



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Electronics D2C / E-com Brand

Own-label audio, power and connectivity accessories sold online

ELECTRONICS

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

This document is confidential and prepared for planning purposes. All financial figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian MSME context and must be validated against live quotes, local rates and professional advice before any investment or borrowing decision.

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out an **Electronics D2C / E-commerce Brand** in India — an own-label audio, power and connectivity accessories business designing and sourcing its range, selling through marketplaces and a direct website, with in-house specification testing, review governance and returns analysis.

The electronics vertical's conventions are set in the consumer-electronics-store anchor and cross-referenced rather than re-derived: **nothing opened is sold as new; stock depreciates while it sits; and ROCE belongs beside net margin.** The IT-peripherals plan established that in this category the counterfeit is a safety question and that the market generates no feedback to correct price. This plan is that market's other side — the brand selling direct — and its problem is the inverse: not that the customer cannot check the product, but that the ONE signal she uses to judge it is the most manipulable artefact in the entire transaction.

□ **THE REVIEW THAT WAS BOUGHT.** For an unknown D2C brand, the star rating is the whole of the customer's evidence. She cannot open the box, cannot test the capacity, has never heard the name, and is looking at 4.4 stars from three thousand people — which she reasonably treats as the collective verdict of three thousand strangers. Indian e-commerce electronics runs on incentivised reviews, review-for-refund arrangements, purchased ratings, and above all **REVIEW GATING**: asking for a public review only from customers who have already privately said they are happy. Gating breaks no platform rule, requires no fake accounts, and produces a rating that is entirely composed of genuine reviews from genuine buyers — and is still a lie, because the sample was selected. This plan solicits nothing conditionally and incentivises nothing: gated solicitation falls from 34% to nil, incentivised reviews from 21% to nil, and verified-purchase share rises to 96%.

□ **But the rating cannot be repaired by honesty alone, so this plan publishes the number that constrains it: THE RETURN RATE, ALONGSIDE THE RATING, ON EVERY LISTING.** A 4.5 with a 12% return rate and a 4.5 with a 3% return rate are different products, and no rating system distinguishes them — because the customer who returned the item in week two usually never wrote anything at all. Return rate falls from 11.8% to 4.6% while the rating rises only from 4.1 to 4.3, which is the honest shape: the rating barely moved and the product genuinely improved. This is the anchor's attach-rate-and-claims-paid pairing generalised, and it now stands as a library rule: **WHEREVER A SINGLE FLATTERING METRIC IS THE INDUSTRY STANDARD, FIND THE SECOND NUMBER THAT CONSTRAINS IT AND PUBLISH BOTH.**

Two structural facts shape everything else. **THE MARKETPLACE IS SIMULTANEOUSLY THE LANDLORD, THE TAX COLLECTOR AND THE COMPETITOR** — it sets the commission, owns the customer and the delivery address, ranks by undisclosed criteria it changes without notice, and sells its own private label in the same category using this brand's own sales data. Platform cost runs at 46.6% of MRP in Year 1, falling to 29.6%, and own-channel share is driven from 4% to 24% because a brand that cannot reach its own customers is a supplier with a logo. And the specification is the product: mAh, wattage and range claims are unverifiable at purchase and universally inflated, so tested-versus-claimed is published on the headline spec of every SKU and average overstatement goes from 22.4% to nil.

This plan models a brand requiring **₹5.40 crore** (₹2.40 crore investor + ₹1.80 crore promoter + ₹1.00 crore working-capital facility + ₹20 lakh term loan), moving from **₹18.60 crore revenue and a ₹1.42 crore loss** to **₹56.00 crore revenue and ₹3.36 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 6.0% net margin on 48% gross, with contribution after platform costs rising from 6.0% to 18.4%. (D2C electronics accessories — figures illustrative.)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A brand that prints its return rate next to its rating.

Vision: To be the accessory brand whose specification survives being measured.

Mission: Ask everyone for a review or nobody; pay for none of them; publish the return rate beside the star rating; test the headline number and print what we measured; say what the platform costs us; build a channel we own; and never sell a returned unit as new.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — the only workable form. Marketplace seller agreements, brand and trademark ownership, BIS registration in the brand's name, institutional capital and outside investment all require it.
- **Trademark and design registration held by the company**, not the promoter — **because in a D2C accessories business the brand is the only durable asset and it is routinely left personally held.**
- **Employed customer-experience, testing and channel staff**, with product testing separated from marketing — **because the person who wrote the listing is not the person to confirm the number in it.**

Regulatory anchor: a business where the marketing is regulated more tightly than the product, and where two rule-sets have recently converged on exactly the practices this trade lives by. **The Consumer Protection Act 2019 and the E-Commerce Rules make it an unfair trade practice to post or procure fake or misleading reviews, and the BIS standard on online consumer reviews (IS 19000) sets out requirements for collection, moderation and publication — including that a seller must not selectively solicit only favourable reviews. Review gating is therefore not a clever workaround; it is the specific practice the framework addresses, and a brand doing it is exposed even though every individual review is genuine.** Then: **the CCPA's guidelines on misleading advertisements and endorsements, which reach influencer content, "as advertised" claims and specification statements alike; Legal Metrology on declared quantity — mAh, wattage and capacity printed on a package are declared values, so an inflated power-bank rating is a false declaration before it is marketing; BIS compulsory registration under the CRO, which covers power banks, adaptors, chargers and much of this catalogue and is granted PER MODEL in the brand's own name — the D2C brand is the registrant, not a reseller relying on somebody else's certificate; e-waste and EPR obligations, which fall on the brand as producer rather than on the platform; battery transport and storage rules on lithium cells; marketplace seller agreements governing listing, ranking, returns liability and settlement; and GST with correct treatment of marketplace TCS and returns.**

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with consumer-electronics, D2C or product-design background. Three competences decide outcomes. *Product judgement at a price point*, because in accessories the difference between a good brand and a bad one is a specification decision made at sourcing — which cell, which chipset, which tolerance — and it cannot be recovered by marketing afterwards. *The discipline to refuse review manipulation while competitors use it*, since the practice is near-universal, materially effective, and produces a visible ranking advantage this brand will not have. And *channel independence*, which means spending on a direct site that converts worse and costs more than a marketplace listing, for years, because the alternative is permanent tenancy. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **product testing and review governance report to the promoter, never to marketing or growth, whose listings and ratings they constrain.**

4. Market Analysis — India

Indian D2C electronics accessories is a large and fast-growing market with almost no barriers to entry, which is precisely why the entry cost is trust rather than capital.

Demand drivers

- **Very high smartphone penetration generating recurring accessory demand** — audio, power and cables replaced far more often than the devices they serve.
- **Wireless audio as a category that barely existed a decade ago**, now the largest single accessory line by value.
- **Online-first buying behaviour in the ₹500-₹3,000 band**, where the customer will not visit a shop and the entire decision is made on a listing page.
- **Falling component and contract-manufacturing costs**, which have made credible own-label products achievable without a factory.
- **Weak incumbent loyalty** — accessory brands are switched casually, which cuts both ways and is why a return rate matters more than a rating.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Online accessory spend across audio, power and connectivity	Large; growing faster than device sales
SAM	Listings this brand can rank for without buying the ranking outright	Bounded by DISCOVERY, not demand
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Net revenue across marketplaces and own channel	₹18.6cr → ₹56cr; own channel 4% → 24%

The constraint in D2C accessories is not demand, manufacturing or capital — it is discovery, and discovery is sold by an auction the brand does not control. There is no shelf to win and no distributor to persuade: there is a search results page, and position on it is determined by a ranking algorithm the platform does not disclose, weighted by sales velocity, rating, and how much the seller is willing to pay. A brand can therefore have a genuinely better product at a fair price and be invisible, and the only reliable remedies are to buy placement or to accumulate the rating and velocity that earn it. This is why review manipulation is not a fringe practice in this category — it is the cheapest available substitute for both. Three consequences shape the plan. Paid placement is treated as a real and permanent cost of the model rather than a launch expense, at 12% of revenue by Year 3 and reported inside contribution after platform costs rather than below it. Category focus is narrow — four lines, not forty — because ranking accrues per listing and a brand spread across a hundred SKUs earns velocity on none of them. And the own channel is built from Year 1 despite converting worse and costing more — from 4% to 24% of revenue — because it is the only asset in this business that a platform cannot reprice, deprioritise or compete with using the brand's own data.

5. Competition & Position

Landscape: established Indian accessory brands with scale, ranking and their own distribution; the platforms' private labels, which sell in the same category, rank in the same results and are informed by every seller's sales data; global brands at a premium; hundreds of white-label sellers relabelling identical factory product; and the counterfeit and grey channel the IT-peripherals plan describes. **Because the listing page is the entire point of**

comparison, competition runs on price, rating and position — two of which can be bought and one of which is set by the platform.

The brand's position

- No conditional review solicitation and no incentivised reviews, ever.
- Return rate published on every listing beside the star rating.
- Tested-versus-claimed printed on the headline specification of every SKU.
- Returned units never sold as new — resaleable, refurbished-disclosed or scrapped, with the split published.
- Platform cost as a share of MRP disclosed, and own-channel share reported as a number that must rise.
- BIS registration held per model in the brand's own name.
- Contribution after platform costs reported as the real margin.

The competitive difficulty is that this brand's central discipline is invisible to the customer and directly reduces the number she uses to choose. A competitor who gates reviews shows 4.6 stars; this brand, asking everybody, shows 4.3 — and the difference is entirely an artefact of who was asked. The customer has no way to know that, no mechanism exists to tell her, and the platform does not distinguish between the two. So the honest brand ranks lower, converts worse, and pays more for placement to compensate — which is the same structure the LED plan found, where accurate disclosure is a competitive disadvantage. Three answers work. Publish the constraining number: a return rate of 4.6% beside a 4.3 rating tells a reader far more than 4.6 stars alone, and a competitor with a gated rating cannot match it without disclosing a return rate he will not want to show. Compete on repeat purchase rather than on first purchase — repeat rate rises from 9% to 31% — because the customer who buys a second time has tested the product herself and needs no rating at all. And build the own channel relentlessly — since on a marketplace the brand is renting a position it can lose overnight, while a returning customer on its own site is the only demand it actually owns.

6. The Review That Was Bought

Element	Character	Economics
Reviews solicited CONDITIONALLY (gating — asking only the already-happy)	Every review genuine, the sample selected, the result a lie	34% → NIL
Incentivised reviews (discount, gift or refund for a rating)	Near-universal and specifically addressed by the rules	21% → NIL
Verified-purchase share of published reviews	The floor of any honest rating	62% → 96%
 RETURN RATE PUBLISHED ALONGSIDE THE STAR RATING on every listing	The second number that constrains the first	0% → 100% of listings
Star rating / return rate	The rating barely moves while the product genuinely improves	4.1 → 4.3 / 11.8% → 4.6%
Returned units resaleable as new / refurbished-disclosed / scrapped	Nothing opened sold as new	41% → 68% / 0% → 27% / 59% → 5%
Tested-versus-claimed published on the headline spec / average overstatement	mAh and watts are declared quantities	0% → 100% / 22.4% → NIL

Platform cost as % of MRP · own-channel share · contribution after platform	Landlord, tax collector and competitor at once	46.6% → 29.6% · 4% → 24% · 6.0% → 18.4%
---	--	--

Review gating deserves its own paragraph because it is the most defensible-sounding dishonesty in Indian e-commerce and almost nobody who does it believes they are doing anything wrong. The mechanism is simple: after delivery the brand messages the customer asking whether she is satisfied. If she says yes, she receives a link to leave a public review. If she says no, she receives a customer-service response and no link. Every review that results is genuine, unpaid, from a verified purchaser, and describes a real experience — and the rating they produce is nonetheless false, because the population was filtered before it was sampled. A brand doing this can say truthfully that it has never bought a review, never written one, and never paid for one, while displaying a number that means something entirely different from what the reader assumes. It is also the practice the E-Commerce Rules and IS 19000 specifically address, which most operators have not noticed. Three practices follow. Solicitation is unconditional or absent — every delivered customer is asked in the same words at the same interval, or none is — and the gated share is reported as it falls to nil rather than quietly discontinued. Nothing of value is ever offered for a review, including the widespread "review and we'll extend your warranty" arrangement, which is an incentivised review wearing a service badge. And negative reviews are answered publicly and left standing — because a brand that removes them has recreated gating at the other end of the process, and the answer is visible to every subsequent reader in a way the review itself is not.

7. The Marketplace, the Return and the Spec Sheet

The landlord who is also the competitor

- **The platform sets the commission, owns the customer and the delivery address, and ranks by criteria it does not disclose and changes without notice.**
- **It also sells its own private label in the same category, informed by this brand's sales data — a competitor with the referee's whistle.**
- **Platform cost — commission, fulfilment, advertising and returns — is 46.6% of MRP in Year 1, falling to 29.6%.**
- **Own-channel share driven from 4% to 24%, because a brand that cannot reach its own customers is a supplier with a logo.**

The return that is not a refund

- **Return rates of 8-15% are normal in this category, and a returned unit is frequently unsaleable as new.**
- **Resaleable as new 41% → 68%; refurbished-disclosed 0% → 27%; scrapped 59% → 5%.**
- **Nothing opened is sold as new — the anchor's rule, applied where the temptation is greatest because the box looks untouched.**
- **Returns cost borne falls from 8.0% to 4.0% of revenue, and the reason is product improvement rather than stricter refusal.**

The specification is the product in this category, and it is inflated as a matter of routine because the buyer cannot check it and the seller knows she cannot. A power bank labelled 20,000 mAh may contain cells totalling far less, or may quote raw cell capacity while delivering perhaps sixty per cent of it at the output voltage — a distinction that is technically arguable and practically deceptive. A charger rated at 65 watts may sustain it for ninety seconds before throttling. Earbuds claiming forty hours of playback are quoting the case and the buds

together, which is not what a reader understands. None of this is detectable at purchase, all of it is detectable in a laboratory, and the LED plan's finding applies directly: the claim cannot be made honest, only its provenance can. Three practices follow. Every SKU's headline specification is measured in-house and published as tested-versus-claimed, with the test method stated, taking average overstatement from 22.4% to nil. Where an industry convention differs from what a reader would understand — cell capacity versus delivered capacity, combined versus device playback — BOTH numbers are printed rather than the flattering one. And testing reports to the promoter rather than to marketing — because the person who wrote the listing is never the right person to confirm the number in it, and in a business where the listing is the entire sales channel that pressure is constant.

8. Operations Plan (design, test, list, sell, return, retain)

- **Specify and test: headline specification measured in-house per SKU with the method stated and TESTED-VERSUS-CLAIMED published (0% → 100%); average overstatement 22.4% → nil; both numbers printed where an industry convention differs from a reader's understanding.**
- **Register in our own name: BIS compulsory registration held PER MODEL by the brand rather than relied on from a supplier; trademark and design registered to the company, not the promoter.**
- **Solicit unconditionally or not at all: every delivered customer asked in the same words at the same interval, or none is; gated solicitation 34% → NIL and incentivised reviews 21% → NIL, with the gated share reported as it falls rather than quietly discontinued.**
- **Never pay for a rating: nothing of value offered for a review, including "review and we'll extend your warranty", which is an incentivised review wearing a service badge; negative reviews answered publicly and LEFT STANDING.**
- **Publish the constraining number: RETURN RATE DISPLAYED BESIDE THE STAR RATING on every listing (0% → 100%), because a 4.5 at 12% returns and a 4.5 at 3% are different products.**
- **Grade every return: resaleable as new / refurbished-disclosed / scrapped, with the split published (41%/0%/59% → 68%/27%/5%); NOTHING OPENED SOLD AS NEW.**
- **Analyse returns as product data: reason coded per unit and fed to sourcing — return rate falling 11.8% → 4.6% through product change rather than through stricter refusal.**
- **Report the platform honestly: commission, fulfilment, advertising and returns aggregated as PLATFORM COST AS A % OF MRP (46.6% → 29.6%), with CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS reported as the real margin (6.0% → 18.4%).**
- **Build what we own: own-channel share 4% → 24%; repeat-purchase rate 9% → 31%; CAC per new customer ₹412 → ₹268.**
- **Carry the producer obligations: EPR as producer rather than platform; lithium storage and transport handled; warranty honoured directly rather than deflected to the marketplace.**

Control points

Area	Activity	Control point
☐ The sample that was filtered	Conditional (gated) solicitation / incentivised reviews	34% → NIL / 21% → NIL
☐ The number that constrains the rating	Return rate published beside the star rating on every listing	0% → 100%

The honest shape of improvement	Star rating / return rate	4.1 → 4.3 / 11.8% → 4.6%
□ Nothing opened sold as new	Returns resaleable / refurbished-disclosed / scrapped	68% / 27% / 5%
□ The spec sheet is the product	Tested-versus-claimed published / average overstatement	0% → 100% / 22.4% → NIL
□□ Landlord, tax collector and competitor	Platform cost as % of MRP / own-channel share	46.6% → 29.6% / 4% → 24%
The real margin	Contribution after platform costs	6.0% → 18.4%
Demand we own	Repeat-purchase rate · CAC per new customer	9% → 31% · ₹412 → ₹268

9. Review Rules, BIS & Operating Compliance (India)

- **Consumer Protection Act 2019 and the E-Commerce Rules make posting or procuring fake or misleading reviews an unfair trade practice, and BIS IS 19000 on online consumer reviews sets requirements for collection, moderation and publication — including that a seller must not selectively solicit only favourable reviews. Review gating is therefore not a workaround; it is the specific practice the framework addresses, and a brand doing it is exposed even though every individual review is genuine.**
- **CCPA guidelines on misleading advertisements and endorsements**, which reach influencer content, comparative claims and specification statements alike.
- **Legal Metrology on declared quantity — mAh, wattage and capacity printed on a package are declared values, so an inflated power-bank rating is a false declaration before it is marketing.**
- **BIS compulsory registration under the CRO, granted PER MODEL and held IN THE BRAND'S OWN NAME — a D2C brand is the registrant rather than a reseller relying on somebody else's certificate, which is the distinction most new entrants miss.**
- **E-waste and EPR obligations fall on the brand as producer, not on the platform;** lithium cell storage and transport rules apply to inventory held for fulfilment.
- Marketplace seller agreements governing listing, ranking, returns liability and settlement — **the document that determines how much of this business the brand actually controls.**
- GST with correct treatment of marketplace TCS and returns; EPF/ESI and POSH across warehouse and customer-experience staff.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Customer experience, RETURNS ANALYSIS & REVIEW GOVERNANCE	14	24	38
Marketplace & channel operations	10	17	26
Warehouse, packing & dispatch	9	15	24
Product development & sourcing	6	10	15
Brand, content & performance marketing	6	10	15
Finance & accounts · technology (site, catalogue, analytics)	3 · 3	5 · 5	8 · 8

PRODUCT TESTING & SPEC VERIFICATION (reports to the promoter, NOT marketing)	2	4	6
Leadership	3	4	5
Total	56	94	145

The shape of this table is the plan's argument. Customer experience, returns analysis and review governance is the largest function at thirty-eight people — larger than marketing and product combined — because in a D2C accessories business those three activities ARE the product improvement loop: the returned unit tells you what is wrong, the review tells you what she expected, and the governance ensures the rating still means something when you have fixed it. A brand that staffs customer experience as a complaint desk has decided to sell whatever the factory shipped. Product testing and specification verification is small, independent, and reports to the promoter rather than to marketing — the control-independence rule, and unusually load-bearing here because the listing is the entire sales channel and the pressure to round a measured 16,400 mAh up to a marketed 20,000 is constant, cost-free and applied by the people whose targets depend on it. The person who wrote the listing is never the right person to confirm the number in it.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Setup	Month 0-6	BIS registration filed per model in the brand's own name before first listing; trademark and design registered to the company; in-house test bench commissioned so no SKU is listed before its headline spec is measured; review policy written as unconditional-or-none with no incentives, and configured in the CX tooling rather than left to judgement; return-rate display built into listing templates from launch; own website live from month one despite negligible traffic
Year 1	Year 1	₹18.60cr revenue, ₹1.42cr loss; gated solicitation 34% and incentivised reviews 21% — the inherited practices this plan exists to end; rating 4.1 against an 11.8% return rate with only 41% of returns resaleable; tested-versus-claimed published on 0% of SKUs with 22.4% average overstatement; platform cost 46.6% of MRP; own channel 4%; contribution after platform 6.0%
Year 2	Year 2	₹34.00cr revenue, ₹18L loss; gating and incentives at nil from month five; return rate published on 100% of listings; rating 4.2 at a 7.1% return rate; tested-versus-claimed on 84% of SKUs and overstatement down to 6.2%; platform cost 37.9%; own channel 12%; repeat rate 19%; contribution after platform 12.4%
Year 3	Year 3	₹56.00cr revenue, ₹3.36cr profit; ROCE 50.9%; gated and incentivised reviews NIL with verified-purchase share 96%; RETURN RATE PUBLISHED BESIDE THE RATING ON 100% OF LISTINGS at 4.3 stars and a 4.6% return rate; tested-versus-claimed on 100% of SKUs with overstatement NIL; returns 68% resaleable, 27% refurbished-disclosed, 5% scrapped and NOTHING OPENED SOLD AS NEW; platform cost 29.6% of MRP; own channel 24%; repeat rate 31%; CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS 18.4%

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. **Contribution after platform costs and own-channel share are the levers. Gross margin is not one — 48% looks healthy and the platform takes most of it, which is why a D2C plan led by gross margin is describing a business that does not exist.**

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Inventory (finished goods, multi-SKU, fulfilment-centre placement)	1,48,00,000
Launch & initial operating losses (two loss years are the model)	1,42,00,000
Brand building, launch marketing & content	88,00,000
Product development, tooling & moulds	74,00,000
Working capital (marketplace settlement cycle)	40,00,000
Technology (D2C site, catalogue, REVIEW GOVERNANCE, returns analytics)	26,00,000
PRODUCT TESTING & SPEC-VERIFICATION programme	12,00,000
Warehouse, packing & fit-out	6,00,000
Deposits, insurance, legal, BIS & registrations	4,00,000
Total project cost	5,40,00,000
Investor / venture contribution	2,40,00,000
Promoter contribution	1,80,00,000
Working-capital facility (inventory & settlement cycle)	1,00,00,000
Term loan (fit-out, test bench, technology)	20,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Audio (TWS, headphones, speakers)	8,37,00,000	15,64,00,000	25,76,00,000
Power (banks, chargers, adaptors) · cables & connectivity	5,58,00,000 · 2,79,00,000	10,20,00,000 · 5,10,00,000	16,80,00,000 · 8,40,00,000
Wearables & small gadgets	1,86,00,000	3,06,00,000	5,04,00,000
TOTAL NET REVENUE (after returns)	18,60,00,000	34,00,00,000	56,00,00,000
Cost of goods sold	10,42,00,000	18,36,00,000	29,12,00,000
GROSS PROFIT / gross margin	8,18,00,000 / 44.0%	15,64,00,000 / 46.0%	26,88,00,000 / 48.0%
Marketplace commission & fulfilment fees	3,72,00,000	6,20,00,000	9,30,00,000
Advertising & PAID PLACEMENT (bidding for our own ranking)	1,86,00,000	3,20,00,000	5,04,00,000
RETURNS COST BORNE (unsaleable stock + reverse logistics)	1,49,00,000	2,04,00,000	2,24,00,000
CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS / % of revenue	1,11,00,000 / 6.0%	4,20,00,000 / 12.4%	10,30,00,000 / 18.4%
Salaries (CX, channel, product, brand, admin)	1,18,00,000	1,66,00,000	2,62,00,000

Warehouse, packing & inbound logistics · product development & tooling amortisation	31,00,000 · 26,00,000	62,00,000 · 58,00,000	1,00,00,000 · 96,00,000
Warranty & replacement provision	22,00,000	40,00,000	62,00,000
Technology (site, catalogue, review governance, analytics)	12,00,000	28,00,000	46,00,000
PRODUCT TESTING & SPEC VERIFICATION	8,00,000	22,00,000	38,00,000
Depreciation · insurance, legal, statutory & audit · finance cost · settlement disputes	12,00,000 · 10,00,000 · 8,00,000 · 6,00,000	18,00,000 · 16,00,000 · 16,00,000 · 12,00,000	26,00,000 · 24,00,000 · 22,00,000 · 18,00,000
Total operating expenses	2,53,00,000	4,38,00,000	6,94,00,000
Net profit / (loss) before tax	(1,42,00,000)	(18,00,000)	3,36,00,000
Net margin	(7.6%)	(0.5%)	6.0%
AVERAGE CAPITAL EMPLOYED / RETURN ON CAPITAL EMPLOYED	₹5.00cr / (28.4%)	₹5.40cr / (3.3%)	₹6.60cr / 50.9%
REVIEWS GATED (conditional solicitation) / INCENTIVISED / verified-purchase share	34% / 21% / 62%	NIL / NIL / 88%	NIL / NIL / 96%
RETURN RATE PUBLISHED BESIDE THE RATING / star rating / RETURN RATE	0% / 4.1 / 11.8%	100% / 4.2 / 7.1%	100% / 4.3 / 4.6%
Returns resaleable as new / refurbished-disclosed / SCRAPPED	41% / 0% / 59%	58% / 18% / 24%	68% / 27% / 5%
TESTED-VERSUS-CLAIMED published on headline spec / average overstatement	0% / 22.4%	84% / 6.2%	100% / NIL
PLATFORM COST AS % OF MRP / own-channel share / repeat-purchase rate / CAC per new customer	46.6% / 4% / 9% / ₹412	37.9% / 12% / 19% / ₹332	29.6% / 24% / 31% / ₹268

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- Contribution after platform costs is the only honest margin in this business. Gross margin of 48% is real and almost entirely consumed: commission and fulfilment take 16.6 points, advertising 9.0 and returns 4.0, leaving 18.4% — and a D2C plan led by gross margin is describing a business that does not exist.
- The rating and the return rate move differently, which is the point. The rating rises from 4.1 to 4.3 — barely — while the return rate falls from 11.8% to 4.6%: the product genuinely improved and the star average hardly noticed, which is exactly why the rating alone cannot be trusted as a quality signal.
- Returns are a product-development input before they are a cost. Reason-coding every returned unit and feeding it to sourcing is what takes the return rate down; refusing more returns would move the same number and mean nothing.
- Own channel is bought, not earned. Taking own-channel share from 4% to 24% costs marketing spend that converts worse than a marketplace listing, and it is the only line item in this plan that reduces dependence on a counterparty who is also a competitor.
- Break-even: Year 3, and two loss years are the model rather than a misfortune. ROCE of 50.9% reflects a business carrying very little capital and a great deal of operating risk — the mirror image of the EMS plan's 21.6% on ₹14 crore of machines.

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3 (festival)	Q4
Opening balance	2,40,00,000	1,78,00,000	1,28,00,000	84,00,000
Collections (marketplace settlement net of fees, own-channel prepaid)	4,40,00,000	4,56,00,000	4,72,00,000	4,92,00,000
Inventory, advertising, salaries, logistics & overheads	5,02,00,000	5,06,00,000	5,16,00,000	5,42,00,000
Closing balance	1,78,00,000	1,28,00,000	84,00,000	34,00,000

Cash in marketplace D2C is governed by a settlement cycle the brand does not control and a festival peak that must be funded months before it pays. Stock is bought and placed into fulfilment centres weeks ahead of a sale event, advertising is prepaid to secure placement, and the platform settles net of commission, fees and a returns reserve on its own cycle — frequently seven to fifteen days after delivery, with disputed deductions resolved later or not at all. The brand therefore funds inventory, placement and advertising simultaneously, at the exact moment its own cash is furthest from returning. A festival quarter that looks like the year's best trading is the quarter that consumes the most working capital, and a brand reading strong sell-through as strength discovers it in the settlement report. Three disciplines apply. The facility is sized against the pre-festival inventory and placement build rather than average working capital, and settlement receivables are reconciled line by line, since deductions that are never queried become permanent. Advertising is treated as a variable cost tied to contribution after platform costs rather than as a fixed budget, so a campaign that does not clear that bar is stopped rather than defended. And the own channel earns a second justification here beyond independence — it is prepaid and settles immediately, which makes every point of own-channel share a working-capital improvement as well as a strategic one.

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Review integrity:** gated (conditional) solicitation share; incentivised review share; verified-purchase share; negative reviews answered and left standing; review-removal requests made (must be nil).
- **The constraining number:** return rate published beside the rating on every listing; rating AND return rate tracked together by SKU; return reasons coded and fed to sourcing.
- **Product truth:** tested-versus-claimed on the headline spec; average overstatement; both-numbers disclosure where convention differs from a reader's understanding.
- **Returns:** resaleable / refurbished-disclosed / scrapped split; units sold as new that had been returned (must be nil); warranty claims by SKU.
- **Platform dependence:** platform cost as a percentage of MRP; own-channel share; contribution after platform costs; ranking sensitivity to advertising spend.
- **Demand we own:** repeat-purchase rate; CAC per new customer; own-channel conversion; customer contactability.
- **Compliance:** BIS registration per model in the brand's name; Legal Metrology declaration accuracy; EPR obligations as producer.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: ₹2.40 crore of investor capital plus ₹1.80 crore promoter contribution, with a ₹1.00 crore facility and only ₹20 lakh of term debt. Four points. First, this is an equity proposition: there is nothing to secure beyond inventory, two of the three years are loss-making by design, and a lender asked to fund it against assets is

being asked the wrong question. Second, the diagnostic is contribution after platform costs, not gross margin. Forty-eight per cent gross looks like a healthy consumer business and the platform takes nearly two-thirds of it; 6.0% rising to 18.4% is the number that determines whether this brand can ever fund itself. Third, ask how reviews are solicited, and treat "we have never bought a review" as an incomplete answer. Gating produces a rating composed entirely of genuine reviews and is still false — a brand that cannot describe its solicitation policy in one sentence is probably gating, and the practice is specifically addressed by the E-Commerce Rules and IS 19000 rather than merely frowned upon. Fourth, ask for the return rate beside the rating, by SKU. A 4.5-star brand with an 11% return rate is selling a product people do not keep, and it is the single most reliable quality signal available to an outside investor in this category — which is precisely why nobody publishes it.

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Inventory (finished goods, multi-SKU, fulfilment-centre placement)	1,48,00,000	27.4%
Launch & initial operating losses	1,42,00,000	26.3%
Brand building, launch marketing & content	88,00,000	16.3%
Product development, tooling & moulds	74,00,000	13.7%
Working capital (marketplace settlement cycle)	40,00,000	7.4%
Technology (D2C site, catalogue, review governance, returns analytics)	26,00,000	4.8%
Product testing & spec-verification programme	12,00,000	2.2%
Warehouse, packing & fit-out	6,00,000	1.1%
Deposits, insurance, legal, BIS & registrations	4,00,000	0.7%
Total	5,40,00,000	100%

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
------	------------

☐ THE REVIEW THAT WAS BOUGHT — AND THE ONE THAT WAS MERELY SELECTED	FOR AN UNKNOWN D2C BRAND THE STAR RATING IS THE WHOLE OF THE CUSTOMER'S EVIDENCE: SHE CANNOT OPEN THE BOX, CANNOT TEST THE CAPACITY, HAS NEVER HEARD THE NAME, AND IS LOOKING AT 4.4 STARS FROM THREE THOUSAND PEOPLE. THE CATEGORY RUNS ON INCENTIVISED REVIEWS, REVIEW-FOR-REFUND ARRANGEMENTS, PURCHASED RATINGS AND ABOVE ALL GATING — ASKING FOR A PUBLIC REVIEW ONLY FROM CUSTOMERS WHO HAVE ALREADY PRIVATELY SAID THEY ARE HAPPY. GATING IS THE MOST DEFENSIBLE-SOUNDING DISHONESTY IN INDIAN E-COMMERCE: EVERY RESULTING REVIEW IS GENUINE, UNPAID AND FROM A VERIFIED PURCHASER, AND THE RATING IS NONETHELESS FALSE BECAUSE THE POPULATION WAS FILTERED BEFORE IT WAS SAMPLED — SO A BRAND CAN TRUTHFULLY SAY IT HAS NEVER BOUGHT A REVIEW WHILE DISPLAYING A NUMBER THAT MEANS SOMETHING ENTIRELY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT THE READER ASSUMES. AND IT IS THE SPECIFIC PRACTICE THE E-COMMERCE RULES AND IS 19000 ADDRESS → SOLICITATION UNCONDITIONAL OR ABSENT — every delivered customer asked IN THE SAME WORDS AT THE SAME INTERVAL, OR NONE IS — with the gated share REPORTED AS IT FALLS TO NIL rather than quietly discontinued (34%→NIL); NOTHING OF VALUE OFFERED FOR A REVIEW (21%→NIL), INCLUDING "REVIEW AND WE'LL EXTEND YOUR WARRANTY", WHICH IS AN INCENTIVISED REVIEW WEARING A SERVICE BADGE; verified-purchase share 62%→96%; and NEGATIVE REVIEWS ANSWERED PUBLICLY AND LEFT STANDING, BECAUSE A BRAND THAT REMOVES THEM HAS RECREATED GATING AT THE OTHER END OF THE PROCESS
☐ THE RATING CANNOT BE REPAIRED BY HONESTY ALONE — PUBLISH THE NUMBER THAT CONSTRAINS IT	EVEN AN HONESTLY COLLECTED RATING IS A WEAK QUALITY SIGNAL, BECAUSE THE CUSTOMER WHO RETURNED THE ITEM IN WEEK TWO USUALLY NEVER WROTE ANYTHING AT ALL — SO THE RATING SYSTEMATICALLY OVER-REPRESENTS PEOPLE WHO KEPT THE PRODUCT. A 4.5 WITH A 12% RETURN RATE AND A 4.5 WITH A 3% RETURN RATE ARE DIFFERENT PRODUCTS AND NO RATING SYSTEM DISTINGUISHES THEM → THE RETURN RATE PUBLISHED BESIDE THE STAR RATING ON EVERY LISTING (0%→100%), WHICH A COMPETITOR WITH A GATED RATING CANNOT MATCH WITHOUT DISCLOSING A RETURN RATE HE WILL NOT WANT TO SHOW; both tracked together BY SKU; and the honest share reported — THE RATING RISES ONLY 4.1→4.3 WHILE THE RETURN RATE FALLS 11.8%→4.6%, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHY THE RATING ALONE CANNOT BE TRUSTED: THE PRODUCT GENUINELY IMPROVED AND THE STAR AVERAGE HARDLY NOTICED. LIBRARY RULE: WHEREVER A SINGLE FLATTERING METRIC IS THE INDUSTRY STANDARD, FIND THE SECOND NUMBER THAT CONSTRAINS IT AND PUBLISH BOTH — the anchor's attach-rate-and-claims-paid pairing, generalised
☐ THE MARKETPLACE IS LANDLORD, TAX COLLECTOR AND COMPETITOR AT ONCE	IT SETS THE COMMISSION, OWNS THE CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP AND THE DELIVERY ADDRESS, RANKS BY CRITERIA IT DOES NOT DISCLOSE AND CHANGES WITHOUT NOTICE, CHARGES FOR THE PLACEMENT IT CONTROLS — AND SELLS ITS OWN PRIVATE LABEL IN THE SAME CATEGORY, INFORMED BY THIS BRAND'S OWN SALES DATA. IT IS A COMPETITOR HOLDING THE REFEREE'S WHISTLE, AND THE SELLER AGREEMENT IS THE DOCUMENT THAT DETERMINES HOW MUCH OF THIS BUSINESS THE BRAND ACTUALLY CONTROLS. PLATFORM COST RUNS AT 46.6% OF MRP IN YEAR 1 → COMMISSION, FULFILMENT, ADVERTISING AND RETURNS AGGREGATED AND REPORTED AS PLATFORM COST AS A % OF MRP (46.6%→29.6%) rather than scattered across the P&L where their combined weight is invisible; CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS reported as THE REAL MARGIN (6.0%→18.4%); OWN-CHANNEL SHARE DRIVEN 4%→24% AS A NUMBER THAT MUST RISE, BECAUSE A BRAND THAT CANNOT REACH ITS OWN CUSTOMERS IS A SUPPLIER WITH A LOGO; category focus kept narrow, SINCE RANKING ACCRUES PER LISTING AND A BRAND SPREAD ACROSS A HUNDRED SKUs EARNS VELOCITY ON NONE OF THEM; and settlement deductions RECONCILED LINE BY LINE, since those never queried become permanent

□ THE SPEC SHEET IS THE PRODUCT AND IT IS INFLATED AS ROUTINE	A POWER BANK LABELLED 20,000 mAh MAY CONTAIN CELLS TOTALLING FAR LESS, OR MAY QUOTE RAW CELL CAPACITY WHILE DELIVERING PERHAPS SIXTY PER CENT OF IT AT THE OUTPUT VOLTAGE — TECHNICALLY ARGUABLE AND PRACTICALLY DECEPTIVE. A 65W CHARGER MAY SUSTAIN IT FOR NINETY SECONDS BEFORE THROTTLING. EARBUDS CLAIMING FORTY HOURS ARE QUOTING THE CASE AND THE BUDS TOGETHER, WHICH IS NOT WHAT A READER UNDERSTANDS. NONE OF IT IS DETECTABLE AT PURCHASE, ALL OF IT IS DETECTABLE IN A LABORATORY, AND mAh AND WATTAGE ON A PACKAGE ARE DECLARED QUANTITIES UNDER LEGAL METROLOGY — A FALSE DECLARATION BEFORE IT IS MARKETING → HEADLINE SPECIFICATION MEASURED IN-HOUSE PER SKU WITH THE METHOD STATED and TESTED-VERSUS-CLAIMED PUBLISHED (0%→100%, average overstatement 22.4%→NIL); WHERE AN INDUSTRY CONVENTION DIFFERS FROM WHAT A READER WOULD UNDERSTAND — CELL VERSUS DELIVERED CAPACITY, COMBINED VERSUS DEVICE PLAYBACK — BOTH NUMBERS PRINTED RATHER THAN THE FLATTERING ONE; and testing REPORTING TO THE PROMOTER RATHER THAN MARKETING, BECAUSE THE PERSON WHO WROTE THE LISTING IS NEVER THE RIGHT PERSON TO CONFIRM THE NUMBER IN IT, AND THE PRESSURE TO ROUND A MEASURED 16,400 mAh UP TO A MARKETED 20,000 IS CONSTANT, COST-FREE AND APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE WHOSE TARGETS DEPEND ON IT
□ THE RETURN THAT COMES BACK LOOKING NEW	RETURN RATES OF 8-15% ARE NORMAL IN THIS CATEGORY AND A RETURNED UNIT FREQUENTLY ARRIVES IN APPARENTLY PERFECT PACKAGING — WHICH IS PRECISELY WHERE THE ANCHOR'S RULE BITES HARDEST, BECAUSE RE-LISTING IT AS NEW IS COSTLESS, UNDETECTABLE AND RECOVERS THE ENTIRE LOSS. AND THE RETURN ITSELF IS TREATED ACROSS THE TRADE AS A COST TO BE MINIMISED BY REFUSAL RATHER THAN AS THE MOST HONEST PRODUCT FEEDBACK A BRAND EVER RECEIVES → EVERY RETURN GRADED AND THE SPLIT PUBLISHED — resaleable as new 41%→68%, REFURBISHED-DISCLOSED 0%→27%, scrapped 59%→5% — with UNITS SOLD AS NEW THAT HAD BEEN RETURNED HELD AT NIL; return REASONS CODED PER UNIT AND FED TO SOURCING, SO THE RATE FALLS 11.8%→4.6% THROUGH PRODUCT CHANGE RATHER THAN THROUGH STRICTER REFUSAL — WHICH WOULD MOVE THE SAME NUMBER AND MEAN NOTHING; and returns cost borne reported as a share of revenue (8.0%→4.0%) rather than netted invisibly against sales
The honest brand ranks lower and pays more for the same position	A COMPETITOR WHO GATES REVIEWS SHOWS 4.6 STARS; THIS BRAND, ASKING EVERYBODY, SHOWS 4.3 — AND THE DIFFERENCE IS ENTIRELY AN ARTEFACT OF WHO WAS ASKED. THE CUSTOMER HAS NO WAY TO KNOW THAT, NO MECHANISM EXISTS TO TELL HER, AND THE PLATFORM DOES NOT DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE TWO — SO THE HONEST BRAND RANKS LOWER, CONVERTS WORSE AND PAYS MORE FOR PLACEMENT TO COMPENSATE. THIS IS THE LED PLAN'S STRUCTURE EXACTLY: ACCURATE DISCLOSURE AS A COMPETITIVE DISADVANTAGE, IN A MARKET THAT GENERATES NO CORRECTING FEEDBACK → PUBLISH THE CONSTRAINING NUMBER SO THE COMPARISON CHANGES SHAPE; COMPETE ON REPEAT PURCHASE RATHER THAN FIRST PURCHASE (9%→31%), BECAUSE THE CUSTOMER WHO BUYS A SECOND TIME HAS TESTED THE PRODUCT HERSELF AND NEEDS NO RATING AT ALL; treat PAID PLACEMENT AS A PERMANENT COST OF THE MODEL rather than a launch expense, reported INSIDE contribution after platform costs; and accept a slower first year — TWO LOSS YEARS ARE THE MODEL RATHER THAN A MISFORTUNE, AND A D2C BRAND PROMISING YEAR-1 PROFITABILITY IS EITHER GATING, UNDER-INVESTING IN PRODUCT, OR NOT COUNTING THE PLATFORM

The settlement cycle and the festival that must be funded before it pays	STOCK IS BOUGHT AND PLACED INTO FULFILMENT CENTRES WEEKS AHEAD OF A SALE EVENT, ADVERTISING IS PREPAID TO SECURE PLACEMENT, AND THE PLATFORM SETTLES NET OF COMMISSION, FEES AND A RETURNS RESERVE ON ITS OWN CYCLE — FREQUENTLY 7-15 DAYS AFTER DELIVERY, WITH DISPUTED DEDUCTIONS RESOLVED LATER OR NOT AT ALL. THE BRAND FUNDS INVENTORY, PLACEMENT AND ADVERTISING SIMULTANEOUSLY AT THE EXACT MOMENT ITS CASH IS FURTHEST FROM RETURNING, SO A FESTIVAL QUARTER THAT LOOKS LIKE THE YEAR'S BEST TRADING IS THE ONE THAT CONSUMES THE MOST WORKING CAPITAL → the facility SIZED AGAINST THE PRE-FESTIVAL INVENTORY AND PLACEMENT BUILD rather than average working capital; settlement receivables RECONCILED LINE BY LINE; advertising treated as A VARIABLE COST TIED TO CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS rather than a fixed budget, SO A CAMPAIGN THAT DOES NOT CLEAR THAT BAR IS STOPPED RATHER THAN DEFENDED; and the OWN CHANNEL EARNING A SECOND JUSTIFICATION — IT IS PREPAID AND SETTLES IMMEDIATELY, SO EVERY POINT OF OWN-CHANNEL SHARE IS A WORKING-CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AS WELL AS A STRATEGIC ONE
Vertical-inherited (see the electronics-retail-store anchor & the it-peripherals plan) & compliance	NOTHING OPENED SOLD AS NEW → applied to returns, where the temptation is greatest. ELECTRONICS DEPRECIATES ON THE SHELF → accessory relevance dies with the device generation, so inventory is aged and a superseded SKU is cleared rather than carried. REPORT ROCE BESIDE NET MARGIN → 6.0% net at 50.9% ROCE, the mirror of the EMS plan's 21.6% on ₹14cr of machines — very little capital and a great deal of operating risk. From it-peripherals: THE COUNTERFEIT IS A SAFETY QUESTION → this brand is now the producer, so cell provenance and protection circuitry are its own liability rather than a supplier's; A GATE WITH NO REJECTIONS IS NOT A GATE → incoming QC on contract-manufactured lots reported with rejections. Compliance: CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 2019 AND THE E-COMMERCE RULES MAKING FAKE OR PROCURED REVIEWS AN UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICE, WITH BIS IS 19000 REQUIRING THAT A SELLER NOT SELECTIVELY SOLICIT ONLY FAVOURABLE REVIEWS; CCPA guidelines on misleading advertisements and endorsements reaching influencer content; LEGAL METROLOGY ON mAh AND WATTAGE AS DECLARED QUANTITIES; BIS CRO REGISTRATION PER MODEL HELD IN THE BRAND'S OWN NAME — THE D2C BRAND IS THE REGISTRANT, NOT A RESELLER RELYING ON SOMEBODY ELSE'S CERTIFICATE; EPR falling on the brand AS PRODUCER rather than on the platform; lithium storage and transport; GST with marketplace TCS and returns treated correctly; EPF/ESI and POSH

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths No gated and no incentivised reviews, with the gated share reported as it falls to nil; the return rate published beside the star rating on every listing — a disclosure a gated competitor cannot match; tested-versus-claimed on every headline spec; returns graded with nothing opened sold as new; platform cost disclosed as a share of MRP; own channel at 24% and repeat purchase at 31%; 50.9% return on capital.	Weaknesses An honestly collected rating that displays lower than a gated competitor's, on the number customers use to choose; two loss-making years and no asset to secure; platform cost consuming nearly two-thirds of gross margin; a festival peak that must be funded before it settles; dependence on a counterparty that is also a competitor; and no barrier to a hundred new entrants next quarter.
Opportunities Recurring accessory demand growing faster than device sales; wireless audio as a category still expanding at scale; falling contract-manufacturing costs making credible own-label achievable without a factory; a review-regulation framework that has recently caught up with gating; and repeat customers who need no rating at all.	Threats Platforms' private labels competing in the same results using this brand's sales data; a ranking-algorithm change removing visibility overnight; competitors gating reviews with no visible consequence; commission or fee increases the brand cannot refuse; counterfeit versions of this brand's own SKUs; and lithium cell supply or safety incidents where the brand is now the producer.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This brand would use AiSevak's Electronics vertical tools in operations:

- **Review governance:** unconditional-solicitation enforcement in the CX workflow, gated and incentivised-share reporting driven to nil, verified-purchase tracking, negative-review response workflow with a removal-request register held at nil.
- **The constraining number:** return-rate-beside-rating publication on every listing, rating-and-return tracked together by SKU, return-reason coding fed to sourcing.
- **Product truth:** in-house spec measurement per SKU with method capture, tested-versus-claimed publication, both-numbers disclosure where convention differs from reader understanding, BIS per-model registration register in the brand's name.
- **Returns:** grading workflow (resaleable / refurbished-disclosed / scrapped), sold-as-new-after-return exception reporting, warranty claims by SKU.
- **Platform economics:** platform cost as a percentage of MRP, contribution after platform costs by SKU and campaign, settlement reconciliation line by line, own-channel share and repeat-purchase tracking.
- **Producer obligations:** EPR register as producer, lithium storage and transport records, Legal Metrology declaration checks.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- Electronics D2C / e-commerce brand: own-label audio, power and connectivity accessories business designing and sourcing its range, selling through marketplaces and a direct website, with in-house specification testing, review governance and returns analysis. **Seventh plan in the electronics vertical (44) and the direct counterpart to it-peripherals-trade, which describes the same category from the distribution side. The electronics-retail-store anchor's conventions are INHERITED AND CROSS-REFERENCED rather than re-derived.**
- **⚠ CONVENTIONS SET HERE: (a) ☐ THE REVIEW THAT WAS MERELY SELECTED — REVIEW GATING IS THE MOST DEFENSIBLE-SOUNDING DISHONESTY IN INDIAN E-COMMERCE: EVERY RESULTING REVIEW IS GENUINE, UNPAID AND VERIFIED, AND THE RATING IS STILL FALSE BECAUSE THE POPULATION WAS FILTERED BEFORE IT WAS SAMPLED. A brand can truthfully say it never bought a review while displaying a number that means something entirely different from what the reader assumes. GENERALISE: A STATISTIC ASSEMBLED FROM A SELECTED SAMPLE IS FALSE EVEN WHEN EVERY DATA POINT IN IT IS TRUE. (b) ☐ WHEREVER A SINGLE FLATTERING METRIC IS THE INDUSTRY STANDARD, FIND THE SECOND NUMBER THAT CONSTRAINS IT AND PUBLISH BOTH — the return rate beside the star rating, as the anchor pairs attach rate with claims-paid rate. AND NOTE THE DIAGNOSTIC SHAPE: THE RATING ROSE 4.1→4.3 WHILE THE RETURN RATE FELL 11.8%→4.6%, WHICH IS PRECISELY WHY THE RATING ALONE CANNOT BE TRUSTED — THE PRODUCT IMPROVED AND THE STAR AVERAGE HARDLY NOTICED. (c) ☐ SOLICIT UNCONDITIONALLY OR NOT AT ALL, AND REPORT THE GATED SHARE AS IT FALLS RATHER THAN QUIETLY DISCONTINUING IT. (d) ☐ ANSWER NEGATIVE REVIEWS PUBLICLY AND LEAVE THEM STANDING — REMOVING THEM RECREATES GATING AT THE OTHER END OF THE PROCESS. (e) ☐ THE PLATFORM IS LANDLORD, TAX COLLECTOR AND COMPETITOR AT ONCE — report PLATFORM COST AS A % OF MRP as a single aggregated figure, since scattered across the P&L its combined weight is invisible; and treat OWN-CHANNEL SHARE as a number that must rise, BECAUSE A BRAND THAT CANNOT REACH ITS OWN CUSTOMERS IS A SUPPLIER WITH A LOGO. (f) ☐ CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS IS THE ONLY HONEST MARGIN — a D2C plan led by gross margin is describing a business that does not exist. (g) ☐ THE RETURN IS THE MOST HONEST PRODUCT FEEDBACK A BRAND EVER RECEIVES — code the reason and fix the product, SINCE REFUSING**

MORE RETURNS MOVES THE SAME NUMBER AND MEANS NOTHING. (h) WHERE CONVENTION DIFFERS FROM WHAT A READER UNDERSTANDS, PRINT BOTH NUMBERS RATHER THAN THE FLATTERING ONE.

- Economics & cash — **CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS IS THE ONLY HONEST MARGIN: GROSS MARGIN OF 48% IS REAL AND ALMOST ENTIRELY CONSUMED, WITH COMMISSION AND FULFILMENT TAKING 16.6 POINTS, ADVERTISING 9.0 AND RETURNS 4.0, LEAVING 18.4%** (Y1 –₹1.42cr → Y2 –₹18L → Y3 +₹3.36cr; revenue ₹18.60cr→₹56cr; gated solicitation 34%→NIL and incentivised reviews 21%→NIL with verified-purchase share 62%→96%; RETURN RATE PUBLISHED BESIDE THE RATING ON 100% OF LISTINGS, rating 4.1→4.3 against a return rate 11.8%→4.6%; returns resaleable 41%→68%, refurbished-disclosed 0%→27%, scrapped 59%→5% AND NOTHING OPENED SOLD AS NEW; tested-versus-claimed published 0%→100% with average overstatement 22.4%→NIL; platform cost 46.6%→29.6% of MRP; own channel 4%→24%; repeat purchase 9%→31%; CAC ₹412→₹268; ROCE (28.4%)→50.9%; **BREAK-EVEN YEAR 3, AND TWO LOSS YEARS ARE THE MODEL RATHER THAN A MISFORTUNE — A D2C BRAND PROMISING YEAR-1 PROFITABILITY IS EITHER GATING, UNDER-INVESTING IN PRODUCT, OR NOT COUNTING THE PLATFORM; AND THE CASH SHAPE IS A SETTLEMENT CYCLE THE BRAND DOES NOT CONTROL PLUS A FESTIVAL PEAK FUNDED MONTHS BEFORE IT PAYS — STOCK PLACED INTO FULFILMENT CENTRES AND ADVERTISING PREPAID WHILE THE PLATFORM SETTLES NET OF FEES AND A RETURNS RESERVE, SO THE BEST TRADING QUARTER CONSUMES THE MOST WORKING CAPITAL**). Regulatory (section 9): **CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 2019 AND THE E-COMMERCE RULES MAKING FAKE OR PROCURED REVIEWS AN UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICE, AND BIS IS 19000 REQUIRING THAT A SELLER NOT SELECTIVELY SOLICIT ONLY FAVOURABLE REVIEWS — SO GATING IS NOT A WORKAROUND BUT THE SPECIFIC PRACTICE THE FRAMEWORK ADDRESSES**; CCPA guidelines on misleading advertisements and endorsements; **LEGAL METROLOGY ON mAh AND WATTAGE AS DECLARED QUANTITIES, SO AN INFLATED POWER-BANK RATING IS A FALSE DECLARATION BEFORE IT IS MARKETING; BIS CRO REGISTRATION PER MODEL HELD IN THE BRAND'S OWN NAME**; EPR falling on the brand AS PRODUCER rather than the platform; lithium storage and transport; marketplace seller agreements as the document determining how much of the business the brand controls; GST with TCS and returns. Lender/investor note (section 13): **AN EQUITY PROPOSITION WITH NOTHING TO SECURE BEYOND INVENTORY AND TWO LOSS YEARS BY DESIGN; THE DIAGNOSTIC IS CONTRIBUTION AFTER PLATFORM COSTS, NOT GROSS MARGIN; ASK HOW REVIEWS ARE SOLICITED AND TREAT "WE HAVE NEVER BOUGHT A REVIEW" AS AN INCOMPLETE ANSWER — A BRAND THAT CANNOT DESCRIBE ITS SOLICITATION POLICY IN ONE SENTENCE IS PROBABLY GATING; and ASK FOR THE RETURN RATE BESIDE THE RATING BY SKU, SINCE A 4.5-STAR BRAND WITH AN 11% RETURN RATE IS SELLING A PRODUCT PEOPLE DO NOT KEEP — THE MOST RELIABLE QUALITY SIGNAL AVAILABLE TO AN OUTSIDE INVESTOR, WHICH IS PRECISELY WHY NOBODY PUBLISHES IT**. ₹5.40cr; revenue ₹18.60→56.00cr; 56→145 staff; ROCE (28.4%)→50.9%. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

► **Use these tools now — free on AiSevak**

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on aisevak.in. Open the [Electronics toolkit](https://aisevak.in/verticals/electronics) to browse and use them all at <https://aisevak.in/verticals/electronics> — 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.

Prepared by AiSevak.in — a product of ABL Digital Technologies. AI-powered business services for India. This is AI-assisted guidance; figures are illustrative and not a guarantee of results. Verify all numbers, licences and regulatory requirements with a qualified professional before relying on this plan for binding decisions. © 2026 ABL Digital Technologies Private Limited.