



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Fish-Feed and Aqua-Input Manufacturing

Aqua feed sold on digestible protein and published trial results, because crude protein counts nitrogen and the farmer cannot run a control

FISHERIES AND AQUACULTURE

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 a **Fish-Feed & Aqua-Input Manufacturing** business in India — extruded shrimp and finfish feed, specialty and functional feeds, minerals, probiotics and water conditioners, plus contract manufacturing and trial services, producing about 6,800 tonnes a year at an average realisation of ₹1.00 lakh per tonne by Year 3.

This plan inherits the ten fisheries anchor rules and takes **anchor (e) — feed traceable and its fishmeal source declared — as one of its cores**. It sits upstream of every other plan in the vertical: feed is 55–60% of a farmer's cash cost, and he cannot verify a single thing about it.

☐ **THE LABEL COUNTS NITROGEN AND THE ANIMAL NEEDS AMINO ACIDS.** "Crude protein 38%" is not a measurement of protein — it is a measurement of NITROGEN, multiplied by 6.25 and called protein. Feather meal, leather meal and non-protein nitrogen all raise that figure while delivering little or nothing the shrimp can digest, **SO A FEED CAN BE HONESTLY LABELLED 38% CRUDE PROTEIN AND FEED LIKE 28%.** The declaration is accurate, the test is correct, the label is lawful, **AND THE NUMBER ON THE BAG DOES NOT DESCRIBE WHAT THE ANIMAL RECEIVES.** No Indian labelling requirement asks for DIGESTIBLE protein or for an amino-acid profile, so the only figure the farmer is given is the one that can be inflated without feeding anything. So this mill **PUBLISHES DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND THE LYSINE AND METHIONINE PROFILE PER BATCH, at 100%, with NIL** feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen in any formulation.

☐ **AND THE FARMER CANNOT RUN A CONTROL.** The only outcome that matters is FCR — feed conversion ratio — and **IT CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED ON A SINGLE FARM**, because it is confounded by seed quality, stocking density, water quality, disease pressure and weather. Five variables, one observation, no control pond: **SO A BAD FEED AND A BAD SEASON ARE INDISTINGUISHABLE TO THE MAN WHO PAID FOR BOTH.** THE ONE MEASUREMENT THAT WOULD EXPOSE A POOR FEED IS STRUCTURALLY UNAVAILABLE TO THE ONLY PERSON WITH AN INTEREST IN MAKING IT. So we run the trial he cannot: **38 REPLICATED POND TRIALS** with the protocol published — same seed, same water, same density, feed the only variable — **INCLUDING 6 IN WHICH OUR OWN FEED UNDERPERFORMED.** WHERE THE LABEL MEASURES A PROXY AND THE OUTCOME CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED, THE BUYER HOLDS TWO NUMBERS AND NEITHER TELLS HIM ANYTHING — **SO PUBLISH THE DIGESTIBLE FRACTION AND RUN THE TRIAL HE CANNOT.**

☐ **AND OUR OWN GROWTH IS COUPLED TO ADVICE WE THINK IS WRONG.** The dealer who sells our feed is, in most of this market, also the farmer's lender and the buyer of his harvest — and **OUR TONNAGE RISES WHEN HE RECOMMENDS HEAVIER FEEDING AND DENSER STOCKING, WHICH IS THE ADVICE THAT RAISES DISEASE RISK.** So we publish a **FEEDING CHART PER STOCKING DENSITY** — the only document in the chain capable of contradicting the dealer — and pay **NIL volume-linked dealer incentives, forgoing ₹2.24 crore.**

This plan models an operator requiring **₹22.00 crore** (₹8.80 crore term loan + ₹5.60 crore investor + ₹4.80 crore working capital + ₹2.80 crore promoter), moving from **₹24.00 crore revenue and a ₹0.44 crore loss** to **₹68.00 crore revenue and ₹3.40 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 5.0% net margin and 24.0% return on capital. (Aqua feed — figures illustrative.)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A feed mill that publishes what the animal actually absorbs.

Vision: To replace a nitrogen number with a nutrition number.

Mission: Publish digestible protein and the amino-acid profile; use no feather meal or non-protein nitrogen; run replicated trials and publish the ones we lose; declare the fishmeal source and audit the fish-in-fish-out ratio; and pay no dealer a rupee for selling more.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended. Feed licensing, institutional supply, raw-material import and outside capital all assume it.
- **Trial publication as a scheduled release, not an editorial decision — the structural precondition, since a trial programme that publishes selectively is a marketing department with ponds.**
- **Formulation authority held outside sales — because the cheapest way to hit a crude-protein specification is always the one that feeds the animal least.**

Regulatory anchor: BIS standards for aquaculture feeds and the feed provisions of state Animal Feed orders, **which prescribe CRUDE PROTEIN — nitrogen $\times$ 6.25 — and DO NOT REQUIRE DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN OR ANY AMINO-ACID DECLARATION, so the single most important nutritional fact about a feed is one no manufacturer is obliged to disclose and few measure;** the Legal Metrology (Packaged Commodities) Rules for bag declarations and net weight; FSSAI and CAA provisions on prohibited substances in aqua feed, including antibiotic growth promoters; the Insecticides Act and the Drugs and Cosmetics framework where functional additives make therapeutic claims, **a boundary probiotics and immunostimulants are routinely marketed across;** import regulations and quarantine on fishmeal and fish oil; the Factories Act, EPF, ESI and dust and extrusion safety obligations; environmental consents for boiler, dryer emissions and effluent; and the Consumer Protection Act on representation. **The decisive structural fact is that THE LABEL IS REQUIRED TO STATE A NUMBER THAT CAN BE RAISED WITHOUT FEEDING THE ANIMAL, AND IS NOT REQUIRED TO STATE THE NUMBER THAT CANNOT.**

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with feed manufacturing, animal nutrition or aqua-input background, with a nutrition head and a trials lead. Three competences decide outcomes. *Formulation under raw-material volatility*, because fishmeal and soya move independently and a formulation locked to a digestible-protein promise cannot be quietly re-cut when they do. *Capacity utilisation*, since an extrusion line is a fixed-cost machine and eighteen points of utilisation moves profit further than any price change. And *the willingness to publish a trial we lost*, which is the whole proposition and which happened six times in Year 3. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **trial publication is a scheduled release rather than an editorial decision, and formulation authority sits outside sales.**

4. Market Analysis — India

The largest single cost in aquaculture, sold on a number that does not measure nutrition.

Demand drivers

- **Aquaculture expansion** in shrimp, pangasius, tilapia and carp.
- **Shift from farm-made to extruded pellet feed** for better water stability.
- **Rising FCR awareness** among larger and better-capitalised farmers.
- **Functional and specialty feeds** as disease pressure rises.
- **Export-buyer pressure** pushing traceability upstream into inputs.
- **Fishmeal substitution research** creating a genuine formulation frontier.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian aqua-feed demand across shrimp and finfish	Large; feed is 55-60% of farm cash cost
SAM	Volume we can formulate without feather meal or NPN	Bounded by FORMULATION, not by demand
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Tonnes sold on a published digestible-protein figure	₹24cr → ₹68cr; 6,800 tonnes; 38 published trials

Revenue mix and share (Year 3)

Stream	Share	Gross margin — and where the substitution pressure sits
Shrimp feed — grower & finisher	42.0%	16.0% — highest volume; where crude protein is gamed
Finfish feed — carp, pangasius, tilapia	22.0%	13.0% — thinnest margin; most price-driven
Shrimp feed — starter & nursery	14.0%	24.0% — highest protein spec; least tolerant of filler
Specialty & functional feed	10.0%	30.0% — where therapeutic claims are routinely made
Aqua inputs — minerals, probiotics, conditioners	8.0%	34.0% — the least regulated shelf in the trade
Contract manufacturing & trial services	4.0%	28.0% — running trials for buyers, including rivals

The first row is where substitution pays best: at 42% of revenue and the thinnest price tolerance, two points of digestible protein removed via feather meal is invisible on the label and worth more than the entire specialty margin. The third row is the opposite — starter feed at 45-50% protein cannot absorb filler without failing visibly within days, WHICH IS WHY THE INDUSTRY'S STARTER FEEDS ARE GENERALLY HONEST AND ITS GROWER FEEDS ARE NOT: the feedback loop is short enough to discipline one and far too long to discipline the other. The sixth row is deliberate — we run controlled trials as a paid service, including for competitors, because a market with more published trial data is one where our own disclosure stops being a disadvantage.

Constraints

- **Fishmeal and soya prices**, independent, volatile and 82% of material cost.
- **Capacity utilisation**, the dominant fixed-cost variable in extrusion.
- **Formulation discipline**, which caps the cheapest routes to a specification.
- **Dealer distribution**, where we decline the incentive structure everyone else uses.

5. Competition & Position

Competitor type	Strength	Weakness this plan exploits
Multinational feed manufacturers	Formulation science, scale, brand, technical service	Crude protein on the bag; trials rarely published
Large Indian feed mills	Distribution depth, price, dealer relationships, credit	Volume-linked dealer incentives couple sales to over-feeding
Regional and small mills	Cheapest, local, flexible, informal credit	Feather meal and NPN routine; no digestibility data

Farm-made and wet feed	Lowest cash cost; uses local trash fish	Poor water stability; worst FIFO ratio of all
This plan	Digestible protein published, replicated trials including losses, FIFO audited, nil volume incentives	Higher cost; declines the trade's distribution model

The positioning gives the farmer a number he can compare and a trial he can read, and it is aimed at the larger and better-capitalised farms first, because they are the only ones who already suspect that FCR is telling them nothing. The honest difficulty is distribution: the trade moves feed through dealers paid on tonnage, and **WE ARE ASKING THEM TO SELL A PRODUCT ON WHICH THEY EARN NO VOLUME BONUS, AT A HIGHER PRICE, TO A FARMER WHOSE CREDIT THEY HOLD** — a structural refusal to participate in the mechanism that moves ninety per cent of the market's volume. Our answer is direct extension to 5,200 farmers and a fixed dealer margin: slower, more expensive, fewer people, and the only arrangement consistent with a feeding chart that tells the farmer to use LESS.

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. Declining volume-linked dealer incentives and refusing to endorse over-feeding recommendations forgave ₹2.24 crore of gross profit — the largest item, off the P&L because it is tonnage never sold, and the one every competitor's distribution model is built on. The controlled trial farm — replicated ponds, monitoring, and publication of results including the ones we lost — cost ₹1.86 crore. Digestible-protein and amino-acid testing on every batch cost ₹98 lakh. Declaring the fishmeal source and auditing the fish-in-fish-out ratio cost ₹72 lakh. Total ₹5.80 crore against ₹3.40 crore of profit — so a mill with the same plant and the same dealers running trade-standard practice would earn ₹9.20 crore.

6. The Label Counts Nitrogen and the Animal Needs Amino Acids

This is the finding, and it is a measurement error that the law requires.

What is declared	What it actually measures
Crude protein 38%	Nitrogen × 6.25
Feather meal contribution	Nitrogen, largely indigestible
Non-protein nitrogen	Nitrogen, no amino acids at all
Digestible protein	Not required; rarely measured
Lysine and methionine	Not required; the limiting nutrients

"Crude protein 38%" is not a measurement of protein. It is nitrogen, multiplied by the conventional factor of 6.25 and given a protein's name — done that way for a century because nitrogen is cheap to measure and protein is not. **THE CONVENTION IS SOUND ONLY IF THE NITROGEN IS PRESENT AS DIGESTIBLE AMINO ACIDS, AND NOTHING IN THE TEST OR THE LABEL REQUIRES THAT IT IS.** Feather meal is nitrogen-rich and largely indigestible to shrimp; leather meal likewise; non-protein nitrogen contributes to the reading and contains no amino acids at all. **SO A FEED CAN BE HONESTLY LABELLED 38% CRUDE PROTEIN AND FEED THE ANIMAL LIKE 28% — accurate declaration, correct test, lawful label, and a farmer told a true fact that does not describe what he bought.**

What makes this durable rather than merely regrettable is the second half of the problem: **THE FARMER CANNOT MEASURE THE OUTCOME EITHER.** The number that would expose a poor feed is FCR — kilograms of feed per kilogram of growth — and on a real farm it is **CONFOUNDED BY SEED QUALITY, STOCKING DENSITY, WATER QUALITY, DISEASE PRESSURE AND WEATHER**, every one of which moves it further than a two-point protein difference does. He has five variables, one observation and no control pond. **A BAD FEED AND A BAD SEASON ARE THEREFORE INDISTINGUISHABLE TO THE MAN WHO PAID FOR BOTH** — and if his crop underperforms he will conclude, reasonably and wrongly, that it was the water or the seed. **THE LABEL IS MEASURABLE AND MISLEADING; THE OUTCOME IS MEANINGFUL AND UNMEASURABLE** — and between those two facts there is no route by which a farmer can learn what his feed is worth, **WHICH IS WHY THE MARKET CLEARS ON PRICE PER BAG AND CRUDE PROTEIN AND WHY IT WOULD BE IRRATIONAL FOR IT TO DO ANYTHING ELSE.**

So the mill publishes the number the law does not ask for, and runs the experiment the farmer cannot. **DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND THE LYSINE AND METHIONINE PROFILE ARE PUBLISHED PER BATCH at 100%, with NIL feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen in any formulation** — and **FORMULATION AUTHORITY SITS OUTSIDE SALES**, because the cheapest way to hit a crude-protein specification is always the one that feeds the animal least, and that route has to be closed by structure rather than by intention. And **38 REPLICATED POND TRIALS** were run and published **WITH THE PROTOCOL** — same seed, same water, same density, same management, feed as the only variable — which is the only design under which FCR means anything at all. **SIX OF THOSE TRIALS SHOWED OUR OWN FEED UNDERPERFORMING, AND ALL SIX WERE PUBLISHED**, because a trial programme that reports only its wins is a marketing department with ponds, and every reader knows it. The publication runs on a schedule with no editorial gate for exactly that reason. **WHERE THE LABEL MEASURES A PROXY AND THE OUTCOME CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED, THE BUYER HOLDS TWO NUMBERS AND NEITHER TELLS HIM ANYTHING — SO PUBLISH THE DIGESTIBLE FRACTION AND RUN THE TRIAL HE CANNOT.**

7. Our Growth Is Coupled to Advice We Think Is Wrong

Two further findings, one of which implicates this business directly.

☐ **THE DEALER WHO SELLS OUR FEED IS THE FARMER'S LENDER AND THE BUYER OF HIS HARVEST.** That structure was set out in the shrimp-farming plan as the farmer's problem; **SEEN FROM THE MILL IT IS OUR OPPORTUNITY, AND THAT IS THE UNCOMFORTABLE PART.** Our tonnage rises when the dealer recommends heavier feeding and denser stocking — and those are precisely the recommendations that raise disease risk and destroy the crop. **A FEED MANUFACTURER PAYING VOLUME-LINKED DEALER INCENTIVES IS BUYING EXACTLY THAT ADVICE, WHETHER OR NOT ANYONE INTENDS IT**, because an incentive on tonnage is an incentive on the recommendation that produces tonnage. So we **PUBLISH A FEEDING CHART PER STOCKING DENSITY** — which is the only document anywhere in the chain capable of contradicting the dealer, since it comes from the manufacturer and tells the farmer to use **LESS** — and pay **NIL** volume-linked incentives, with dealer margin **FIXED** rather than escalating, forgoing ₹2.24 crore. **NIL** feed was sold above our own published rate for the stated density, which is the test of whether the chart is real.

☐ **AND THE FISHMEAL IN AQUA FEED IS ITSELF WILD-CAUGHT.** The vertical's anchor (e) becomes the core question here: a farmed-shrimp industry built to relieve pressure on wild stocks **CONSUMES WILD FISH TO DO IT**, and for much of its history has consumed more wild protein than it produced. The ratio has a name — **fish-in-fish-out** — and almost nobody in India publishes it, partly because the source fisheries are small, unregulated and often composed of juveniles that would otherwise have grown. So the **FISHMEAL SOURCE IS**

DECLARED and the FIFO RATIO AUDITED AND PUBLISHED, falling from 1.42 to 0.94 kg of wild fish per kg of farmed output — crossing below one, which is the point at which the industry stops being a net consumer of wild protein — with NIL fishmeal of undeclared origin and 6 batches rejected on provenance.

□ **AND THE FUNCTIONAL-ADDITIVE SHELF IS THE LEAST REGULATED IN THE VERTICAL.** Probiotics, immunostimulants and gut-health products are marketed with claims about disease resistance and survival that **WOULD REQUIRE A DRUG LICENCE IF MADE ABOUT A HUMAN**, and the boundary is routinely crossed because nothing at all sits on the other side of it. So every functional claim we make is supported by one of our own replicated trials or is not made — which is why the specialty line is 10% of revenue rather than the 20% the margin would justify.

What a farmer can check in sixty seconds, before buying

The first question is one almost no bag in India can answer.

- **Does the bag state digestible protein, or only crude protein?** Crude protein is nitrogen. Nitrogen is not food.
- **Is lysine and methionine listed?** Those are the limiting nutrients. Their absence from the label is the answer.
- **Does the ingredient list include feather or leather meal?** Both raise the declared figure and feed almost nothing.
- **Is there a replicated trial, and does it name the control?** An FCR claim without a control pond is a story.
- **Has the manufacturer ever published a trial it lost?** If not, you are reading advertising with a table in it.
- **Does your dealer earn more for selling you more?** If so, his feeding advice and his invoice point the same way.

The asymmetry here is unusual because **BOTH** of the farmer's numbers fail him, in opposite directions. The label is precise, cheap, universally reported and **NOT MEASURING WHAT HE NEEDS TO KNOW**; the outcome measures exactly what he needs and **IS SO CONFOUNDED THAT IT CANNOT BE READ**. He is not short of information — **HE IS SURROUNDED BY IT, AND NONE OF IT RESOLVES. THAT IS RARER AND MORE DURABLE THAN CONCEALMENT**, because there is nothing hidden to expose and no villain to name: the crude-protein convention is a century-old shorthand, the confounding of FCR is a fact about ponds, and everyone is behaving lawfully. It also means disclosure alone cannot be the remedy — publishing digestible protein helps only if he believes the number, and he cannot check that either. **WHICH IS WHY THE TRIAL PROGRAMME IS LOAD-BEARING RATHER THAN THE LABEL**: a replicated trial is the only artefact here a farmer can evaluate **WITHOUT TRUSTING US**, because the protocol is published and the design either has a control or it does not.

8. Operations Plan (formulate, test, trial, publish)

The formulation

- **Nil feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen** in any product.
- **Formulation authority outside sales** — the cheap route to a spec stays closed.
- **Digestible protein and amino-acid profile set as the target**, not crude protein.
- **Fishmeal source declared per lot**, with provenance rejection where absent.

The batch

- **Digestible protein, lysine and methionine tested per batch** and published.
- **Traceability to raw-material lot** for every bag despatched.
- **Proximate and water-stability checks** before release.
- **Batch record retained** against later complaint investigation.

The trial

- **Replicated pond trials with a stated control** — 38 in Year 3.
- **Protocol published with the result**, not summarised after it.
- **Losses published** — 6 trials where our feed underperformed.
- **Release on a schedule**, with no editorial gate.

The channel

- **Feeding chart published per stocking density** — the document that contradicts the dealer.
- **Nil volume-linked dealer incentives**; margin fixed, not escalating.
- **Direct technical extension** to 5,200 farmers.
- **Nil feed sold above our own published rate** for the stated density.

The operational hinge is a fishmeal price spike that puts our grower formulation ₹6.80 a kilo above the market, with two large dealers already unhappy about the absence of a volume bonus. Formulation offers a lawful and invisible solution: four points of fishmeal replaced with feather meal, crude protein held at 38%, perhaps three points of digestible protein lost — **A CHANGE NO CUSTOMER COULD DETECT, NO TEST WOULD FLAG AND NO LABEL WOULD MENTION**, restoring the price gap inside a week. The argument for it is real: a mill which loses its dealers publishes nothing to anybody. So **THE SPECIFICATION IS SET ON DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND CANNOT BE MET WITH INDIGESTIBLE NITROGEN (anchor j)**; the price rise was passed through, published with its reason, and two dealers were lost. **THE FEEDING CHART MADE THAT SURVIVABLE**, because a farmer on our published rate needs materially less feed per kilo of output — **THE ONLY COMPARISON A HIGHER PRICE PER BAG CAN BE ARGUED AGAINST**.

9. Feed, Labelling & Environmental Compliance (India)

- **BIS aquaculture feed standards and state Animal Feed orders** — which prescribe **CRUDE PROTEIN** and do not require digestible protein or any amino-acid declaration.
- **Legal Metrology (Packaged Commodities) Rules** for bag declarations, net weight and ingredient listing.
- **FSSAI and CAA provisions on prohibited substances** in aqua feed, including antibiotic growth promoters (anchor c, upstream).
- **Drugs and Cosmetics framework** where functional additives make therapeutic claims — **a boundary probiotics and immunostimulants are routinely marketed across, because nothing sits on the other side of it**.
- **Import regulation and quarantine** on fishmeal and fish oil, and provenance documentation (anchor e).
- **Factories Act, EPF, ESI** and dust, boiler and extrusion safety obligations.
- **Environmental consents** for dryer emissions, boiler and effluent.
- **Consumer Protection Act** on representation and comparative claims. **The label is required to state a number that can be raised without feeding the animal, and is not required to state the number that cannot.**

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / managing director	1	1	Cannot override a formulation specification

Production — grinding, extrusion, drying, coating, bagging	28	60	113 tonnes per worker per year at 85% utilisation
Distribution, warehousing & despatch	22	48	Dealer margin fixed, not escalating
Controlled trial farm & monitoring	14	30	38 replicated trials; protocol published with result
Technical extension & farmer education	12	26	5,200 farmers reached directly
Admin, finance, legal & business development	10	22	Nil pay linked to tonnage anywhere
Laboratory — digestible protein, amino acid, proximate	8	16	Every batch; formulation authority outside sales
Total	95	203	6,800 tonnes; FIFO 0.94; 6 losing trials published

The production headcount is derived rather than assumed, and it reconciles three ways. By volume: 6,800 tonnes at 113 tonnes per production worker per year is 60 direct workers across grinding, extrusion, drying, coating and bagging — a ratio set by the extrusion line's throughput rather than by labour, since this is a capital-intensive process where people handle material rather than make it. By cost per tonne: the ₹3.56 crore of trials, digestibility testing and fishmeal provenance across 6,800 tonnes is ₹5,235 per tonne — 5.2 per cent of a ₹1.00 lakh per tonne realisation, down from ₹9,167 in Year 1, and high for a commodity conversion business because the trial farm is genuinely expensive to run. By cost per head: the ₹1.74 crore trial-farm and laboratory salary line across 46 people is ₹3.78 lakh cost-to-company each, with the remaining ₹1.10 crore of those two lines being pond operation, stocking for trials, monitoring equipment and assay consumables. Formulation authority sits with the laboratory rather than with sales, and nobody's pay is linked to tonnage.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Formation, plant & first formulations	Month 0-12	Incorporation, extrusion line, consents, feed licence, first SKUs
Laboratory commissioned; digestible protein published	Month 6-14	Every batch tested; lysine and methionine on the bag
Trial farm operating; first results published	Month 10-20	12 replicated trials in Year 1, including 3 we lost
Fishmeal provenance and FIFO audit	Month 12-22	Source declared per lot; FIFO 1.42 published
Feeding chart published; volume incentives declined	Month 14-26	Dealer margin fixed; direct extension to 3,600 farmers
Scale & trial services	Month 28-36	6,800 tonnes, 85% utilisation, FIFO 0.94, 38 trials

Training and competence

- **Running a replicated trial** so the control is real and the protocol survives reading.

- **Publishing a losing result** without hedging it into meaninglessness.
- **Selling without a volume bonus** to a dealer who is offered one everywhere else.
- **Explaining digestible protein** to a farmer who has bought on crude protein for twenty years.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees. They exist to show the drivers of an aqua-feed P&L under a digestible-protein rule. Every input is editable. **The defining economics are that this is a commodity conversion business — raw material is 82% of cost of goods, gross margin is 19.8%, and capacity utilisation moves profit further than price does: eighteen points of utilisation takes profit from ₹3.40 crore to ₹0.48 crore.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Extrusion plant, dryers, coaters & grinding	826	The fixed-cost core; utilisation decides the year
Working capital — raw material and finished stock	448	Fishmeal and soya bought against volatile prices
Controlled trial farm — replicated ponds and monitoring	268	Owned, because a hired trial is not a control
Land, building & utilities	194	Boiler, dryer emissions and effluent consents
Laboratory — digestible protein, amino acid, proximate	194	Amino-acid analysis is the expensive part
Warehousing, bagging & despatch	186	Batch traceability to raw-material lot
Licences, registrations, consents & pre-operative	84	Feed licence, BIS, consents, insurance
Total project cost	2,200	₹880L term loan + ₹560L investor + ₹480L WC + ₹280L promoter

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND AMINO-ACID PROFILE PUBLISHED PER BATCH / batches sold on a crude-protein figure alone / lysine and methionine stated on the bag / feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen in any formulation	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL	100% / NIL / 100% / NIL
REPLICATED POND TRIALS RUN AND PUBLISHED WITH THE PROTOCOL / FCR claimed without a replicated trial behind it / replicated trials completed / trials published in which OUR OWN feed underperformed	100% / NIL / 12 / 3	100% / NIL / 26 / 5	100% / NIL / 38 / 6
FISHMEAL SOURCE DECLARED AND FISH-IN-FISH-OUT RATIO AUDITED / fishmeal of undeclared origin used in any batch / FIFO ratio published (kg wild fish per kg farmed output) / batches rejected on fishmeal provenance	100% / NIL / 1.42 / 18	100% / NIL / 1.18 / 11	100% / NIL / 0.94 / 6

FEEDING CHART PUBLISHED PER STOCKING DENSITY; NIL VOLUME-LINKED DEALER INCENTIVES / dealer margin or incentive tied to tonnage sold / farmers reached by direct technical extension / feed sold above our own published rate for the stated density	100% / NIL / 1,840 / NIL	100% / NIL / 3,600 / NIL	100% / NIL / 5,200 / NIL
BATCH TRACEABLE TO RAW-MATERIAL LOT / batches despatched without lot-level ingredient records / complaint investigations closed with a stated cause / complaints attributed to our feed and compensated	100% / NIL / 68% / 14	100% / NIL / 84% / 9	100% / NIL / 96% / 5
Feed produced (tonnes) / average realisation per tonne / tonnes per production worker per year / trials, testing and provenance cost per tonne / capacity utilisation	2,400 / ₹1.00L / 86 / ₹9,167 / 48%	4,800 / ₹1.00L / 109 / ₹6,125 / 72%	6,800 / ₹1.00L / 113 / ₹5,235 / 85%

Row two's last column is the number that makes the rest of the table believable: six published trials in which our own feed lost. A trial programme reporting only wins is a marketing department with ponds, every reader knows it, and the publication therefore runs on a schedule with no editorial gate. Row three's third column crossing below 1.0 — 0.94 kg of wild fish per kg of farmed output — is the point at which this feed stops making the industry a net consumer of wild protein, and it is the single most consequential number here for anyone outside the transaction. Row four's last column at NIL throughout is the test of whether the feeding chart is real: publishing a rate and then selling above it would make the chart a brochure. Row five's fourth column shows complaints attributed to our own feed and compensated falling from 14 to 5 — reported rather than suppressed, because a complaint process that never finds against the manufacturer is not an investigation.

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Gross margin
Shrimp feed — grower & finisher	1,008	2,016	2,856	16.0%
Finfish feed — carp, pangasius, tilapia	528	1,056	1,496	13.0%
Shrimp feed — starter & nursery	336	672	952	24.0%
Specialty & functional feed	240	480	680	30.0%
Aqua inputs — minerals, probiotics, conditioners	192	384	544	34.0%
Contract manufacturing & trial services	96	192	272	28.0%
Total revenue	2,400	4,800	6,800	19.8% blended

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)
Revenue	2,400	4,800	6,800
Cost of goods — fishmeal, soya, oils, additives & conversion	(1,925)	(3,851)	(5,455)
Gross profit	475	949	1,345
Controlled FCR trial farm — replicated ponds, published protocol	(118)	(156)	(186)
Distribution, logistics & warehousing	(68)	(110)	(148)

Digestible-protein and amino-acid testing on every batch	(58)	(80)	(98)
Admin, finance, legal & business development	(62)	(74)	(86)
Fishmeal source declaration & fish-in-fish-out audit	(44)	(58)	(72)
Marketing, technical extension & farmer education	(38)	(50)	(60)
EBITDA	87	421	695
Depreciation & amortisation	(98)	(134)	(168)
Finance cost	(72)	(108)	(142)
Other income — trial services to third parties & by-products <i>(disclosed)</i>	24	44	68
PBT	(59)	223	453
Tax	15	(56)	(113)
PAT	(44)	167	340
Net margin	(1.8%)	3.5%	5.0%
ROCE	(0.5%)	13.0%	24.0%

Cost of goods at 80.2% of revenue is raw-material dominated, and fishmeal and soya move independently — which is precisely why a formulation locked to a digestible-protein promise is expensive: it removes the cheapest response to an input spike, WHICH IS THE ONE EVERY COMPETITOR REACHES FOR. The three commitment lines total ₹3.56 crore, 5.2% of revenue, and the trial farm alone is ₹1.86 crore — an unusually large line for a manufacturing plan, and it is the load-bearing one, because it is the only artefact a farmer can evaluate without trusting us. Other income of ₹68 lakh is trial services run for third parties and by-product sales, disclosed as a line and 1.0% of revenue. Commitments of ₹5.80 crore against ₹3.40 crore of profit — ₹3.56 crore of opex above plus ₹2.24 crore of gross profit forgone by declining volume-linked dealer incentives, which never reaches the P&L — mean a trade-standard mill would earn ₹9.20 crore.

12.5 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹68.0cr	₹3.40cr	As modelled, digestible protein published, trials run
Trade-standard — crude protein only, feather meal, volume incentives	₹83.0cr	₹10.29cr	The trade's model, computed rather than dismissed
Capacity utilisation falls 18 points	₹54.4cr	₹0.48cr	Extrusion is a fixed-cost machine
Fishmeal & soya prices rise 20%	₹68.0cr	₹0.71cr	82% of material cost; only partly passed through
Dealer network shifts to a volume-incentive rival	₹57.8cr	₹1.88cr	The distribution risk our model creates
A disease year cuts regional stocking 25%	₹58.5cr	₹2.12cr	Demand is downstream of the ponds' survival

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Term loan	880	Extrusion plant, laboratory, trial farm; 8 years
Investor equity	560	Trial programme and brand; publication covenant
Working capital facility	480	Fishmeal and soya against volatile prices
Promoter contribution	280	Cash and feed-manufacturing leadership
Total	2,200	Illustrative structure

A lender should read capacity utilisation, FIFO ratio, published trial count including losses, and the complaint-attribution figure — and should understand that this mill has deliberately removed its own cheapest response to an input shock. When fishmeal spikes, every competitor can re-cut the formulation behind an unchanged crude-protein label; we cannot, so a 20% raw-material rise takes profit to ₹0.71 crore where a trade-standard mill would absorb most of it invisibly. The starkest figure is that crude-protein labelling, feather meal and volume-linked dealer incentives would take profit from ₹3.40 crore to ₹10.29 crore on the same plant and the same dealers, with every step lawful. The sharpest exposure is utilisation: eighteen points takes profit to ₹0.48 crore, because extrusion is a fixed-cost machine and a half-empty line has no variable saving to offer. The dealer-shift scenario is live rather than theoretical: declining volume incentives is a standing invitation for a competitor to take the channel, and ₹1.88 crore is what fifteen per cent of it costs.

- **Use of funds** — 38% extrusion plant, 20% working capital, 12% trial farm, 9% laboratory, 9% land and building, 8% warehousing and bagging, 4% licences and pre-operative.
- **Repayment** — term loan from Year 2 cash flow; working capital revolving against raw material and dealer receivables.
- **Investor exit** — sale to a feed or agri-inputs group, an integrated aqua company or a nutrition multinational; or promoter buyback. **The digestible-protein specification, trial publication and nil-volume-incentive commitments survive change of control.**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
------	--------	------------

The label counts nitrogen and the animal needs amino acids	"CRUDE PROTEIN 38%" IS NOT A MEASUREMENT OF PROTEIN — it is NITROGEN × 6.25, done that way for a century because NITROGEN IS CHEAP TO MEASURE AND PROTEIN IS NOT. THE CONVENTION IS SOUND ONLY IF THE NITROGEN IS PRESENT AS DIGESTIBLE AMINO ACIDS, AND NOTHING IN THE TEST OR THE LABEL REQUIRES THAT IT IS. Feather meal is nitrogen-rich and largely indigestible to shrimp; NON-PROTEIN NITROGEN CONTRIBUTES TO THE READING AND CONTAINS NO AMINO ACIDS AT ALL. SO A FEED CAN BE HONESTLY LABELLED 38% CRUDE PROTEIN AND FEED THE ANIMAL LIKE 28% — ACCURATE DECLARATION, CORRECT TEST, LAWFUL LABEL, AND A FARMER TOLD A TRUE FACT THAT DOES NOT DESCRIBE WHAT HE BOUGHT. BIS standards and state Feed orders PRESCRIBE CRUDE PROTEIN AND DO NOT REQUIRE DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN OR ANY AMINO-ACID DECLARATION, so the single most important nutritional fact about a feed is one NO MANUFACTURER IS OBLIGED TO DISCLOSE. At 42% of revenue in grower feed, two points of digestible protein removed via feather meal is INVISIBLE ON THE LABEL, INVISIBLE IN THE BAG AND WORTH MORE THAN THE ENTIRE SPECIALTY MARGIN	PUBLISH THE NUMBER THE LAW DOES NOT ASK FOR. DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND THE LYSINE AND METHIONINE PROFILE PUBLISHED PER BATCH (100%), with NIL feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen in ANY formulation — and FORMULATION AUTHORITY SITS OUTSIDE SALES, BECAUSE THE CHEAPEST WAY TO HIT A CRUDE-PROTEIN SPECIFICATION IS ALWAYS THE ONE THAT FEEDS THE ANIMAL LEAST, AND THAT ROUTE HAS TO BE CLOSED BY STRUCTURE RATHER THAN BY INTENTION. Note the industry's own tell: STARTER FEEDS AT 45-50% PROTEIN ARE GENERALLY HONEST AND GROWER FEEDS ARE NOT, BECAUSE THE FEEDBACK LOOP IS SHORT ENOUGH TO DISCIPLINE ONE AND FAR TOO LONG TO DISCIPLINE THE OTHER (₹98L)
The farmer cannot run a control	The number that would expose a poor feed is FCR, and on a real farm it is CONFOUNDED BY SEED QUALITY, STOCKING DENSITY, WATER QUALITY, DISEASE PRESSURE AND WEATHER — every one of which moves it FURTHER THAN A TWO-POINT PROTEIN DIFFERENCE DOES. FIVE VARIABLES, ONE OBSERVATION, NO CONTROL POND. A BAD FEED AND A BAD SEASON ARE THEREFORE INDISTINGUISHABLE TO THE MAN WHO PAID FOR BOTH, and he will conclude, REASONABLY AND WRONGLY, that it was the water or the seed. THE LABEL IS MEASURABLE AND MISLEADING; THE OUTCOME IS MEANINGFUL AND UNMEASURABLE — BETWEEN THOSE TWO FACTS THERE IS NO ROUTE BY WHICH A FARMER CAN LEARN WHAT HIS FEED IS WORTH, WHICH IS WHY THE MARKET CLEARS ON PRICE PER BAG AND CRUDE PROTEIN	RUN THE EXPERIMENT HE CANNOT. 38 REPLICATED POND TRIALS published WITH THE PROTOCOL — same seed, same water, same density, same management, FEED AS THE ONLY VARIABLE, which is the only design under which FCR means anything at all. SIX SHOWED OUR OWN FEED UNDERPERFORMING AND ALL SIX WERE PUBLISHED, BECAUSE A TRIAL PROGRAMME THAT REPORTS ONLY ITS WINS IS A MARKETING DEPARTMENT WITH PONDS AND EVERY READER KNOWS IT — publication runs on a SCHEDULE WITH NO EDITORIAL GATE for exactly that reason (₹1.86cr). GENERAL RULE: WHERE THE LABEL MEASURES A PROXY AND THE OUTCOME CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED, THE BUYER HOLDS TWO NUMBERS AND NEITHER TELLS HIM ANYTHING — SO PUBLISH THE DIGESTIBLE FRACTION AND RUN THE TRIAL HE CANNOT

Our growth is coupled to advice we think is wrong	The dealer who sells our feed is ALSO THE FARMER'S LENDER AND THE BUYER OF HIS HARVEST — set out in the shrimp-farming plan as the farmer's problem, but SEEN FROM THE MILL IT IS OUR OPPORTUNITY, AND THAT IS THE UNCOMFORTABLE PART. Our tonnage rises when he recommends HEAVIER FEEDING AND DENSER STOCKING, and those are precisely the recommendations that RAISE DISEASE RISK AND DESTROY THE CROP. A FEED MANUFACTURER PAYING VOLUME-LINKED DEALER INCENTIVES IS BUYING EXACTLY THAT ADVICE, WHETHER OR NOT ANYONE INTENDS IT, BECAUSE AN INCENTIVE ON TONNAGE IS AN INCENTIVE ON THE RECOMMENDATION THAT PRODUCES TONNAGE	PUBLISH A FEEDING CHART PER STOCKING DENSITY — THE ONLY DOCUMENT ANYWHERE IN THE CHAIN CAPABLE OF CONTRADICTING THE DEALER, SINCE IT COMES FROM THE MANUFACTURER AND TELLS THE FARMER TO USE LESS — and pay NIL volume-linked incentives, dealer margin FIXED rather than escalating, forgoing ₹2.24cr. NIL feed sold above our own published rate for the stated density, WHICH IS THE TEST OF WHETHER THE CHART IS REAL. Direct technical extension to 5,200 farmers; nil pay linked to tonnage anywhere in the business
The fishmeal is itself wild-caught	A farmed-shrimp industry built to RELIEVE PRESSURE ON WILD STOCKS CONSUMES WILD FISH TO DO IT, and for much of its history has CONSUMED MORE WILD PROTEIN THAN IT PRODUCED. The ratio has a name — FISH-IN-FISH-OUT — and almost nobody in India publishes it, partly because the source fisheries are SMALL, UNREGULATED AND OFTEN COMPOSED OF JUVENILES THAT WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE GROWN	FISHMEAL SOURCE DECLARED and FIFO RATIO AUDITED AND PUBLISHED, 1.42 → 0.94 kg wild fish per kg farmed output — CROSSING BELOW ONE, WHICH IS THE POINT AT WHICH THIS FEED STOPS MAKING THE INDUSTRY A NET CONSUMER OF WILD PROTEIN. NIL fishmeal of undeclared origin; 6 batches rejected on provenance (anchor e) (₹72L)
The input spike that makes substitution rational	A fishmeal spike puts our grower formulation ₹6.80 A KILO ABOVE THE MARKET with two large dealers already unhappy about the absent volume bonus. Formulation offers an ENTIRELY LAWFUL AND INVISIBLE solution: four points of fishmeal replaced with feather meal, CRUDE PROTEIN HELD AT 38%, three points of digestible protein lost — A CHANGE NO CUSTOMER COULD DETECT, NO TEST WOULD FLAG AND NO LABEL WOULD MENTION, RESTORING THE PRICE GAP INSIDE A WEEK. And the argument for it is real: A MILL WHICH LOSES ITS DEALERS PUBLISHES NOTHING TO ANYBODY	THE FORMULATION SPECIFICATION IS SET ON DIGESTIBLE PROTEIN AND CANNOT BE MET WITH INDIGESTIBLE NITROGEN — the system refuses rather than warns (anchor j). The price rise was PASSED THROUGH, PUBLISHED WITH ITS REASON, and TWO DEALERS WERE LOST. THE FEEDING CHART MADE THAT SURVIVABLE, BECAUSE A FARMER USING OUR PUBLISHED RATE NEEDS MATERIALLY LESS FEED PER KILO OF OUTPUT, AND THAT COMPARISON IS THE ONLY THING A HIGHER PRICE PER BAG CAN BE ARGUED AGAINST
The functional-additive shelf is unregulated	Probiotics, immunostimulants and gut-health products are marketed with claims about disease resistance and survival that would require a drug licence if made about a human, and the boundary is crossed because nothing sits on the other side of it	Every functional claim supported by one of our own replicated trials or not made at all — which is why the specialty line is 10% of revenue rather than the 20% the margin would justify; and contract trial services offered to third parties, including competitors, because a market with more published trial data is one where our own disclosure stops being a disadvantage
Utilisation, raw material and distribution	Extrusion is a fixed-cost machine so 18 points of utilisation is ₹0.48cr; fishmeal and soya +20% is ₹0.71cr; a dealer shift of 15% of revenue is ₹1.88cr	Contract manufacturing at 4% of revenue to fill the line; finfish feed as counter-cyclical volume when shrimp stocking falls; raw-material forward buying within formulation constraints; and direct extension to 5,200 farmers so demand is not wholly intermediated by the channel we decline to incentivise

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths • Digestible protein and amino acids published per batch • Nil feather meal, leather meal or non-protein nitrogen • 38 replicated trials published, including 6 we lost • FIFO audited and published — 1.42 → 0.94 • Nil volume-linked dealer incentives; feeding chart published	Weaknesses • ₹5.80cr forgone against ₹3.40cr of profit • No cheap response to an input spike • Declines the distribution model of the whole market • Utilisation-critical; 18 points takes profit to ₹0.48cr
Opportunities • Larger farmers who already distrust their FCR • Any digestible-protein labelling rule would favour us • Trial services sold to buyers and competitors • Fishmeal substitution as a genuine formulation frontier • Export-buyer pressure pushing traceability into inputs	Threats • Rivals re-cutting formulations invisibly on a price spike • Dealer channel shifting to volume-incentive competitors • Fishmeal and soya price volatility • Disease years cutting regional stocking and demand

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Digestible-protein batch register** — DP, lysine and methionine per batch, published to the bag.
- **Formulation lock** — specification set on digestible protein; indigestible nitrogen cannot satisfy it.
- **Replicated trial manager** — protocol, control, result and scheduled publication with no editorial gate.
- **FIFO audit ledger** — fishmeal source per lot and fish-in-fish-out ratio published.
- **Feeding chart generator** — recommended rate per stocking density, per species, per stage.
- **Dealer margin register** — fixed margins; volume-linked incentives blocked at entry.
- **Complaint attribution tracker** — investigations closed with a stated cause, including against us.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, tonnage, realisation, raw-material prices, utilisation and trial costs are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on fishmeal and soya markets, regional stocking, disease pressure and channel access. Figures are in Indian rupees. **This plan inherits the ten fisheries anchor rules (a)-(j) and takes anchor (e) as one of its cores.**
- **The central finding is that the label counts nitrogen and the animal needs amino acids.** "Crude protein 38%" is nitrogen × 6.25, a century-old shorthand that is sound only if the nitrogen is present as digestible amino acids — and nothing in the test or the label requires that it is. **Feather meal, leather meal and non-protein nitrogen all raise the reading while feeding little or nothing, so a feed can be honestly labelled 38% crude protein and feed like 28%: accurate declaration, correct test, lawful label, and a farmer told a true fact that does not describe what he bought.**
- **What makes it durable is that the farmer cannot measure the outcome either.** FCR is confounded by seed, density, water, disease and weather — five variables, one observation, no control pond. **A bad feed and a bad season are indistinguishable to the man who paid for both, and he will most often conclude, reasonably and wrongly, that it was the water or the seed.** The label is measurable and misleading; the outcome is meaningful and unmeasurable. **Between those two facts there is no route by which a farmer can learn what his feed is worth**

— which is why the market clears on price per bag and crude protein, and why it would be irrational for it to do anything else.

- **So the mill publishes what the law does not ask for and runs the experiment the farmer cannot.** Digestible protein and the amino-acid profile per batch, nil feather meal or NPN, and formulation authority outside sales — because the cheapest route to a crude-protein specification is always the one that feeds the animal least. **38 replicated trials with the protocol published, six of which showed our own feed underperforming and all six published, because a trial programme reporting only its wins is a marketing department with ponds. WHERE THE LABEL MEASURES A PROXY AND THE OUTCOME CANNOT BE ATTRIBUTED, THE BUYER HOLDS TWO NUMBERS AND NEITHER TELLS HIM ANYTHING — SO PUBLISH THE DIGESTIBLE FRACTION AND RUN THE TRIAL HE CANNOT.**
- **Our own growth is coupled to advice we think is wrong, and this plan says so.** The dealer who sells our feed is the farmer's lender and the buyer of his harvest; our tonnage rises when he recommends heavier feeding and denser stocking, which is exactly what raises disease risk. **A feed manufacturer paying volume-linked dealer incentives is buying that advice whether or not anyone intends it, because an incentive on tonnage is an incentive on the recommendation that produces tonnage.** Hence a feeding chart that tells the farmer to use less, and nil volume incentives, at ₹2.24 crore.
- **The fishmeal in aqua feed is itself wild-caught.** An industry built to relieve pressure on wild stocks consumes wild fish to do it, and for much of its history consumed more wild protein than it produced. **The fish-in-fish-out ratio fell from 1.42 to 0.94 — crossing below one, the point at which this feed stops making the industry a net consumer of wild protein** — with source declared per lot and six batches rejected on provenance.
- **The asymmetry is unusual because both of the farmer's numbers fail him, in opposite directions.** The label is precise, cheap, universally reported and not measuring what he needs; the outcome measures exactly what he needs and is too confounded to read. **He is not short of information — he is surrounded by it, and none of it resolves. That is rarer and more durable than concealment, because there is nothing hidden to expose and no villain to name.** It also means disclosure alone cannot be the remedy: publishing digestible protein helps only if he believes it, and he cannot check that either. **Which is why the trial programme is load-bearing rather than the label — a replicated trial is the only artefact in this market a farmer can evaluate without trusting us.**
- **Compliance and professional advice.** BIS aquaculture feed standards and state Animal Feed orders, **which prescribe crude protein and do not require digestible protein or any amino-acid declaration;** Legal Metrology bag declarations; FSSAI and CAA provisions on prohibited substances including antibiotic growth promoters; the Drugs and Cosmetics framework where functional additives make therapeutic claims, **a boundary probiotics and immunostimulants are routinely marketed across;** import regulation and quarantine on fishmeal and fish oil; the Factories Act, EPF, ESI and dust, boiler and extrusion safety; environmental consents for dryer emissions and effluent; and the Consumer Protection Act on representation and comparative claims. **The label is required to state a number that can be raised without feeding the animal, and is not required to state the number that cannot.** Professional advice should be taken on comparative-claim substantiation, functional-additive claim boundaries, trial-publication liability, and fishmeal import provenance documentation.

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

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