

Tesla, Inc. - The Next Vehicle, or the Autonomous Future?

Internal ID: S&F-STR-541

Topic: Operations Strategy, Capital Allocation, Innovation

Industry: Automobile Manufacturers

Source: Strategy & Finance

Publication date: 5 October 2026

License: Not specified

Decision date and information cutoff: October 23, 2024, 11:59 p.m. U.S. Eastern Time

Decision scope: How Tesla should sequence investment and scarce engineering and manufacturing capacity between more affordable vehicles and autonomy/robotaxi development

Case convention: This is an author-created decision exercise based on public information. It does not report private deliberations. No later product launch, technical result, regulatory action, or business outcome is included.

The decision

Tesla's October 23, 2024, quarterly update placed two ambitions side by side. The company remained on track to begin launching more affordable vehicles in the first half of 2025. It also described autonomous transport as a long-term goal and had unveiled a purpose-built Cybercab concept earlier in October. The choices were becoming concrete in manufacturing as well as product design: the more affordable models would use aspects of Tesla's current and next-generation platforms and could run on existing vehicle lines; the Cybercab would pursue a purpose-built "unboxed" manufacturing strategy. [T1, T4]

Tesla's leadership team now has to decide how to sequence scarce engineering attention, capital, and factory resources. Should the company concentrate on the more affordable vehicles and use its current lines to support volume growth? Should it prioritize autonomy and the Cybercab, whose potential business model could extend beyond selling vehicles? Or should it maintain both efforts under a staged plan with milestones that govern when resources move from development to broader production and deployment?

The public disclosures do not provide a program-level budget or enough data to calculate the relative value of these paths. They do show a company with substantial resources, current products in ramp, a near-term launch target, and a longer-term technology bet whose requirements remain unsettled. A recommendation must state what Tesla should prioritize next, what evidence would justify increasing or reducing commitment, and what trade-offs management should accept.

A near-term vehicle plan with a cost trade-off

Tesla said its more affordable models would use aspects of both its current and next-generation platforms and be built on the same manufacturing lines as its existing lineup. Management acknowledged that this plan would achieve less cost reduction than it had previously expected, but argued it would allow more capex-efficient volume growth during uncertain times. Tesla estimated current maximum vehicle capacity at close to three million units before investment in new lines and said the approach could enable more than 50% growth over 2023 production. These are company estimates, not demonstrated future capacity or product economics. [T1]

There is a practical attraction to using existing factories: Tesla may grow without first constructing a separate set of vehicle lines. But capacity is not the same as profitable demand. Tesla's Q3 2024 cost of goods sold per vehicle was approximately \$35,100, calculated by dividing automotive sales cost by new deliveries excluding operating leases. That figure is a company-wide average, not the expected cost or margin of an affordable model. The company did not disclose the future vehicles' prices, model-level costs, demand assumptions, or the degree to which they might replace sales of Model 3 and Model Y. [T1]

Current production programs also require attention. Tesla reported that its refreshed Model 3 ramp continued in Q3, while Cybertruck production increased and its gross margin turned positive for the first time. Its 10-Q said temporary under-utilization during production ramps affected nine-month automotive gross margin. A new model might use established lines, but adding volume, launch work and existing ramps together could affect staffing, quality, throughput, or the timing of other projects. The public filing does not show the plant-by-plant constraints that would determine how serious those conflicts are. [T1, T2]

Autonomy as a different kind of product and investment

At the October 10 "We, Robot" event, Tesla presented Cybercab, a two-seat concept without a steering wheel or pedals, alongside a broader autonomous-transport vision. Tesla described the Cybercab as a purpose-built product that would pursue "unboxed" manufacturing. The Q3 update characterized autonomous transport as a long-term ambition and reported more than two billion cumulative miles driven with FSD (Supervised). The same update stated that active driver supervision is required and the vehicle is not autonomous. Supervised miles do not establish readiness for a paid, unsupervised ride service. [T1, T4]

Autonomy could change the value proposition if vehicles can safely and legally operate without a human driver, achieve high utilization, and generate attractive economics for Tesla or vehicle owners. It could also create a software or fleet-service revenue stream beyond the initial vehicle sale. Yet the disclosures do not provide a validation dataset by operating domain, unsupervised incident or intervention rates, commercial authorization, fleet utilization, service costs, or a per-mile contribution model. Each is a question for diligence, not an outcome to assume.

The investment choice is not simply "cars versus software." Tesla's Q3 10-Q reported nine-month R&D expense of \$3.264 billion, up 14% from the prior year, with the increase primarily driven by additional AI-related costs. Nine-month capital expenditures were \$8.56 billion, mainly for AI-related capital expenditures, global factory expansion, machinery and equipment. Those figures cover the company, not specific programs. Management had meaningful liquidity, reporting \$33.65 billion in cash, cash equivalents and short-term investments at September 30. But each dollar and engineering hour committed still competes with other product, factory, service and energy investments. [T2]

Operating context

Tesla's delivery trend contained both a reason for urgency and a reason for patience. It delivered 462,890 vehicles in Q3, up 6.4% from the prior-year quarter, but first-nine-month deliveries were about 2.3% below the comparable 2023 period. Automotive sales revenue for the first nine months fell 7%; Tesla attributed the decrease primarily to lower average selling prices from price reductions, financing offers and mix, and also reported fewer combined Model 3 and Model Y cash deliveries. In Q3, automotive sales revenue rose 1% year over year, with higher Model 3/Y and other-model deliveries partly offset by lower average selling prices. [T1-T3]

Nine-month automotive gross margin was 19.0%, down from 19.7% a year earlier. Tesla cited lower selling prices and temporary factory under-utilization during production ramps as pressures; lower per-vehicle costs, regulatory-credit revenue and FSD revenue partly offset them. Q3 automotive gross margin was 20.1%, compared with 18.7% in Q3 2023. These figures are company-reported and aggregate multiple models, regions and revenue sources. They do not isolate price elasticity, customer response, the effect of financing incentives, or the economics of a future vehicle. [T2]

Tesla also reported \$739 million in Q3 automotive regulatory-credit revenue and \$2.071 billion for the first nine months, up 53% year over year. The company attributed the increase to demand in North America as other manufacturers scaled back battery-electric-vehicle plans. Credits contributed to reported revenue and margin, but they are not a measure of consumer demand for Tesla vehicles and may depend on other manufacturers' decisions. [T2]

The evidence supports more than one diagnosis. Tesla may need a refreshed, more affordable product to restore growth and defend the core vehicle business. Alternatively, lower prices and recent production transitions may be temporary pressures, with refreshed models and increased utilization improving results. A third interpretation is that current vehicle economics are only part of the opportunity: autonomy and software investment may position Tesla for a different business model. The public information does not resolve these explanations or show that they are mutually exclusive.

Exhibit 1. Selected information available at the cutoff

Measure	Q3 2024 / 9M 2024	Comparison or definition
Vehicle deliveries	Q3: 462,890; 9M: 1,293,656	Q3 2023: 435,059; 9M 2023: 1,324,074 [T1, T3]
Automotive sales revenue	Q3: \$18.831bn; 9M: \$53.821bn	Q3 +1%; 9M –7% year over year [T1, T2]
Automotive gross margin	Q3: 20.1%; 9M: 19.0%	Q3 2023: 18.7%; 9M 2023: 19.7% [T2]
Cost of goods sold per vehicle	Approximately \$35,100 in Q3	Company-calculated automotive sales cost divided by new deliveries, excluding operating leases; not model-specific [T1]
Cash and short-term investments	\$33.65bn at September 30	\$18.11bn cash and equivalents plus \$15.54bn short-term investments [T2]
Capital expenditures	\$8.56bn for 9M 2024	Company said mainly AI-related capex, factory expansion, machinery and equipment [T2]
Research and development	\$3.264bn for 9M 2024	Up \$389m, or 14%; company attributed overall increase primarily to AI costs [T2]
Announced affordable models	Start of launch planned for first half 2025	Use aspects of current and next-generation platforms; current lines; less cost reduction than previously expected [T1]
Autonomy evidence	More than 2bn cumulative FSD (Supervised) miles as of Q3	Requires active driver supervision; Tesla says it is not autonomous [T1]

The percentage changes in this exhibit are reported by Tesla or calculated from company-reported deliveries. “Automotive gross margin” is a company segment measure. None of the measures gives a stand-alone forecast for a future model or robotaxi service.

Three paths to consider

1. **Affordable-vehicle first.** Protect the first-half-2025 launch and prioritize engineering and factory readiness for the current-line models. This path could address volume and use existing capacity, but it would accept the smaller cost reduction management disclosed and could defer parts of the autonomy program.
2. **Autonomy/Cybercab first.** Direct more scarce technical and manufacturing attention toward AI, autonomy validation and the purpose-built Cybercab. This path could build capabilities for a different transport model, but the company has not publicly demonstrated unsupervised commercial readiness or robotaxi unit economics; it could also slow near-term vehicle refresh and volume expansion.

3. **Staged two-track portfolio.** Continue work on both programs but set explicit milestones, decision rights and resource limits. Affordable-model spending could expand with verified launch economics and ramp evidence; autonomy commitments could expand with specified technical, safety, regulatory and service-economics evidence. This path preserves parallel learning but requires credible gates and may leave both programs short of the resources they would receive under a single priority.

These paths are analytical choices for this exercise, not a description of a decision already made by Tesla. The company's public statements are plans and management estimates; they are not verified outcomes.

Assignment

Prepare a recommendation for Tesla's senior leadership team as of October 23, 2024. Select one of the three paths or propose a clearly defined alternative. Address:

1. Which program should receive priority in the next 12-18 months, and what is the strategic rationale?
2. What resources or capabilities are actually scarce? Which evidence from the case indicates a constraint, and what remains unknown?
3. What milestones and thresholds should govern continued investment, pause, scale-up or redirection in each program?
4. How should Tesla distinguish vehicle demand and contribution from company-wide averages, and supervised-driving progress from unsupervised commercial readiness?
5. What additional data should management request before committing further capital or engineering capacity?
6. What observation would cause you to change your recommendation?

Do not assume a particular affordable-model price or margin, future vehicle demand, autonomy readiness, regulatory approval, or robotaxi operating result. Label any numerical assumptions you introduce. Do not use information first available after the cutoff.

Sources and conventions

Source IDs point to the companion Tesla source register. The research synthesis and limitations are in literature-review.md; extracted locators and calculations are in evidence-extraction.md. All dates, plans, measurements and forecasts are attributed to Tesla unless identified as derived calculations. Figures are rounded as reported; the nine-month delivery change (−2.3%) and Q3 delivery change (+6.4%) are calculations from reported counts.