Bloom Energy Corporation

NYSE: BE | Electrical Equipment & Parts | Price-level review | 4 September 2026

RATING	Last close	Weighted fair value	Accumulation zone	Upgrade trigger	Horizon
WATCHLIST	**$235.55** 3 Sep 2026 +11.8% since last review	**$205** 12.8% below the close was $197	**$155 – $175** 26% to 34% below the market	A sustained trade into the zone would upgrade to Buy	12 – 24 months Score 57 / 100

The rating is unchanged at Watchlist and the reason for it has strengthened. Three weeks ago the shares stood 6.5% above this report's weighted fair value; they now stand 12.8% above it, because the price rose 11.8% while the underlying estimates moved far less. The operating business remains one of the best-performing industrials in the market. Nothing that happened in the period changed it: there was no new disclosure, no order announcement, and none of the three governance items the previous report asked for. What moved the shares was a dovish turn in rate expectations and speculation about index inclusion, neither of which is information about Bloom Energy. Investment score 57 out of 100, against 59. All figures as at the 3 September 2026 close.

What has changed since the last review

The previous report was published on 11 August with the shares at $210.63, following the second-quarter results of 28 July. It concluded that the company was excellent and the entry point was not, that the price already reflected the good news and then some, and that the weighted arithmetic turned clearly favourable only in the $150 to $165 region. It named three things the company itself should do — publish a dated contracted backlog figure, resolve the scandium sourcing allegation, and restore free cash flow guidance — and six conditions that would change the view.

Twenty-four days on, none of the three has been done and none of the six conditions has been met. The next scheduled opportunity is the third-quarter report on 27 October. In the meantime the shares rose 11.8%, and it is worth being precise about why, because the distinction between a price move and information matters more for a Watchlist name than for any other rating.

The 8.4% session on 3 September was not about Bloom Energy

Most of the period's gain came in one session. The shares rose 8.41% on 3 September on 15.6m shares against a twenty-day average of 11.9m, and reporting on the day attributes the move to three things: dovish remarks from Federal Reserve Governor Christopher Waller that pulled the ten-year Treasury yield down two basis points and lifted high-beta equities generally, the reduction in financing costs that a lower yield implies for capital-intensive power infrastructure, and speculation that Bloom Energy is a leading candidate for addition to the S&P 500 at this month's quarterly rebalancing, which a Barron's piece on 2 September set out. Options activity corroborates the last of these: 237,000 contracts changed hands on 3 September against roughly 95,000 on each of the three preceding sessions.

None of that is a statement about the business. It matters to this report in one specific way. Index inclusion, if it happens, obliges passive funds to buy a fixed quantity of stock regardless of price, which would push the shares further from the accumulation zone and could raise the floor beneath them for reasons that have nothing to do with fuel cells. An investor waiting for $155 to $175 should understand that the wait may be made longer by a mechanical bid, and should decide in advance whether that changes anything. This report's position is that it does not: a higher price supported by forced buying is a worse entry, not a better one.

Where the sell-side stands

Date	Firm	Price target	Rating	Comment
1 Sep	**Evercore ISI**	$350 reiterated	Buy	Highest active target in the published set

Date	Firm	Price target	Rating	Comment
27 Aug	**Bernstein**	$282 reiterated	Market Perform	Reiterated the target raised on 18 August
18 Aug	**Bernstein**	$247 → $282	Hold maintained	The only target increase of the period
3 Aug	**J.P. Morgan**	$346 → $314	Buy maintained	Predates the last review

Individual analyst actions from TipRanks via StockAnalysis.com and the moomoo research feed, retrieved 4 September 2026.

The consensus is barely distinguishable from three weeks ago: an average target of $275.08 across twenty-nine analysts against $273.51 previously, with a median of $288.50. The distribution is the interesting part and it is unchanged: ten Strong Buy, five Buy, twelve Hold, one Sell and one Strong Sell. Fourteen of twenty-nine analysts decline to recommend the stock, and the published range runs from $97 to $390 — a low target 59% below the market and a high 66% above it. That spread is not the mark of a group that disagrees about a company's quality; it is the mark of a group that disagrees about what such a company is worth, which is precisely the question this report has said is the one that matters.

Insiders sold, broadly and repeatedly

The clearest new information in the period came from the filing record rather than from the company. Between 13 and 18 August, Bloom Energy filed four separate Rule 144 notices of proposed sale and five Forms 4 recording actual disposals, the sellers including directors Jeffrey Immelt and John Chambers and officers Aman Joshi, Satish Chitoori and Shawn Soderberg. A further Form 4 was filed on 1 September, and one recording a transaction by chief executive KR Sridhar on 4 September. Insider ownership stands at 1.80% of shares outstanding.

Individually these are unremarkable; scheduled sales after a 359% twelve-month move are what one would expect, and the amounts are small against a $69bn market capitalisation. Collectively, and in this particular context, they carry more weight than usual. The previous report's central complaint was that the company was asking the market to accept an unpublished backlog figure on trust while its prior public statements were the subject of a securities complaint. A board and executive team that sells broadly and simultaneously, while declining to publish the number that would substantiate the valuation, is not misconduct, but it is not reassurance either. The management score below moves down a point for it.

The litigation is live and its calendar is near

The securities class action covering purchasers between 27 February 2025 and 8 July 2026 remains unresolved. Its lead-plaintiff deadline is 28 September 2026, which falls inside this report's review horizon and ahead of the third-quarter results. The underlying allegation is unchanged: that filings asserting the supply chain had no significant exposure to China were not corrected while the company allegedly relied on Chinese-origin scandium routed through third countries, and that the tariff and margin estimates built on that sourcing picture were therefore unreliable. Nothing has been dismissed, settled or disclosed. The practical consequence is a concentrated stretch of legal-notice headlines through late September on a stock whose average daily true range is 8.2% of its price.

Valuation

The valuation moved in one direction only, and it moved because the price did. Consensus for the current year is $4.12bn of revenue and $2.71 of adjusted earnings, the latter effectively at the midpoint of management's own $2.55 to $2.85 guidance, so the denominator is where the previous report left it. The numerator is 11.8% higher.

Measure	At $235.55	At last review	Comment
P/E on FY26 guidance midpoint	**87.2x**	78.0x	On management's $2.55–$2.85 non-GAAP range, midpoint $2.70
P/E, tax-normalised	**109x**	99x	This report's calculation: guidance midpoint restated at a 21% rate against a 1.26% effective rate
P/E on FY27 consensus	**47.9x**	—	Consensus adjusted earnings of $4.92, above this report's own base-case estimate

Measure	At $235.55	At last review	Comment
EV / sales, FY2026E	**16.9x**	15.3x	Enterprise value $69.5bn on consensus revenue of $4.12bn
EV / EBITDA, trailing	**166x**	—	On trailing EBITDA of $418m; the operating base is still small relative to the price
Free cash flow yield, trailing	**0.90%**	—	Trailing free cash flow $625m on a $69.4bn market capitalisation
Price / book	**42.9x**	—	Book value $1.64bn after 24.7% share issuance over twelve months
Return on invested capital	**22.9%**	—	Genuinely good, and the reason this is a Watchlist rather than an Avoid

Consensus estimates and trailing figures from S&P Global Market Intelligence via StockAnalysis.com, retrieved 4 September 2026. Management guidance from the second-quarter results of 28 July 2026. The tax-normalised multiple is this report's own calculation and is not a company-reported measure.

One figure in that table deserves separating out, because it is the strongest thing the bulls have. On consensus adjusted earnings for 2027 the shares trade at 47.9 times, and consensus expects 2027 revenue of $6.79bn against 2026's $4.12bn. If those numbers are met, a business compounding at 65% is available at under fifty times its earnings two years out, and that is not an obviously absurd price. This report's base case sits below that consensus, at $6.5bn of revenue and $4.30 of adjusted earnings, for the reason the previous report set out at length: essentially all incremental demand comes from the capital budgets of a small number of hyperscalers, and the chief executive has himself declined to forecast whether that spending continues at this pace. Using the street's number would mean making a forecast that the person best placed to make it will not.

The macro variables that matter here

Two macro channels bear on this business and, unusually, both are currently active. The first is demand, and it does not run through the ordinary consumer or credit cycle at all: Bloom Energy's revenue is a function of data-centre capital expenditure by a handful of hyperscalers and neo-cloud operators, which is a corporate budgeting decision rather than a macroeconomic one. Broad measures of activity are consistent with continued spending but tell one little: the ISM services index reached 55.4 in August, its strongest since February, with new orders at 60.9. The variable to watch is the capital expenditure guidance of five or six named companies, not any published macroeconomic series.

The second is the discount rate, and here the exposure is unusually direct for two separate reasons. Bloom Energy carries $2.82bn of debt against $2.72bn of cash and an interest coverage ratio of 8.6 times, so its own financing cost is a live item; and more importantly, the third-party financiers such as Brookfield who purchase the equipment and sell the power onward are themselves buying a long-duration cash flow whose value falls as rates rise. A stock with a five-year beta of 3.81 and no earnings yield to speak of is also among the most rate-sensitive things in the market by construction. The ten-year Treasury yield stood at 4.77% on 3 September, having touched 4.814% the previous day, its highest since November 2023, and futures now price better-than-even odds of a quarter-point increase at the 15–16 September meeting after Chair Kevin Warsh argued at Jackson Hole that financial conditions cannot be described as restrictive. The single session in which this stock rose 8.4% on a two-basis-point fall in the ten-year is a fair measure of how much of its price rests on that number.

Technical picture

Indicator	Value	Reading
Close, 3 Sep 2026	**$235.55**	Up 8.41% on the session, on 1.31 times average volume
SMA 20 / EMA 20	**$216.86 / $217.20**	Price 8.6% above the twenty-day average
SMA 50 / EMA 50	**$227.60 / $227.15**	Reclaimed on 3 September, having sat below it since 17 August
SMA 100	**$249.37**	Price 5.5% below; the nearest overhead resistance

Indicator	Value	Reading
SMA 200	**not computed**	Series covers 100 sessions; S&P Global publishes $190.53 on a longer window
RSI (14)	**57.4**	Neutral to firm, from 45.7. Not extended
MACD (12,26,9)	**–1.62 vs –4.17**	Histogram +2.55, converging toward a zero-line crossing
ATR (14)	**$19.39**	8.2% of price, down from 12.9%. Still extreme in absolute terms
Volume, 20-day average	**11.9m shares**	Down from 17.7m; participation has normalised
Support	**$186, then $157**	24 August low, then the 29 July intraday low
Resistance	**$249, then $295–$305**	100-day average, then the early-July shelf

Computed from Alpha Vantage daily OHLCV, 14 April to 3 September 2026 (100 sessions), using Wilder smoothing for RSI and ATR. The computed fifty-day average of $227.60 matches S&P Global's independently published value. The 200-day average is not computed from this series and no estimate is substituted.

The technical position has improved more than any other dimension of this report. Price sits above both the twenty- and fifty-day averages, the MACD histogram has been positive for a month and the lines are converging on a zero crossing, and RSI at 57 is firm without being extended. The most useful change is in volatility: the average true range has fallen from 12.9% of price to 8.2%, and the twenty-day volume average from 17.7m shares to 11.9m. The parabolic phase and its unwind are both over, and what remains is a stock in a wide but orderly range. None of that changes the rating — a technical setup carries a 5% weight here for good reason — but it does mean the previous report's warning that any position had to be sized for 13% daily moves can be softened to 8%.

Scorecard

Dimension	Score	Prior	Rationale and what moved
Business quality weight 12%	8/10	8/10	Differentiated technology with a genuine permitting and speed advantage. No new information
Financial strength weight 12%	6/10	6/10	Strong cash generation, marginal net debt of $98m, and 24.7% share issuance over twelve months
Competitive advantage weight 13%	7/10	7/10	Dominant today; the moat remains a lead time rather than a structural barrier
Management weight 10%	5/10	6/10	Lowered: excellent execution, but broad insider selling while the three disclosure requests go unanswered
Growth potential weight 18%	9/10	9/10	Held: consensus expects 103% revenue growth this year and 65% next, above this report's own base case
Valuation weight 20%	2/10	3/10	Lowered: 87x guided earnings from 78x, 109x tax-normalised, and now 12.8% above weighted fair value
Risk (10 = lowest risk) weight 10%	3/10	3/10	Held: volatility halved and shorts reduced, offset by a live class action and index-driven price formation
Technical setup weight 5%	6/10	4/10	Raised: above the twenty- and fifty-day averages, MACD converging, daily range down from 12.9% to 8.2%
Overall investment score weighted sum	**57 / 100**	59/100	Weights sum to 100% and the total was computed in code, not by hand

Scored 1–10, where 10 is always best, including Risk. The prior report used the same direction, labelled “higher = safer”; only the wording of the label has changed, so its scores are directly comparable and no restatement was required. Bars are drawn to the width of the column and read left-to-right as better on every row.

A Risk score of 3 out of 10 means a high-risk holding, and the Risks discussed above support it: a beta of 3.81, an average daily true range of 8.2%, an unresolved securities class action with a deadline inside the month, complete dependence on the capital budgets of a handful of buyers, and a price now partly set by index speculation rather than by cash flows. The score did not rise despite genuine improvement in volatility and short interest, because the litigation calendar and the index-driven price formation offset it.

Recommendation

Watchlist, unchanged, and on a stronger version of the same argument. The probability-weighted fair value below is $205, against $197 at the last review; the base case rises because consensus for 2027 has moved above this report’s own estimate and current-year revenue expectations of $4.12bn now sit above management’s guidance midpoint, so a modest raise to the base-case earnings figure is warranted. But the share price rose 11.8% against a 4.2% rise in weighted fair value, so the shortfall widened from 6.5% to 12.8%. An investor buying today is paying fifteen percent more than this report’s own arithmetic supports, for a stock that can move eight percent in a session.

The price at which the view changes is $155 to $175, roughly 20% below weighted fair value and 26% to 34% below the market. The midpoint of that zone has moved up about five percent from the previous report’s $150 to $165, and it is worth being explicit that this is because the base-case earnings estimate moved up, not because the share price did. A zone that tracked the market would not be a zone. A sustained trade into it would upgrade the rating to Buy, on the grounds that the bear case would then be substantially pre-paid.

That level is less accessible than it was. The stock traded at $163.75 on 29 July, which was twelve sessions before the last report and made the zone look realistic; it has not traded below $185.93 in the twenty-four sessions since. If the S&P 500 addition happens, it may not trade there again in this cycle. That is a real cost of the discipline, and an investor who concludes the wait is not worth it is making a defensible judgement — but they should make it knowing they are paying 87 times management’s own guidance for a year already two-thirds elapsed.

What would change the view

Item	Trigger	Consequence
Price	A sustained trade into $155–$175	Roughly 20% below weighted fair value; the bear case largely pre-paid. Would upgrade to Buy
Backlog disclosure	The company publishes a dated, contracted backlog figure	Removes the largest unverifiable input in the bull case. Would support a higher base-case multiple. Not done
Litigation	Dismissal, or a settlement immaterial in size	Removes the disclosure overhang. The lead-plaintiff deadline is 28 September 2026
Cash conversion	Two quarters of free cash flow tracking the $375m-plus operating baseline	Confirms revenue quality without the withdrawn guidance line. Next test 27 October
Q3 FY2026 result	Another raise with product gross margin held above 36%	Evidence that pricing power survives scale. Would lift the growth and moat scores
Negative trigger	Any hyperscaler capital expenditure guidance cut, or a Bloom order deferral	Bear case activates. Downside toward the $76 area on multiple compression
Negative trigger	An adverse development on the China sourcing allegation	Directly impairs the management score and the credibility of the unpublished backlog claim
Negative trigger	S&P 500 addition followed by a fade back through $200 on falling volume	Would indicate the August and September gain was mechanical and is unwinding

For an investor who already holds the stock the calculus differs, and the previous report's answer stands: hold the existing position, decline to add at these levels, and set capital aside for the zone. Selling a business growing revenue at triple digits with a 23% return on invested capital because the multiple is high has cost investors dearly before, and nothing here argues for it.

Scenario analysis

Case	Prob	FY27 rev.	Op. mgn	Adj. EPS	Mult.	Fair value	Assumptions
Bull	25%	$7.4bn	25%	$5.45	60x	**$327**	AI capital expenditure accelerates, share held, margin expands
Base	45%	$6.5bn	23%	$4.30	52x	**$224**	Growth moderates toward 58%, margin holds, tax begins to normalise. Below the $6.79bn / $4.92 consensus
Bear	30%	$4.8bn	17%	$2.31	33x	**$76**	Capital expenditure digestion, orders deferred, multiple de-rates
Wtd	**100%**					**$205**	12.8% below the 3 September close of $235.55. Was $197 against a $210.63 close

Probabilities sum to 100%. Earnings per share derived from operating income less an assumed cash tax rate of 5% in the bull and bear cases and 8% in the base, divided by assumed diluted share counts of 322m, 325m and 335m. These are this report's estimates, not company guidance. The weighted value of $205 is the probability-weighted average of the three case values and was computed in code and checked against the figures shown.

The asymmetry is the argument, and it has become worse rather than better. From $235.55 the bull case offers 38.8% upside and the bear case 67.7% downside, a ratio of 0.57 to one before any probability weighting. At the last review the same calculation gave roughly 0.8 to one. A three-week rally that produced no new information has consumed a quarter of the reward per unit of risk. The bear case retains a 30% weight and still assumes 2027 revenue grows 19%, which is deceleration rather than disaster; the damage in it comes from a multiple compressing to 33 times. For a security that fell 18.5% in a single session on a Russell reconstitution in June and lost half its value between the June peak and the July trough on no fundamental news, a bear case without a multiple halving would not be a bear case.

Investment verdict

No, not at $235.55, and less so than at $210.63.

Nothing in the last three and a half weeks weakened the operating case. Bloom Energy remains the fastest route to power for a customer whose alternative is an idle billion-dollar compute cluster, it delivered a quarter with revenue above a billion dollars and a 22.5% operating margin, and consensus now expects it to more than double revenue this year and grow it another 65% next. The service annuity that was once the bear case keeps compounding with every shipment. A return on invested capital of 23% on a business that spent two decades losing money is a genuine achievement.

The single biggest concern is unchanged and has grown by eleven percent. At 87 times management's own guidance for a year two-thirds elapsed, and 109 times once a normal tax charge is applied, the price requires the present trajectory to extend well into the back half of the decade, on demand that comes from a handful of capital budgets nobody — including the chief executive — is willing to forecast. What the period added to that was not reassuring. The board and senior officers sold across August and into September. The class action moved closer to its lead-plaintiff deadline without resolution. The backlog figure that would substantiate the valuation went unpublished for another month. And the gain itself came from a Federal Reserve governor's remarks and an index committee's likely decision, neither of which will be relevant to the shares in two years.

What would change this is not complicated and has not changed either. Publish the backlog. Resolve the sourcing allegation. Restore free cash flow guidance. Absent those, price does the work, and the price required is $155 to $175. That is a long way below the market and may not be reached. The honest response to that is not to move the number.

Sources and basis of preparation

This is a scheduled price-level review of a report published on 11 August 2026 following Bloom Energy's second-quarter results of 28 July 2026. The reported figures, guidance and earnings-call material underlying that report are carried forward from it and were sourced from the company's second-quarter results release and the earnings call transcript obtained from Investing.com. No earnings call has taken place in the intervening period, so no new transcript was available or required; the next scheduled report is 27 October 2026. Price and daily OHLCV are from Alpha Vantage, covering 100 sessions from 14 April to 3 September 2026, and all technical indicators were computed directly from that series rather than read from third-party summaries. Fundamentals, consensus estimates, share statistics, ownership, short interest, price targets and rating distributions are from S&P Global Market Intelligence and TipRanks via StockAnalysis.com, retrieved 4 September 2026. Insider transactions, Rule 144 notices, Schedule 13G filings and broker actions were retrieved from the moomoo news, notice and research feeds on 4 September 2026. Attribution for the 3 September share-price move is from contemporaneous market reporting by Benzinga, 24/7 Wall St and TradingKey, and the index-inclusion speculation from Barron's of 2 September 2026. Class action details are from notices published by Kaplan Fox and SueWallSt via GlobeNewswire and PR Newswire between 13 August and 1 September 2026. Macroeconomic figures are as reported by the Institute for Supply Management and the Federal Reserve for releases between 28 August and 3 September 2026. Figures identified as this report's own calculation — the tax-normalised multiple and the scenario earnings estimates — are not company-reported measures.