BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Certification & Assessment Body

Independent competency certification whose only product is that an employer believes it

ONLINE EDUCATION & CREATOR BUSINESSES

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out a **Certification & Assessment Body** in India — designing and delivering competency examinations, awarding credentials, accrediting training partners, and providing verification and assessment services to employers, across defined occupational or professional domains.

> **This is the one business in this vertical that sells neither teaching nor software, but credibility itself.** Nothing is taught here and nothing is built; **the entire product is that an employer believes the certificate.** Strip that belief away and the examination, the platform, the item bank and the brand are worth nothing at all — which makes this **the only plan in the vertical whose principal asset does not appear on its balance sheet.**

> **And it produces the sharpest conflict of interest in this vertical, which the plan confronts at the outset rather than in the risk table: the asset is destroyed by precisely the action that maximises short-term revenue — passing more candidates.** Every marginal pass raises this quarter's revenue and lowers the value of every certificate ever issued, **including the ones held by people who genuinely earned them.** The consequence is uncomfortable and must be stated in the language of the P&L: **a pass rate that is too high is a commercial disaster disguised as a good quarter.** This plan therefore models the pass rate **falling from 58% to 51% as the standard is defended**, and treats that decline as evidence the business is working rather than as demand weakness. **A certification body is the only business in this library whose customers benefit from it being hard to satisfy.**

> **Two structural commitments follow from that.** First, **independence: the certifier must not also be the trainer.** Training and certification under one roof means **marking your own homework, and every employer knows it** — so training revenue is reported here as **NIL, by governance rather than by oversight**, and preparation is left to accredited partners who cannot influence assessment decisions. Second, **employer recognition is the only real moat and it is built the slow way**, through employers observing that certified people actually perform better. That produces a genuine chicken-and-egg problem — **candidates come because employers recognise the credential; employers recognise it because candidates hold it** — which is why this plan reports **employers formally recognising the credential (42 → 385)** and **verified employment or advancement of certified candidates at twelve months (61% → 76%)** as its two most important non-financial numbers. **They are the only evidence that the certificate means anything.**

This plan models a business requiring **₹1.15 crore** (₹48 lakh promoter + ₹52 lakh term/investor funding + ₹15 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹1.88 crore revenue and a ₹28 lakh loss** in Year 1 to **₹6.58 crore revenue and ₹94 lakh profit** by Year 3, assessing roughly 62,000 candidates. *(Assessment and credentialing body; recognition-driven — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: An independent awarding and assessment body — competency standards, item banking and psychometrically validated examinations, secure delivery with proctoring, credential issuance and digital verification, training-partner accreditation and audit, and bulk assessment services for employers.

Vision: To issue a credential an employer would hire on without an interview.

Mission: Defend the cut score when revenue argues against it; never train what we certify; treat the failed candidate fairly; and measure ourselves by what employers do, not by what candidates pay.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — practical for scale, technology investment and enterprise contracting.
- **Section 8 / not-for-profit** — **genuinely worth considering**, since the governance form itself signals independence and is common among respected awarding bodies.
- **LLP / proprietorship** — unsuitable; institutional and regulatory recognition requires corporate governance.

> **Regulatory anchor:** India offers two routes to legitimacy and they are not equivalent. **The regulated route** runs through **NCVET recognition as an Awarding Body, Sector Skill Council alignment and NSQF-levelled qualifications** — which confers formal standing, access to government skilling programmes and scheme funding, at the cost of compliance obligations and a qualification framework the body does not fully control. **The market route** builds employer recognition directly, without regulatory endorsement — **slower and harder, but more durable, because a credential employers demand does not depend on a recognition that can be withdrawn.** Most successful bodies eventually hold both. Alongside: **assessment integrity and anti-impersonation controls**; data protection for candidate records, including results and verification data held for many years; **accessibility and reasonable accommodation for candidates with disabilities, which is a legal obligation and not a courtesy**; consumer-protection limits on outcome claims, since **"certified candidates earn more" is a representation and needs evidence**; and a published, genuinely independent **appeals mechanism**.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with assessment, industry or professional-body background. Three competences decide outcomes: *assessment integrity*, which means holding a standard when a large customer wants it relaxed; *employer relationships*, since recognition is the only asset that matters and it is granted person by person; and *governance discipline*, because the structures that keep a certifier independent are the ones a founder is most tempted to bypass. Standard-setting credibility, employer recognition, exam security & governance independence are the differentiators. Ownership, equity, board composition & the independence of the assessment committee are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand is driven by employer difficulty in verifying skills, the skilling mission and NSQF framework, regulated occupations requiring competency proof, corporate hiring and internal certification, and candidates seeking differentiation in crowded labour markets. The market is large but **crowded with certificates nobody trusts**, which is simultaneously the difficulty and the opportunity.

Demand drivers

- **Employer verification difficulty** — degrees and course completions are weak signals of what someone can actually do.
- **Skilling mission & NSQF**, with funded assessment volumes attached to programmes.
- **Regulated and safety-critical occupations** where competency proof is mandatory rather than optional.
- **Corporate internal certification** for role readiness, promotion gates and compliance.
- **Candidate differentiation** in labour markets where qualifications no longer distinguish applicants.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale

TAM	Indian certification & skills assessment	Large; scheme- and employer-funded
SAM	Domains served with credible standards	Domain-bounded
SOM (Yr 1–3)	**Candidates assessed where employers recognise the credential**	~14,000 → ~62,000

> **The market's defining feature is that it is saturated with certificates and starved of trusted ones.** A hiring manager confronted with four credentials in the same domain, none of which they have heard of, **treats all four as equivalent to none** — and that indifference is the real competitor, more than any rival body. The implication for strategy is that **breadth is a trap.** A body certifying twenty occupations badly has twenty credentials nobody trusts; **a body certifying two occupations rigorously has two credentials that mean something, and meaning is the only thing that can later be extended.** This plan therefore concentrates on a narrow domain set, builds employer recognition within it until the credential is genuinely demanded, and expands only from a position where an existing credential's reputation can vouch for a new one. **Growth by adding domains before earning recognition in the first is the standard way certification bodies become certificate printers.**

Target segments

- **Individual candidates** seeking recognised competency proof.
- **Employers** commissioning bulk assessment for hiring, role-readiness and internal promotion.
- **Training providers** seeking accreditation so their learners can be certified.
- **Government skilling programmes** — large assessment volumes, scheme rates, slow payment.
- **Industry associations** seeking a sector standard they do not wish to administer.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: Sector Skill Councils and their assessment agencies, global professional bodies with established brands, university and institutional certificates, **vendor certifications** in technology domains, and **a very large number of low-credibility certificate issuers**. **The strongest competitor in most domains is a global body whose name an employer already knows.**

The business's edge

- **Genuine psychometric rigour** — an examination that actually discriminates between competent and incompetent candidates.
- **Structural independence from training**, which global bodies often possess and local issuers usually do not.
- **Employer co-designed standards**, so the credential tests what hiring managers actually need.
- **Exam security** at a level Indian conditions demand rather than assume.
- **Published outcome evidence**, which almost nobody in this market provides.

> **Underneath the competitive question sits a technical one that this sector rarely discusses in public and which determines whether the credential is real: psychometric validity.** An examination is not a set of questions someone knowledgeable wrote; it is **an instrument that must be shown to discriminate between candidates who can do the work and those who cannot.** That requires **item analysis** to identify questions that fail to distinguish, **defensible cut-score setting** through a method such as modified Angoff rather than a round number chosen because it sounds right, **reliability measurement**, and **differential item functioning analysis** to detect questions that disadvantage a group for reasons unrelated to competence. **An examination that has not been through this is decorative** — it produces a pass or fail that correlates with something, possibly test-taking skill or language fluency, but nobody has established what. **The**

> **uncomfortable corollary is that most certificates in this market would not survive the analysis**, and a body that does it properly carries a cost its competitors do not — which is precisely why the resulting credential can be worth more.

6. Services & Revenue Model

Line	Model	Basis
Certification examination fees	Per candidate	Core volume; lumpy
Recertification & continuing education	Periodic, per holder	**7.4% → 14.9% — the only recurring line**
Training-partner accreditation & audit	Annual fee + audit	Recurring; also a risk-transfer point
Corporate & bulk assessment contracts	Per programme	Best rates; employer-funded
Digital credentials, verification & employer services	Per verification / subscription	Small, high margin, strategically useful
Training & exam preparation revenue	**NIL — by governance**	**Independence firewall**

> **Two lines deserve honest treatment because both can be abused. Recertification is the closest thing this business has to subscription revenue, and it is therefore the most tempting thing to invent.** A three-year renewal cycle attached to a credential in a domain where nothing has changed is **a rent, not a standard** — and candidates recognise it, which damages the credential the renewal was meant to monetise. **The test to apply is genuine skill decay: does competence in this domain actually degrade or become outdated within the cycle?** Where it does — safety-critical work, fast-moving technology, changing regulation — recertification is legitimate and defensible. Where it does not, **the honest answer is not to charge for it. Training-partner accreditation is the second**: it is recurring revenue and useful leverage, but **each accredited partner carries the body's name, so a partner that teaches to the leaked questions rather than the standard damages the credential more than the fee is worth.** Accreditation must therefore be an audit that can fail, and this plan budgets for the audit function accordingly.

7. Go-to-Market — Recognition Before Volume

Building recognition

- **Employer co-design of standards**, which converts a prospective recogniser into a stakeholder before the first exam is written.
- **Industry association endorsement**, which transfers existing credibility rather than requiring new credibility to be built.
- **Published outcome data** — verified employment and advancement of certified candidates, which is the argument nothing else can substitute for.
- **Regulatory recognition** (NCVET / SSC alignment) where the domain has a scheme route.

Building volume

- **Accredited training partners** feeding candidates, without any training revenue accruing to the body.
- **Corporate assessment contracts**, which bring volume and recognition simultaneously.
- **Candidate marketing** where employer demand already exists to point to.
- **Recertification of the existing base**, where genuinely justified.

Sales approach

Win employer recognition first, in a narrow domain → accredit training partners to prepare candidates → grow candidate volume on the back of demonstrated demand → publish outcomes → extend to adjacent domains from a credible base. **The sequencing error that destroys certification bodies is running it backwards** — building candidate volume first, because candidate fees arrive immediately while employer recognition takes years. **A body that has certified twenty thousand people whom no employer asks for has not built an asset; it has built a liability with a marketing budget**, and the certificates already issued cannot be improved retrospectively. **Recognition first is slower, and it is the only order that produces a business worth owning.**

8. Operations Plan (standards, items, exams, credentials, audit)

- **Standard setting:** occupational competency standards defined with employer panels and mapped to NSQF where applicable.
- **Item development:** subject panels write, review and pilot items; **item analysis retires questions that fail to discriminate**.
- **Cut-score setting: defensible methodology (modified Angoff or equivalent), documented and defended by a committee independent of revenue**.
- **Examination delivery:** centres and remote proctoring, identity verification, invigilation protocols.
- **Security:** item rotation and exposure control, statistical anomaly detection, **anti-impersonation controls**.
- **Credentialing:** issuance, digital verifiable credentials, and an employer verification service.
- **Appeals & fairness:** published process, independent review, reasonable accommodations.
- **Partner accreditation:** audit against criteria, with genuine consequences for failure.

Assessment lifecycle

Stage	Activity	Control point
Standard	Employer-defined competencies	Employer panel participation
Items	Write, review, pilot, analyse	Item bank size; discrimination indices
Cut score	**Angoff-type standard setting**	**Set independently of revenue**
Deliver	Centres & remote proctoring	**Security incidents 6 → 1**
Award	**Pass/fail, credential issuance**	**Pass rate 58% → 51% (defended)**
Verify	Employer verification & outcomes	Recognising employers 42 → 385

> **Exam security is an existential risk here rather than an operational one, and the distinction matters for how it is funded.** In most businesses a security failure is costly and survivable. **For a certification body, a leaked item bank does not damage the product — it ends it**, because a credential that can be obtained by memorising circulated answers is worth precisely nothing the moment employers learn this, **and they learn it from the certified people they hire.** The controls are therefore permanent operating costs rather than projects: **item exposure limits with aggressive retirement** — 2,600 items retired annually by Year 3 against 14,500 live, which is expensive and is the price of integrity — **statistical detection of anomalous response patterns**, and **identity verification robust against impersonation, which in Indian conditions is the specific and well-documented threat rather than a theoretical one.** A second point is easy to overlook: **the failed candidate is a customer too.** Roughly half of all candidates fail by design, they paid the same fee, and **how they are treated — clear feedback, a fair retake policy, a real appeals process —**

determines whether the body is seen as rigorous or as arbitrary. Appeals upheld falling from 14% to 6% measures whether the assessment is getting it right the first time.

9. Regulatory, Governance & Integrity (India)

- **NCVET Awarding Body recognition / SSC alignment / NSQF levelling** where the scheme route is taken — formal standing and scheme access, against compliance obligations and reduced control of the qualification.
- **Independence: no training or exam-preparation revenue**; assessment committee independent of commercial management; **cut scores not subject to revenue review.**
- **Assessment integrity:** anti-impersonation, proctoring protocols, item security, documented malpractice procedure with consequences applied consistently.
- **Accessibility: reasonable accommodation for candidates with disabilities is a legal obligation, not a courtesy**, and must be designed into delivery.
- **Outcome claims: "certified candidates earn more" is a representation requiring evidence** under consumer-protection law and the ASCI code — the same discipline the bootcamp plan applied to placement claims.
- **Data protection:** candidate records, results and verification data held for long periods; retention policy and access controls.
- **Appeals:** published, time-bound, and reviewed by people who did not make the original decision.
- GST on assessment services; scheme-funded assessment billing and audit requirements.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / chief assessment officer	1	1	2
Psychometrics & assessment design	**6**	**12**	**22**
Subject panels & item writers (core + contracted)	8	16	30
Examination operations & delivery	7	14	26
Accreditation & audit (training partners)	**5**	**10**	**18**
Employer engagement & recognition	**4**	**9**	**16**
Technology & exam security	4	7	13
Candidate services, appeals & admin	4	8	15
Total	**39**	**77**	**142**

Psychometrics and audit together exceed employer engagement throughout, which is the governance position expressed in headcount: **a certification body that staffs sales ahead of standards is telling you what it actually sells.**

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone

Setup	Month 0–6	Standards with employer panels, item bank, platform, security, recognition groundwork
Launch	Month 6–12	~14,000 candidates, 42 recognising employers; ₹1.88cr revenue, ₹28L loss
Build	Year 2	148 employers, 74 partners, pass rate defended to 54%; ₹3.63cr, ₹15L profit
Scale	Year 3	~62,000 candidates; ₹6.58cr, ₹94L profit; **385 employers, outcomes verified at 76%**

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. ***Employer recognition, verified outcomes, exam security and a defended pass rate are the levers — and the pass rate is modelled FALLING, because a certification body that reports rising pass rates is reporting the erosion of its own asset.***

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Assessment development & item banking (psychometrics, subject panels)	**34,00,000**
Technology (exam platform, proctoring, item-bank security)	26,00,000
Working capital (salaries & operations)	20,00,000
Accreditation, recognition & regulatory compliance	14,00,000
Marketing, employer engagement & candidate acquisition	12,00,000
Legal, governance & registrations	6,00,000
Office & equipment	3,00,000
Total project cost	**1,15,00,000**
Promoter contribution	48,00,000
Term loan / investor funding	52,00,000
Working-capital finance	15,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Certification examination fees	88,00,000	1,62,00,000	2,78,00,000
Corporate & bulk assessment contracts	42,00,000	78,00,000	1,42,00,000
Training-partner accreditation & audit fees	32,00,000	55,00,000	88,00,000
Recertification & continuing education	**14,00,000**	**42,00,000**	**98,00,000**
Digital credentials, verification & employer services	12,00,000	26,00,000	52,00,000
Total revenue	**1,88,00,000**	**3,63,00,000**	**6,58,00,000**
Salaries (psychometrics, panels, ops, audit, admin)	78,00,000	1,32,00,000	2,18,00,000

Assessment development, item writing & review	**34,00,000**	**52,00,000**	**82,00,000**
Technology, exam platform, proctoring & security	**28,00,000**	**42,00,000**	**66,00,000**
Marketing, employer engagement & candidate acquisition	26,00,000	40,00,000	62,00,000
Examination delivery & centre costs	22,00,000	38,00,000	66,00,000
Accreditation, audit & regulatory compliance	12,00,000	18,00,000	28,00,000
Office, overheads & admin	8,00,000	14,00,000	24,00,000
Depreciation, interest & other	8,00,000	12,00,000	18,00,000
Total expenses	**2,16,00,000**	**3,48,00,000**	**5,64,00,000**
Net profit / (loss) before tax	**(28,00,000)**	**15,00,000**	**94,00,000**
Net margin	(14.9%)	4.1%	14.3%
Pass rate — *falling by design, the standard defended*	**58%**	**54%**	**51%**
Employers formally recognising the credential	**42**	**148**	**385**
Certified candidates: employment/advancement verified at 12 months	**61%**	**69%**	**76%**
Training & exam-preparation revenue — *independence firewall*	**NIL**	**NIL**	**NIL**
Exam security incidents	**6**	**2**	**1**
Live item bank / items retired for exposure	2,400 / 380	6,800 / 1,150	14,500 / 2,600
Appeals upheld (of appeals filed)	**14%**	**9%**	**6%**
Recertification rate of eligible holders	—	68%	79%
Candidates assessed / Accredited training partners	~14,000 / 28	~31,000 / 74	~62,000 / 165

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **The pass rate is the most important number in this plan and it must be read backwards from every other business.** A falling pass rate means fewer certificates sold from the same candidate pool — **and it is the evidence that the credential is being protected.** Rising pass rates would improve every financial line for about two years, after which employers would stop recognising the credential and the business would end.
- **Employer recognition and verified outcomes are the real balance sheet.** 42 → 385 recognising employers, and 61% → 76% verified employment or advancement, are what a buyer of this business would actually be purchasing.
- **Recertification is the only recurring line and it grows to 14.9%** — legitimate here because it is applied where competence genuinely decays, and withheld where it does not.
- **Item retirement is a permanent cost of integrity**: 2,600 items retired against 14,500 live by Year 3 is expensive, and a body that does not do it is running an item bank the market has already memorised.
- **Break-even:** Year 2. **Year 1's loss reflects standards, item banking and security built before candidate volume exists — none of which can be deferred, because the first cohort's examination must already be defensible.**

12.4 Projected Cash Flow — Year 1 (quarterly, illustrative)

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4

Opening balance	63,00,000	49,00,000	39,00,000	31,00,000
Collections	40,00,000	44,00,000	46,00,000	48,00,000
Salaries, assessment development, technology, delivery & overheads	54,00,000	54,00,000	54,00,000	54,00,000
Closing balance	**49,00,000**	**39,00,000**	**31,00,000**	**25,00,000**

> **Candidate fees are collected before the examination, which is comfortable, but two features of this business make the cash position less benign than it looks. Scheme-funded assessment pays after delivery, after audit, and often after a long administrative delay** — so a body that grows on government skilling volumes is **financing the government's programme out of its own working capital**, at rates that were thin to begin with. The discipline is to **cap scheme-funded volume as a proportion of the whole and price it knowing the collection period**, rather than accepting it because the numbers are large. The second is that **the cost base is almost entirely fixed and front-loaded against integrity: psychometricians, item writers, security infrastructure and the audit function all cost the same whether five thousand or fifty thousand candidates sit the exam.** That is what produces the Year 1 loss, and it also produces the temptation this plan exists to resist — **when volume disappoints, the fastest available remedies are to certify more of the people who did sit, to accept a training-partner relationship that should have failed audit, or to add a domain before the first is recognised. All three raise this quarter's revenue and spend the only asset the business has.**

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Credibility: pass rate (watched for rises, not falls)**; recognising employers; **verified candidate outcomes at 12 months**; appeals upheld.
- **Integrity: exam security incidents**; item exposure and retirement; anomalous-response detections; malpractice actions taken; **training-partner audits failed**.
- **Assessment quality:** item discrimination indices; reliability coefficients; cut-score documentation; differential item functioning reviews.
- **Commercial:** candidates assessed; recertification rate; corporate contract share; **scheme-funded share and its collection period**.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹52 lakh term/investor funding plus ₹15 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹48 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, the principal asset — recognition — is not securable and does not appear on the balance sheet**, so lending is effectively against receivables and the promoter's covenant. **Second, and unusually, a lender or investor should treat a HIGH pass rate as a warning sign rather than a strength.** A body reporting 85% pass rates is either assessing people who were already competent or **is not assessing at all — and in the second case the revenue is real today and the business is worth nothing in five years. Third, the diligence question that matters is employer-side: how many employers actually ask for this credential, and can that be verified by asking them rather than by reading the body's marketing?** Candidate volume can be bought; employer demand cannot. **Fourth, examine the independence structure concretely** — whether any training revenue exists, whether cut scores can be revisited by anyone with a revenue target, and whether the appeals process is genuinely independent. **Those three arrangements are what protect the asset, and a body that has quietly relaxed them is already consuming its own capital while reporting a profit.**

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Assessment development & item banking	34,00,000	29.6%
Technology (exam platform, proctoring, item-bank security)	26,00,000	22.6%
Working capital (salaries & operations)	20,00,000	17.4%
Accreditation, recognition & regulatory compliance	14,00,000	12.2%
Marketing, employer engagement & candidate acquisition	12,00,000	10.4%
Legal, governance & registrations	6,00,000	5.2%
Office & equipment	3,00,000	2.6%
Total	**1,15,00,000**	**100%**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
Pass-rate drift — the defining risk	**Every marginal pass raises this quarter's revenue and lowers the value of every certificate ever issued, INCLUDING those held by people who genuinely earned them. A pass rate that is too high is a commercial disaster disguised as a good quarter.** Cut scores set by an Angoff-type method, documented, and **defended by a committee independent of revenue**; pass rate modelled falling 58% → 51%
Loss of independence (training + certifying)	**Training and certification under one roof is marking your own homework, and every employer knows it.** Training revenue reported **NIL by governance**; preparation left to accredited partners who cannot influence assessment decisions
Item-bank leakage — existential, not operational	**A leaked bank does not damage the product, it ENDS it — a credential obtainable by memorising circulated answers is worth nothing the moment employers learn, AND THEY LEARN IT FROM THE CERTIFIED PEOPLE THEY HIRE.** Aggressive exposure limits and retirement (2,600 items/yr by Y3), statistical anomaly detection, **anti-impersonation identity verification — the specific, well-documented Indian threat rather than a theoretical one**
Volume before recognition	**A body that has certified twenty thousand people whom no employer asks for has not built an asset — it has built a liability with a marketing budget**, and issued certificates cannot be improved retrospectively. Recognition first, in a narrow domain, then volume
Breadth before depth	**Twenty occupations certified badly means twenty credentials nobody trusts; two certified rigorously means two that MEAN something — and meaning is the only thing that can later be extended.** Adding domains before earning recognition in the first is **the standard way certification bodies become certificate printers**
Invented recertification	**A renewal cycle in a domain where nothing has changed is a RENT, not a standard — and candidates recognise it, damaging the credential the renewal was meant to monetise.** Test: does competence genuinely decay or become outdated? Where not, **the honest answer is not to charge for it**

Training-partner damage	Each accredited partner carries the body's name — **a partner teaching to leaked questions rather than the standard damages the credential more than the fee is worth.** Accreditation must be an audit that *can fail*, funded accordingly
Weak psychometric validity	**An examination that has not been through item analysis, defensible cut-score setting, reliability measurement and DIF review is DECORATIVE** — it produces a result correlating with something, possibly test-taking skill or language fluency, but nobody has established what
Unfair treatment of failed candidates	**Roughly half of candidates fail by design, paid the same fee, and how they are treated decides whether the body is seen as rigorous or arbitrary.** Clear feedback, fair retake policy, independent appeals (upheld 14% → 6%); **reasonable accommodation as a legal obligation, not a courtesy**
Scheme-funded receivables	Pays after delivery, after audit, after administrative delay — **a body growing on skilling volumes is financing the government's programme from its own working capital at thin rates.** Cap scheme share; price for the collection period

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths **Structural independence from training, which local issuers usually lack**; genuine psychometric rigour as a differentiator competitors avoid the cost of; employer co-designed standards; **recognition compounds and is very hard to replicate once earned**; recertification as legitimate recurring revenue; candidate fees collected in advance.	**Weaknesses** **The principal asset is reputation and appears nowhere on the balance sheet**; fixed, front-loaded cost base regardless of volume; **recognition takes years while candidate fees are available immediately — a permanent temptation**; scheme receivables slow; a single security failure is unsurvivable.
Opportunities A market **saturated with certificates and starved of trusted ones**; employer verification demand; NSQF/NCVET scheme routes; corporate internal certification; digital verifiable credentials and employer verification services; extension to adjacent domains once one credential is genuinely demanded.	**Threats** Global professional bodies with names employers already know; vendor certifications in technology domains; **the indifference of hiring managers who treat all unknown credentials as equivalent to none**; regulatory recognition being withdrawn or reframed; impersonation and leakage; price competition from bodies that do not bear the cost of rigour.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This certification body would use AiSevak's E-learning and Compliance vertical tools in operations:

- **Assessment integrity: item bank with exposure and retirement tracking**, item discrimination and reliability analytics, cut-score documentation register.
- **Security: incident log, anomalous-response detection, identity-verification and malpractice register**.
- **Credibility: recognising-employer register**, **verified candidate-outcome tracking at 12 months**, appeals log with upheld rate.
- **Partners:** accreditation audit workflow with pass/fail outcomes, partner performance by candidate results.
- **Commercial:** candidate volumes, recertification rate, **scheme-funded share and collection ageing** (with Finance vertical).

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- Certification & assessment body: competency standards, item banking and psychometrically validated examinations, secure delivery and proctoring, credential issuance and digital verification, training-partner accreditation and audit, and bulk assessment for employers.
- ⚠ **CLOSES THE ELEARNING VERTICAL (9/9). THE ONE BUSINESS HERE THAT SELLS NEITHER TEACHING NOR SOFTWARE BUT CREDIBILITY ITSELF** — nothing is taught, nothing is built; **the entire product is that AN EMPLOYER BELIEVES THE CERTIFICATE**, and strip that belief away and the exam, platform, item bank and brand are worth nothing at all → **THE ONLY PLAN IN THE VERTICAL WHOSE PRINCIPAL ASSET DOES NOT APPEAR ON ITS BALANCE SHEET.**
- **THE SHARPEST CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN THE VERTICAL, CONFRONTED AT THE OUTSET RATHER THAN IN THE RISK TABLE: THE ASSET IS DESTROYED BY PRECISELY THE ACTION THAT MAXIMISES SHORT-TERM REVENUE — PASSING MORE CANDIDATES.** Every marginal pass raises this quarter's revenue and lowers the value of every certificate ever issued, **INCLUDING THOSE HELD BY PEOPLE WHO GENUINELY EARNED THEM** → stated in P&L language: **A PASS RATE THAT IS TOO HIGH IS A COMMERCIAL DISASTER DISGUISED AS A GOOD QUARTER**, so the model runs the **PASS RATE FALLING 58%→54%→51% AS THE STANDARD IS DEFENDED, treating the decline as EVIDENCE THE BUSINESS IS WORKING rather than as demand weakness**. **A CERTIFICATION BODY IS THE ONLY BUSINESS IN THIS LIBRARY WHOSE CUSTOMERS BENEFIT FROM IT BEING HARD TO SATISFY.** Lender corollary: **treat a HIGH pass rate as a WARNING SIGN — a body reporting 85% is either assessing people who were already competent or IS NOT ASSESSING AT ALL, and in the second case the revenue is real today and the business is worth nothing in five years.**
- **TWO STRUCTURAL COMMITMENTS FOLLOW. (1) INDEPENDENCE — THE CERTIFIER MUST NOT ALSO BE THE TRAINER**: training and certification under one roof is **MARKING YOUR OWN HOMEWORK, AND EVERY EMPLOYER KNOWS IT** → **training and exam-preparation revenue reported as NIL, BY GOVERNANCE RATHER THAN BY OVERSIGHT** (the same independence problem as the carbon-advisory and environmental-consultancy plans), with preparation left to accredited partners who cannot influence assessment decisions, and **cut scores not subject to revenue review**. **(2) EMPLOYER RECOGNITION IS THE ONLY REAL MOAT AND IT IS BUILT THE SLOW WAY**, producing a genuine chicken-and-egg — **candidates come because employers recognise the credential; employers recognise it because candidates hold it** → the two most important non-financial numbers are **EMPLOYERS FORMALLY RECOGNISING THE CREDENTIAL (42→148→385)** and **VERIFIED EMPLOYMENT/ADVANCEMENT OF CERTIFIED CANDIDATES AT 12 MONTHS (61%→69%→76%) — THE ONLY EVIDENCE THAT THE CERTIFICATE MEANS ANYTHING**, and together they are **the real balance sheet: what a buyer of this business would actually be purchasing.**
- **THE SEQUENCING ERROR THAT DESTROYS CERTIFICATION BODIES IS RUNNING IT BACKWARDS — building candidate VOLUME first because candidate fees arrive immediately while employer recognition takes years: A BODY THAT HAS CERTIFIED TWENTY THOUSAND PEOPLE WHOM NO EMPLOYER ASKS FOR HAS NOT BUILT AN ASSET, IT HAS BUILT A LIABILITY WITH A MARKETING BUDGET — and the certificates already issued CANNOT BE IMPROVED RETROSPECTIVELY.** Related: **BREADTH IS A TRAP — twenty occupations certified badly means twenty credentials nobody trusts, while two certified rigorously means two that MEAN something, AND MEANING IS THE ONLY THING THAT CAN LATER BE EXTENDED**; adding domains before earning recognition in the first is **THE STANDARD WAY CERTIFICATION BODIES BECOME CERTIFICATE PRINTERS.** The market's defining feature: **SATURATED WITH CERTIFICATES AND STARVED OF TRUSTED ONES — a hiring manager facing four unknown credentials TREATS ALL FOUR AS EQUIVALENT TO NONE, and that INDIFFERENCE is the real competitor, more than any rival body.**
- **THE TECHNICAL CORE THIS SECTOR RARELY DISCUSSES AND WHICH DETERMINES WHETHER THE CREDENTIAL IS REAL: PSYCHOMETRIC VALIDITY.** An exam is not a set of questions someone knowledgeable wrote;

it is **an INSTRUMENT that must be SHOWN to discriminate between candidates who can do the work and those who cannot** — requiring **ITEM ANALYSIS** (retiring questions that fail to distinguish), **DEFENSIBLE CUT-SCORE SETTING via modified Angoff or equivalent rather than a round number chosen because it sounds right**, **RELIABILITY MEASUREMENT**, and **DIFFERENTIAL ITEM FUNCTIONING analysis to detect questions disadvantaging a group for reasons unrelated to competence**. **AN EXAMINATION THAT HAS NOT BEEN THROUGH THIS IS DECORATIVE — it produces a pass or fail correlating with SOMETHING, possibly test-taking skill or language fluency, but NOBODY HAS ESTABLISHED WHAT; and the uncomfortable corollary is that MOST CERTIFICATES IN THIS MARKET WOULD NOT SURVIVE THE ANALYSIS**, so a body doing it properly bears a cost competitors do not — **which is precisely why the resulting credential can be worth more.**

- **EXAM SECURITY IS EXISTENTIAL RATHER THAN OPERATIONAL, AND THE DISTINCTION MATTERS FOR HOW IT IS FUNDED: in most businesses a security failure is costly and survivable; FOR A CERTIFICATION BODY A LEAKED ITEM BANK DOES NOT DAMAGE THE PRODUCT — IT ENDS IT**, because a credential obtainable by memorising circulated answers is worth nothing the moment employers learn, **AND THEY LEARN IT FROM THE CERTIFIED PEOPLE THEY HIRE** → controls are **PERMANENT OPERATING COSTS, NOT PROJECTS**: exposure limits with aggressive retirement (**2,600 items retired against 14,500 live by Y3 — expensive, and THE PRICE OF INTEGRITY; a body that does not do it is running an item bank the market has already memorised**), statistical anomaly detection, and **identity verification robust against IMPERSONATION, which in Indian conditions is the specific and well-documented threat rather than a theoretical one** (incidents 6→2→1). Easy to overlook: **THE FAILED CANDIDATE IS A CUSTOMER TOO — roughly HALF of candidates fail BY DESIGN, they paid the same fee, and how they are treated (clear feedback, fair retake policy, a real appeals process) DETERMINES WHETHER THE BODY IS SEEN AS RIGOROUS OR AS ARBITRARY** (appeals upheld 14%→6% measures whether the assessment gets it right first time); **reasonable accommodation for candidates with disabilities is A LEGAL OBLIGATION, NOT A COURTESY.**
- Revenue honesty: **RECERTIFICATION IS THE ONLY RECURRING LINE AND THEREFORE THE MOST TEMPTING THING TO INVENT — a three-year renewal attached to a credential in a domain where NOTHING HAS CHANGED IS A RENT, NOT A STANDARD, and candidates recognise it, DAMAGING THE CREDENTIAL THE RENEWAL WAS MEANT TO MONETISE** → test = **GENUINE SKILL DECAY (does competence actually degrade or become outdated within the cycle?)**; where it does (safety-critical, fast-moving technology, changing regulation) it is legitimate, **where it does not, THE HONEST ANSWER IS NOT TO CHARGE FOR IT** (7.4%→14.9%). **TRAINING-PARTNER ACCREDITATION IS RECURRING REVENUE AND A RISK-TRANSFER POINT — each partner carries the body's name, so A PARTNER TEACHING TO LEAKED QUESTIONS RATHER THAN THE STANDARD DAMAGES THE CREDENTIAL MORE THAN THE FEE IS WORTH → accreditation must be AN AUDIT THAT CAN FAIL**, funded accordingly. Two India routes to legitimacy, **not equivalent**: **REGULATED (NCVET Awarding Body / SSC / NSQF)** gives formal standing and scheme access at the cost of compliance and reduced control of the qualification; **MARKET (employer recognition directly)** is slower and harder **but more durable, because a credential employers demand does not depend on a recognition that can be withdrawn** — most successful bodies eventually hold both. **Section 8 / not-for-profit structure is genuinely worth considering, since the governance form itself signals independence.** Cash: candidate fees collected in advance, but **SCHEME-FUNDED ASSESSMENT PAYS AFTER DELIVERY, AFTER AUDIT AND AFTER ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY — a body growing on skilling volumes is FINANCING THE GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAMME OUT OF ITS OWN WORKING CAPITAL at rates that were thin to begin with** (cap the share, price for the collection period); and **the cost base is almost entirely FIXED AND FRONT-LOADED AGAINST INTEGRITY (psychometricians, item writers, security, audit cost the same at 5,000 or 50,000 candidates)**, which produces the Y1 loss and **the temptation this plan exists to resist: WHEN VOLUME DISAPPOINTS, THE FASTEST AVAILABLE REMEDIES ARE TO CERTIFY MORE OF THOSE WHO DID SIT, TO ACCEPT A TRAINING PARTNER THAT SHOULD HAVE FAILED AUDIT, OR TO ADD A DOMAIN BEFORE THE FIRST IS RECOGNISED — ALL THREE RAISE THIS QUARTER'S REVENUE AND SPEND THE**

ONLY ASSET THE BUSINESS HAS. Psychometrics + audit headcount exceeds employer engagement throughout: **a certification body that staffs SALES ahead of STANDARDS is telling you what it actually sells.** Diligence: **ask HOW MANY EMPLOYERS ACTUALLY ASK FOR THIS CREDENTIAL, verified BY ASKING THEM rather than by reading the body's marketing — candidate volume can be bought, employer demand cannot**; and **examine the independence structure concretely (any training revenue? can cut scores be revisited by anyone with a revenue target? is appeals genuinely independent?) — a body that has quietly relaxed those three is ALREADY CONSUMING ITS OWN CAPITAL WHILE REPORTING A PROFIT.** ₹1.15cr, ~14,000→62,000 candidates, 28→165 partners, rev 1.88→6.58cr, Y1 −₹28L → Y3 ₹94L. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

- **VERTICAL CLOSE — the nine E-learning models compared. Each sells something structurally different, and the governing metric differs in every case:**

#	Plan	What is actually sold	Governing metric	Structural limit
1	online-course-creator	Recorded content, sold repeatedly	**Completion rate**	Discovery & CAC
2	cohort-bootcamp	A scheduled cohort with live teaching	Cohort fill × completion	Seats × calendar
3	membership-community	Ongoing access & belonging	**Churn / NRR**	Member fatigue
4	corporate-training-online	**Evidence of training, to an employer**	Mandated completion & audit record	Buyer ≠ learner
5	coaching-mentorship	One person's attention	**Revenue per coach-hour**	The coach's calendar
6	webinar-masterclass	A single live event	Attendance → back-end conversion	No retention mechanism
7	edu-content-agency	Production capacity for hire	**Billable utilisation**	No compounding asset
8	lms-platform	Software infrastructure	**Net revenue retention**	Capital before compounding
9	**certification-body**	**Credibility itself**	**Pass rate, defended downward**	Recognition builds slowly

The arc of the vertical is a progression in what is being sold — from content (1), to teaching (2, 5), to belonging (3), to compliance evidence (4), to attention (6), to capacity (7), to infrastructure (8), and finally to trust (9). And the governing metrics move in the same direction: the early plans are measured by whether learners finish, the middle ones by whether capacity is used, and the last by whether anyone believes the output. Only two of the nine — the platform and the certification body — own something that compounds; the other seven must re-earn their revenue every cycle, which is the single most useful distinction a promoter can carry away from this vertical.

▶ Use these tools now — free on AiSevak

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on **aisevak.in**. Open the **Online Education & Creator Businesses toolkit** to browse and use them all at **https://aisevak.in/verticals/elearning** — or go straight to any specific tool at **https://aisevak.in/service/<tool-name>**. No signup needed to explore; each tool guides you step by step.