core technologies are identified

R&D activity flows into a company's core technologies through three distinct streams.

The first is **strategic technology development** — dedicated R&D projects focused on advancing a technology area along a defined roadmap, independent of any specific customer requirement. A manufacturer investing in a new materials science capability, or a software company building a proprietary machine learning architecture, is working in this stream. The R&D has a long-term horizon and is directly connected to where the company intends to be technically in three to five years.

The second is **product and service delivery R&D** — work undertaken during the execution of customer-facing projects, where specific technical challenges must be resolved to meet commercial requirements. This is where a significant proportion of qualifying R&D actually happens in most companies, and where it is most likely to go unrecognised. An engineer resolving a materials joining problem on a live project, or a developer working through an integration challenge with no known solution, is advancing a core technology — but only if that work is connected to a named technology area does it become part of a coherent, manageable record of the company's technical advancement.

The third is **process optimisation R&D** — work undertaken to advance the underlying technologies through which a company designs, manufactures, or delivers its products and services. This stream is frequently overlooked because process improvements are often treated as operational activity rather than R&D. Where those improvements involve the systematic advancement of a core technology — a new approach to a manufacturing process, a redesigned production workflow that goes beyond known techniques, an improvement to a software delivery pipeline that requires resolving genuine technical unknowns — they represent qualifying R&D activity that belongs in the company's core technology record.

All three streams are valid and most companies operate across them simultaneously, often without recognising that work in one stream is directly connected to the technology being advanced in another.

What core technologies look like across sectors

The specific technologies vary by sector, but the structure is consistent.

In **precision engineering and manufacturing**, core technologies commonly include subtractive manufacturing processes, additive manufacturing, metrology and quality systems, and the digitalisation of production. Process optimisation is a particularly active R&D stream here — improvements to machining tolerances, tooling design, or production throughput frequently involve genuine advancement of the underlying manufacturing technology rather than standard operational improvement.

In **industrial automation**, core technologies typically include robotics and motion control, mechanical process design, system architecture, and the integration of sensor networks and software into physical systems. R&D in this sector often arises in the delivery of customer projects, where integrating new automation capability into an existing production environment surfaces technical challenges that go beyond known solutions.

In **software and telecoms**, core technologies often cover proprietary algorithms or models, cybersecurity mechanisms, network architecture, and platform infrastructure. The three identification streams all apply — but the boundary between standard software development and advancement of a core technology requires particular care, and is one of the areas where the framework's discipline around naming and defining technology areas does the most useful work.

In **MedTech**, core technologies span medical device engineering, biocompatibility and materials science, regulatory-grade testing and validation methodology, and increasingly AI-assisted diagnostics and data processing. Process optimisation R&D is significant here too — improvements to sterilisation, manufacturing consistency, or device assembly often involve systematic advancement of the underlying materials or engineering technology.

In **agri-food and AgriTech**, core technologies include plant physiology and cultivar development, ecophysiology, precision agriculture sensing and data systems, and post-harvest processing science. Both strategic development and process optimisation streams are active — cultivar advancement programmes run in parallel with improvements to growing, harvesting, and processing techniques that themselves involve genuine technical advancement.

In **product manufacturing**, core technologies cover materials science, process engineering, tooling and fixture design, and sustainable manufacturing — where reducing material waste or energy consumption frequently involves systematic advancement of the underlying process technology rather than standard operational improvement.

The boundary between R&D and standard engineering

One of the most practically important challenges in applying the Core Technologies framework is what ReaDI Watch refers to as the Fuzzy Zone — the blurred boundary between standard professional engineering and qualifying R&D. It is not a formally defined concept, but it describes a real and recurring problem that companies encounter when trying to identify what genuinely qualifies.

The distinction matters enormously for tax credits and grant funding. R&D tax credit frameworks in Ireland, the UK, and Canada each define qualifying activity in their own terms, but a common requirement across all three is that the work involves the resolution of scientific or technological uncertainty — uncertainty that a competent professional in the relevant field could not readily resolve using existing knowledge and standard techniques. Work that sits below that threshold, however technically demanding, is standard professional practice rather than R&D under those frameworks.

The Core Technologies framework helps companies navigate this boundary by anchoring R&D identification in the technologies being advanced, rather than in the projects being delivered. When a company has a named core technology area with a defined state of the art, identifying qualifying activity becomes a question of whether specific work is systematically attempting to advance that technology beyond its known limits — a question with a clear, documentable answer.

Without that structure, the boundary becomes a source of both under-claiming — genuinely qualifying work goes unrecognised — and audit risk, where non-qualifying work gets included because the limits of the technology were never clearly drawn.

What structured core technology management enables

Naming and managing core technologies is not an administrative exercise. The downstream benefits are substantive.

R&D tax credit and grant optimisation. A defined core technology structure gives claims a hard evidential core — technology areas named, state of the art documented, advancements traced from investigation to outcome. Claims built on this foundation are more defensible under audit and more complete in their capture of qualifying activity across all three identification streams.

Knowledge retention. Core Technology History Files — documented records of everything learned in a technology area over time — ensure that technical know-how is retained when staff leave. This is particularly acute in engineering and software companies where tacit knowledge is concentrated in a small number of people.

Technical due diligence and valuation. Investors, acquirers, and grant bodies increasingly want to see a company's technical asset base quantified and documented. A structured core technology record provides exactly that — a transparent, auditable account of what the company knows, what it is building toward, and how far along the technology readiness curve it sits.

R&D governance. Core technologies are ratified at R&D Board level — the governance structure that oversees the company's technology roadmap, aligns R&D investment with commercial strategy, and provides the sign-off mechanism for qualifying R&D classification. Without this structure, R&D decisions are made informally, inconsistently, and without a clear record.

Speed to market. There is a direct relationship between how well a company manages its core technologies and how quickly it can move new capabilities along the technology readiness scale toward commercialisation. Companies that know what they know, and have a system for building on it, convert R&D investment into commercial output faster than those that don't.

Where this model reaches its limits

For most companies, naming and managing core technologies as discrete areas is the right starting point — and for many, it remains the right model indefinitely. Where it begins to show its limits is in organisations where the most significant R&D happens not within a single technology area, but at the points where multiple technologies interact. That complexity — and how to manage it — is the subject of the companion article on Systems R&D.

Related reading

- Systems R&D and Complexity: Why Industry 4.0 Demands a Different Approach
- Going from Retrospective to Real-Time R&D Tax Credits