



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

LMS Platform Business

Subscription learning software built for Indian institutional constraints

ONLINE EDUCATION & CREATOR BUSINESSES

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 **Learning Management System (LMS) Platform** business in India — a subscription software product sold to **schools, colleges and universities, corporates, and training providers**, covering course delivery, assessment, learner tracking, compliance reporting and integrations, with implementation, support and usage-based revenue alongside it.

This is the first and only product business in this vertical, and it inverts every convention the preceding plans established. There is no content to produce, no learner to teach, no project to deliver. In their place: **software economics — a heavy build before any revenue exists, near-zero marginal cost for each additional customer, and value that compounds rather than resetting.** That last property is precisely **the answer to the content agency's central problem**, where every project ended and the next began from zero. **What the plan must be honest about is the price of that answer: roughly two years of losses, ₹1.85 crore of capital, and a Year 1 in which the business loses 45% of its own revenue.** Compounding is real, but it is bought.

The competitive position must be stated plainly because it is uncomfortable: this product competes against free, and against incumbents with fifteen-year head starts. Moodle is open-source; Google Classroom costs nothing; global platforms have budgets this business will not match for a decade. **The honest response to "free" is total cost of ownership rather than features** — free software still needs hosting, customisation, upgrades, support and someone whose job it is, and institutions consistently underestimate all five. **The only defensible Indian position is depth on the things global platforms do badly:** vernacular interface and content handling, **low-bandwidth and genuinely offline-first delivery**, UPI and local fee collection, **NEP, AICTE, UGC and NAAC compliance reporting**, and pricing that fits an Indian institutional budget. **Offline-first is the sharpest of these — a platform that assumes reliable connectivity has silently excluded a large part of the country**, and no global vendor is going to build for that constraint.

Two structural traps shape the operating plan. The first is **the buyer-user split, which appeared in the corporate-training plan and produces a specific pathology here: feature bloat.** An LMS is bought by an administrator and used by learners, so **features accumulate because they win procurement checklists, not because anyone uses them — the RFP is, in a real sense, the enemy of the product**, since every "does it have X?" answered yes adds code to be maintained forever. This plan therefore reports **feature adoption — the share of shipped features used by more than 10% of customers, 54% rising to 78% — a number most vendors would rather not calculate.** The second is **services drift:** the constant temptation to accept lucrative customisation work, which slowly converts a product company into an agency. **Custom development is capped and falls from 9.2% to 4.1% of revenue, because the business it turns into is the one described in the preceding plan.**

This plan models a business requiring **₹1.85 crore** (₹65 lakh promoter + ₹95 lakh investor funding + ₹25 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹1.6 crore revenue and a ₹72 lakh loss** in Year 1 to **₹8.05 crore revenue and ₹1.35 crore profit** by Year 3, with **net revenue retention reaching 121%.** (*SaaS product; retention- and payback-driven — figures illustrative.*)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A multi-tenant learning platform sold on annual subscription — course delivery, assessments, learner analytics, certification, compliance reporting, mobile and offline access, and integrations with student information, HR and payment systems — with implementation, support and usage-based revenue attached.

Vision: To be the platform Indian institutions choose because it was built for their constraints, not adapted to them.

Mission: Work on a weak connection; report what the regulator actually asks for; refuse features that only win checklists; and stay a product company when services money is offered.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — effectively required: external funding, ESOPs, enterprise contracting, IP holding and institutional procurement.
- **LLP** — unsuitable once external equity is contemplated.
- **Proprietorship** — not viable for a funded software product.

Regulatory anchor: the binding obligations are **data protection and security**, and a school LMS raises the sharpest version of both. **The DPDP Act imposes specific requirements where children's personal data is processed — verifiable parental consent, and prohibitions on tracking and behavioural advertising directed at children** — which means a platform serving schools carries obligations a corporate LMS does not, and must be architected for them rather than retrofitted. Beyond that: **data residency and localisation commitments** that institutional buyers increasingly require in contract; **security certification (ISO 27001, SOC 2 or equivalent), which is often a procurement gate rather than a differentiator**; breach notification obligations; accessibility standards where public institutions are buyers; **education-sector compliance outputs — NEP, AICTE, UGC and NAAC reporting formats — which are a product feature, not a legal duty of the vendor**; and clear terms on customer data ownership and exit, since **an institution will ask what happens to its data if it leaves, and the answer must be written down before it is asked**.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with software product and education-technology background. Three competences decide outcomes: *product discipline*, which means saying no to features that win a deal and cost a decade; *enterprise and institutional selling*, since the sales motion is long, committee-driven and unlike anything else in this vertical; and *capital management through a loss-making build*, because the business consumes money for two years before it produces any. Product judgement, retention, sales-cycle management & capital discipline are the differentiators. Ownership, equity, ESOP pool & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand is driven by NEP-driven digitisation of higher education, blended learning in schools, corporate compliance training, skilling programmes, and training providers needing a delivery platform. The market is large and genuinely underserved at the price and constraint profile Indian institutions require. It is **procurement-driven, price-sensitive, long-cycle and sticky once won**.

Demand drivers

- **NEP-driven digitisation** in higher education, with associated reporting and credit-framework requirements.
- **Blended and hybrid delivery** in schools, now a permanent expectation rather than a pandemic artefact.
- **Corporate compliance training**, where the completion record is the deliverable — the buyer described in the corporate-training plan.
- **Training providers and edtechs** needing delivery infrastructure they do not want to build.
- **Government skilling programmes** at large scale, low price and slow payment.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian institutional & corporate LMS spend	Large, growing
SAM	Segments served at this price and feature depth	Segment-bounded
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Accounts won and retained	34 → 218 customers; ~14.8L learners

The segment choice matters more here than in any other plan in this vertical, because school, higher-education and corporate buyers are three different businesses wearing one product. Schools buy on price, need parent-facing features and children's-data compliance, and churn when a principal changes. **Higher education** buys through committees on 9-12 month cycles, needs compliance reporting and student-information integration, and once implemented **almost never leaves — the stickiest customer available**. **Corporates** buy fastest, pay best, need HR-system integration and audit-grade completion records, and churn hardest when an L&D head changes. **A platform chasing all three simultaneously in Year 1 builds three roadmaps and finishes none**, which is the most common way early LMS companies dissipate their capital. This plan leads with higher education and corporates — the two with defensible retention — and treats schools as a later expansion.

Target segments

- **Colleges & universities** — long cycles, high stickiness, compliance-reporting need.
- **Corporates & enterprises** — faster cycles, better rates, integration-heavy.
- **Training providers & edtechs** — platform-as-infrastructure, usage-driven.
- **Schools** — volume, price pressure, children's-data obligations.
- **Government & skilling programmes** — scale at low price, slow collection.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: Moodle and open-source alternatives (free), Google Classroom (free), global platforms such as Canvas, Blackboard, Docebo and Moodle Workplace, HR-suite learning modules bundled into existing enterprise contracts, and Indian competitors at similar stage. **The two hardest competitors are free software and a module the customer already owns.**

The business's edge

- **Offline-first and low-bandwidth architecture** — the constraint global vendors do not design for.
- **Vernacular support** in interface, content handling and assessments.
- **NEP / AICTE / UGC / NAAC reporting built in**, which no global platform will build for one market.
- **UPI and Indian fee-collection workflows** rather than card-first international payment assumptions.
- **Implementation that actually completes** — the failure point that decides renewals.

Competing against free requires an honest argument rather than a dismissive one, because Moodle is genuinely capable software and pretending otherwise loses credibility with a technical buyer. The truthful case is **total cost of ownership**: free software still requires hosting, security patching, version upgrades that break customisations, integration work, and **at least one person whose job it is** — costs institutions routinely underestimate because they are absorbed into existing salaries rather than appearing on an invoice. **The comparison to make is the fully-loaded annual cost including internal effort, not licence fee against zero**, and it should be made with the

institution's own numbers rather than a vendor's. **Where that comparison genuinely favours the free option — a well-resourced institution with a capable IT team and simple needs — the right answer is to walk away**, because a customer who bought against their own arithmetic churns at renewal and tells others why.

6. Product & Revenue Model

Line	Model	Basis
Subscription — institutions	Annual, per learner / band	Stickiest; long cycle
Subscription — corporates & providers	Annual, per seat / tier	Best rates; integration-led
Implementation, migration & onboarding	One-time fee	15% → 8.4% — falling by design
Support, AMC & premium SLA	Annual, tiered	Recurring, high margin
Usage-based (storage, streaming, assessments)	Metered	Grows with account, no selling

Two revenue disciplines protect the model from becoming something else. Implementation fees must fall as a share of revenue, not rise — a growing one-time line means onboarding is getting harder, which is the opposite of what a product should do, and it flatters revenue while disguising a product problem. **Custom development is the more dangerous line.** An institution offers ₹15 lakh for a feature only it will use; the money is real, the engineering team is already hired, and refusing feels wasteful. **Accept enough of those and the roadmap belongs to customers rather than to the product, engineering time is spent on code that serves one account, and the company has quietly become the content agency from the previous plan — a services business with worse margins and a codebase nobody can maintain.** The rule applied here: **build it only if at least three customers want it, and price it as product rather than as bespoke work.** Custom development is held to 9.2% falling to 4.1% of revenue.

7. Go-to-Market — Long Cycles, Slow Money, Sticky Endings

Winning accounts

- **Direct enterprise and institutional sales**, which is the only motion that works for a 6–12 month committee decision.
- **Reference customers within a segment** — institutions buy what comparable institutions bought, more than they buy features.
- **Compliance reporting as the wedge**, since it is a concrete, dated pain no global platform solves.
- **Partner and reseller channels** in regions the direct team cannot cover.

Keeping and growing them

- **Implementation that completes** — measured as **time-to-first-active-learner**, not as contract signature.
- **Expansion within the account** — more departments, more seats, more modules — which is what drives net revenue retention above 100%.
- **Renewal treated as the most important deal of the year**, because it costs a fraction of a new logo and carries the accumulated implementation investment.
- **Usage growth**, which increases revenue without any selling at all.

Sales approach

Lead with higher education and corporates → win on constraints global vendors ignore → implement fast enough that the platform is genuinely live → expand within the account → renew. **The strategic fact underneath all of it is that the migration barrier cuts both ways.** Once an institution's courses, learners, records and integrations are in a platform, **moving is expensive, risky and politically unattractive for whoever proposes it** — which means **the hardest sale in this business is prising a customer away from an incumbent, and the deal that must never be lost is renewal.** A competitor's customer will not switch for a better feature; they switch when something has failed badly enough to justify the pain. **Every retained renewal compounds; every lost one hands a competitor a moat that was yours.**

8. Operations Plan (build, sell, implement, retain)

- **Product engineering:** multi-tenant architecture, **offline-first mobile**, assessments, analytics, integration APIs, on a roadmap owned by the product team.
- **Security & compliance:** certification, penetration testing, data residency, **children's-data handling where schools are served.**
- **Enterprise sales:** pipeline through 6–12 month cycles, RFP responses, pilots, procurement navigation.
- **Implementation & migration:** data import, configuration, integration, training — **the single biggest determinant of renewal.**
- **Customer success:** adoption monitoring, expansion, renewal management, executive relationships.
- **Support:** tiered SLA, with academic-calendar peaks that are entirely predictable and must be staffed for.
- **Cloud operations:** uptime, scaling for examination peaks, cost per learner managed down.
- **Product governance:** **feature adoption reviewed and unused features deprecated rather than accumulated.**

Customer lifecycle

Stage	Activity	Control point
Pipeline	Enterprise/institutional selling	Sales cycle 9.5 → 6.5 months
Close	Procurement, security review, contract	CAC and payback period
Implement	Migration, config, integration, training	Time-to-first-active-learner 68 → 26 days
Adopt	Learner activity, admin usage	Active learners; feature adoption
Expand	Seats, departments, modules, usage	Net revenue retention 96% → 121%
Renew	Annual renewal	Gross logo churn 18% → 8%

Implementation is where software companies of this kind die quietly, and the death is invisible for eleven months. A contract is signed, revenue is recognised, the pipeline looks healthy — **and the platform never actually goes live, because data migration stalled, an integration was harder than scoped, or the champion who bought it moved on and nobody else owns it.** The customer is not unhappy; they are simply not using the product. **Then renewal arrives and there is no case for spending the money, so the account churns and the CAC is written off entirely.** The discipline that prevents this is measuring **time-to-first-active-learner rather than time-to-contract** — an account is not won when it is signed, it is won when learners are on it — and treating a stalled implementation as an emergency in month two rather than a surprise in month twelve. **Reducing this from 68 to 26 days is worth more to the business than any single feature on the roadmap,** because it converts signed contracts into renewable ones.

9. Regulatory, Data Protection & Security (India)

- **Children's data (DPDP Act):** where schools are served, **verifiable parental consent is required, with prohibitions on tracking and behavioural advertising directed at children** — obligations that must be architected in, not retrofitted.
- **Data protection generally:** learner personal data, purpose limitation, retention, breach notification, and processor obligations to institutional customers.
- **Data residency & localisation** commitments, increasingly written into institutional contracts.
- **Security certification** (ISO 27001 / SOC 2 or equivalent) — **usually a procurement gate rather than a differentiator**; penetration testing on a defined cycle.
- **Customer data ownership & exit: the institution will ask what happens to its data if it leaves — the answer must be written down before it is asked**, in an export format that genuinely works.
- **Accessibility standards** where public institutions and government are buyers.
- **Education compliance outputs** — NEP, AICTE, UGC, NAAC formats — a product capability rather than a vendor obligation, and a principal reason to buy Indian.
- Uptime and service-credit commitments in SLA; GST on SaaS, with export treatment for overseas customers.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / product head	1	2	2
Product engineering & QA	24	42	72
Sales & enterprise business development	10	20	36
Implementation & migration	6	12	22
Customer success & account management	5	11	20
Support	5	10	18
Marketing	3	6	11
Admin, finance & accounts	3	5	9
Total	57	108	190

Engineering is 42% of headcount in Year 1 against 34 customers — which is the software shape stated in people rather than rupees: **the product must largely exist before the market is asked to pay for it**. Implementation and customer success together grow faster than sales, because in a subscription business **the revenue is won at renewal, not at signature**.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Build	Month 0–8	Core platform, offline-first mobile, compliance reporting, security certification, pilots
Launch	Month 8–12	34 customers; ₹1.6cr revenue, ₹72L loss; NRR 96%

Prove	Year 2	96 customers, NRR crosses 100% to 108% ; ₹3.68cr, ₹12L loss
Scale	Year 3	218 customers, ~14.8L learners; ₹8.05cr, ₹1.35cr profit; NRR 121%, payback 14 months

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. **Net revenue retention, CAC payback, sales-cycle length and time-to-first-active-learner are the levers — and NRR crossing 100% is the single event that turns this from a cash-consuming business into a compounding one.**

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Product engineering & platform build	68,00,000
Working capital (salaries through pre-revenue build)	42,00,000
Sales, marketing & enterprise pipeline	32,00,000
Cloud infrastructure, security & compliance certification	18,00,000
Implementation & customer success setup	12,00,000
Legal, IP, certifications & registrations	8,00,000
Office & equipment	5,00,000
Total project cost	1,85,00,000
Promoter contribution	65,00,000
Investor funding	95,00,000
Working-capital finance	25,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Subscription — institutions (schools, colleges, universities)	62,00,000	1,42,00,000	3,15,00,000
Subscription — corporates & training providers	48,00,000	1,18,00,000	2,68,00,000
Implementation, migration & onboarding fees	24,00,000	42,00,000	68,00,000
Support, AMC & premium SLA	14,00,000	34,00,000	78,00,000
Usage-based (storage, video streaming, assessments)	12,00,000	32,00,000	76,00,000
Total revenue	1,60,00,000	3,68,00,000	8,05,00,000
Product engineering & development	88,00,000	1,28,00,000	2,18,00,000
Sales & marketing (enterprise pipeline)	52,00,000	96,00,000	1,78,00,000
Cloud infrastructure, hosting & security	26,00,000	44,00,000	82,00,000

Implementation & customer success	24,00,000	40,00,000	68,00,000
Support & operations	16,00,000	30,00,000	56,00,000
Office, overheads & admin	12,00,000	20,00,000	36,00,000
Depreciation, interest & other	14,00,000	22,00,000	32,00,000
Total expenses	2,32,00,000	3,80,00,000	6,70,00,000
Net profit / (loss) before tax	(72,00,000)	(12,00,000)	1,35,00,000
Net margin	(45.0%)	(3.3%)	16.8%
Net Revenue Retention — the SaaS metric	96%	108%	121%
Gross logo churn	18%	12%	8%
CAC payback period (months)	26	19	14
Enterprise sales cycle (months)	9.5	8.0	6.5
Time-to-first-active-learner (days)	68	42	26
Feature adoption — shipped features used by >10% of customers	54%	66%	78%
Custom development as % of revenue — capped by design	9.2%	6.4%	4.1%
Recurring subscription revenue as % of total	68.8%	70.7%	72.4%
Gross margin	68%	74%	79%
Customers / Active learners / DSO (days)	34 / ~1.4L / 92	96 / ~5.2L / 78	218 / ~14.8L / 64

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **Net revenue retention crossing 100% is the single most important event in this plan.** Below it, the business must sell new logos merely to stand still; above it, **existing customers grow the revenue base without any new selling — and expansion at 121% means the installed base alone would grow the business at 21% a year if sales stopped entirely.**
- **CAC payback at 26 months in Year 1 is the honest picture of institutional SaaS in India,** where the sales cycle alone is 9.5 months. **It is why this business needs two years of capital and why a promoter modelling it on months-to-payback assumptions borrowed from consumer software will run out of money.**
- **Time-to-first-active-learner is a revenue metric, not an operations one** — an account that never goes live churns at renewal with the full CAC written off.
- **Gross margin rising 68% → 79%** reflects the marginal-cost property: the 218th customer costs far less to serve than the 34th, which is the entire reason to build software rather than sell services.
- **Break-even: Year 3. Year 1 loses 45% of its own revenue and Year 2 still loses money — this is the only plan in the library with that shape, and it is the software shape rather than a flaw in the model.**

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	1,40,00,000	1,10,00,000	86,00,000	66,00,000
Collections	28,00,000	34,00,000	38,00,000	42,00,000

Engineering, sales, cloud, implementation & overheads	58,00,000	58,00,000	58,00,000	58,00,000
Closing balance	1,10,00,000	86,00,000	66,00,000	50,00,000

This cash profile is fundamentally different from every other plan in this vertical and must be read as such: the business burns roughly ₹90 lakh in Year 1 against a fixed cost base that does not flex with revenue. Engineering salaries are the same in a bad quarter as a good one, which means **runway rather than profitability is the number that governs decisions** — and a delayed enterprise close does not reduce costs, it consumes a month of life. Three disciplines follow. **Bill annually in advance wherever possible**, which is worth more than a price increase: it converts a twelve-month collection into a single upfront one and is the standard reason SaaS businesses survive their own growth. **Watch DSO honestly** — Indian educational institutions pay slowly and government slower, so **a signed ₹40 lakh contract collected at 92 days is not ₹40 lakh of cash, and a business planning on booked revenue will be surprised by its own bank balance.** And **size the raise for eighteen months beyond the plan, not twelve**: sales cycles slip, implementations overrun, and **the most common cause of failure in this category is not a bad product but a company that ran out of money four months before its retention curve turned.**

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Retention economics: net revenue retention**; gross logo churn; expansion revenue from existing accounts; renewal rate by segment.
- **Efficiency: CAC payback period**; sales-cycle length; pipeline conversion by segment; magic-number style efficiency of sales spend.
- **Delivery: time-to-first-active-learner**; stalled implementations; active-learner ratio per account; uptime against SLA.
- **Product discipline: feature adoption above the 10% threshold**; features deprecated; **custom development as % of revenue**; roadmap items driven by three-or-more customers.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹95 lakh investor funding plus ₹25 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹65 lakh promoter contribution. Four points frame this, and the first is that **this is an equity proposition rather than a debt one. There is no security** — the assets are code, a customer list and a team — and **a business that loses money for two years by design cannot service term debt out of cash flow**; working-capital finance against confirmed institutional receivables is appropriate, term lending is not. **Second, the metric to underwrite is net revenue retention, not revenue growth. A platform growing revenue 60% with NRR at 85% is buying customers who leak away and will stop growing the moment the funding does; one growing 40% with NRR at 120% has a compounding asset.** **Third, ask what proportion of signed accounts are actually live** — signed-but-unimplemented contracts are the standard way this category flatters itself, and they churn at renewal with full CAC written off. **Fourth, ask how much revenue came from custom development**: a rising share indicates the company is becoming a services business with a software valuation, which is **the single most common quiet failure in Indian B2B software** and shows up in margins two years after it shows up in the roadmap.

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Product engineering & platform build	68,00,000	36.8%
Working capital (salaries through pre-revenue build)	42,00,000	22.7%

Sales, marketing & enterprise pipeline	32,00,000	17.3%
Cloud infrastructure, security & compliance certification	18,00,000	9.7%
Implementation & customer success setup	12,00,000	6.5%
Legal, IP, certifications & registrations	8,00,000	4.3%
Office & equipment	5,00,000	2.7%
Total	1,85,00,000	100%

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
Competing against free (Moodle, Google Classroom)	Moodle is genuinely capable software and pretending otherwise loses credibility with a technical buyer. Argue total cost of ownership — hosting, patching, upgrades that break customisations, integration, and at least one person whose job it is — using the institution's own numbers. Where the comparison genuinely favours free, walk away: a customer who bought against their own arithmetic churns and tells others why
Global incumbents with 15-year head starts	Do not compete on breadth. Depth on what they do badly: offline-first and low-bandwidth, vernacular, UPI and Indian fee workflows, NEP/AICTE/UGC/NAAC reporting. Offline-first is the sharpest — a platform assuming reliable connectivity has silently excluded a large part of the country, and no global vendor will build for that constraint
Feature bloat from the buyer-user split	An LMS is bought by an administrator and used by learners , so features accumulate to win procurement checklists — the RFP is the enemy of the product, since every "does it have X?" answered yes adds code maintained forever. Report feature adoption (54% → 78%) and deprecate what nobody uses
Services drift	A ₹15L custom feature for one account feels wasteful to refuse. Accept enough and the roadmap belongs to customers, engineering serves single accounts, and the company has quietly become the CONTENT AGENCY from the previous plan — a services business with worse margins and an unmaintainable codebase. Rule: build only if three-plus customers want it; custom dev capped 9.2% → 4.1%
Stalled implementations	Where SaaS companies die quietly, invisibly, for eleven months — contract signed, revenue recognised, platform never live because migration stalled or the champion left. The customer isn't unhappy, they just aren't using it; then renewal arrives with no case to spend, and the full CAC is written off. Measure time-to-first-active-learner (68 → 26 days) , treat a stall as a month-two emergency
Long cycle vs upfront CAC	Payback of 26 months against a 9.5-month sales cycle is the honest picture — a promoter using payback assumptions borrowed from consumer software will run out of money. Annual billing in advance; segment focus; raise for eighteen months beyond plan, not twelve
Chasing three segments at once	Schools, higher education and corporates are three businesses in one product. A platform chasing all three in Year 1 builds three roadmaps and finishes none — the commonest way early LMS companies dissipate capital. Lead with higher ed and corporates; schools later
Children's data (DPDP)	Verifiable parental consent, and prohibitions on tracking and behavioural advertising directed at children — architected in, not retrofitted, before the school segment is entered

Security incident or certification gap	ISO 27001 / SOC 2 as a procurement gate ; penetration testing on cycle; data residency in contract; breach-notification readiness
Slow institutional collection	A signed ₹40L contract collected at 92 days is not ₹40L of cash, and a business planning on booked revenue will be surprised by its own bank balance. Annual advance billing, milestone-linked implementation fees, DSO 92 → 64

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths Near-zero marginal cost per additional customer and value that COMPOUNDS rather than resetting — the answer to the content agency's central problem; gross margin rising to 79%; migration barrier makes retained customers extremely sticky; recurring revenue 72%; constraints (offline, vernacular, compliance) that global vendors will not build for.	Weaknesses Loses 45% of its own revenue in Year 1 and does not break even until Year 3; ₹1.85cr of capital before compounding begins; 9.5-month sales cycles with CAC paid upfront; no security for lenders; fixed cost base that does not flex when a quarter disappoints; revenue depends on implementations completing.
Opportunities NEP-driven higher-education digitisation and its reporting requirements; corporate compliance training; training providers wanting infrastructure rather than a build; usage-based expansion growing revenue without selling; regional and vernacular depth; eventual export to comparable markets with the same constraints.	Threats Free and open-source alternatives; learning modules bundled free into HR suites the customer already owns; global vendors moving down-market on price; funding-market conditions during a two-year loss period; a security or children's-data incident; the slow conversion into a services company nobody notices until margins fall.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This LMS platform business would use AiSevak's E-learning and Technology vertical tools in operations:

- **Retention economics: net revenue retention and expansion tracking**, gross logo churn by segment, renewal calendar and risk scoring.
- **Efficiency: CAC payback and sales-cycle analytics**, pipeline conversion by segment, sales-spend efficiency.
- **Delivery: time-to-first-active-learner dashboard and stalled-implementation alerts**, active-learner ratio per account, SLA and uptime reporting.
- **Product discipline: feature-adoption reporting against the 10% threshold**, deprecation log, **custom-development revenue share monitor**.
- **Compliance**: children's-data consent records, security-certification calendar, data-residency and exit-obligation register.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- LMS platform: multi-tenant subscription software for schools, colleges and universities, corporates and training providers — course delivery, assessment, analytics, certification, compliance reporting, offline/mobile access and integrations, with implementation, support and usage-based revenue attached.
- **⚠ THE FIRST AND ONLY PRODUCT/SOFTWARE BUSINESS IN THE VERTICAL, AND IT INVERTS EVERY CONVENTION THE PRECEDING PLANS ESTABLISHED** — no content to produce, no learner taught directly, no project to deliver; instead **SOFTWARE ECONOMICS: A HEAVY BUILD BEFORE ANY REVENUE EXISTS, NEAR-ZERO**

MARGINAL COST PER ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER, AND VALUE THAT COMPOUNDS RATHER THAN RESETTING — that last property being **PRECISELY THE ANSWER TO THE CONTENT AGENCY'S CENTRAL PROBLEM** (where every project ended and the next began from zero). What must be stated honestly is **THE PRICE OF THAT ANSWER: roughly two years of losses, ₹1.85cr of capital, and a Year 1 in which the business LOSES 45% OF ITS OWN REVENUE** — the **ONLY** plan in the library with that shape, and **IT IS THE SOFTWARE SHAPE RATHER THAN A FLAW IN THE MODEL. COMPOUNDING IS REAL, BUT IT IS BOUGHT.**

- **THE COMPETITIVE POSITION MUST BE STATED PLAINLY BECAUSE IT IS UNCOMFORTABLE: THIS PRODUCT COMPETES AGAINST FREE, AND AGAINST INCUMBENTS WITH FIFTEEN-YEAR HEAD STARTS** (Moodle open-source, Google Classroom free, Canvas/Blackboard/Docebo, and learning modules bundled into HR suites the customer **ALREADY OWNS**). The honest response to "free" is **TOTAL COST OF OWNERSHIP** rather than features — **free software still needs hosting, security patching, version upgrades that BREAK CUSTOMISATIONS, integration work, and AT LEAST ONE PERSON WHOSE JOB IT IS, costs institutions routinely underestimate because they are absorbed into existing salaries rather than appearing on an invoice** → compare fully-loaded annual cost **INCLUDING** internal effort, using the institution's **OWN** numbers; and **WHERE THAT COMPARISON GENUINELY FAVOURS FREE** — a well-resourced institution with a capable IT team and simple needs — **THE RIGHT ANSWER IS TO WALK AWAY, because a customer who bought against their own arithmetic CHURNS AT RENEWAL AND TELLS OTHERS WHY** (Moodle is genuinely capable software and pretending otherwise loses credibility with a technical buyer). **THE ONLY DEFENSIBLE INDIAN POSITION IS DEPTH ON WHAT GLOBAL PLATFORMS DO BADLY: vernacular interface and content, LOW-BANDWIDTH AND GENUINELY OFFLINE-FIRST delivery, UPI and Indian fee-collection workflows, NEP/AICTE/UGC/NAAC compliance reporting, and pricing that fits an Indian institutional budget — OFFLINE-FIRST BEING THE SHARPEST, SINCE A PLATFORM THAT ASSUMES RELIABLE CONNECTIVITY HAS SILENTLY EXCLUDED A LARGE PART OF THE COUNTRY, AND NO GLOBAL VENDOR IS GOING TO BUILD FOR THAT CONSTRAINT.**
- **TWO STRUCTURAL TRAPS SHAPE THE OPERATING PLAN. (1) THE BUYER-USER SPLIT (from corporate-training-online) PRODUCES A SPECIFIC PATHOLOGY HERE: FEATURE BLOAT** — an LMS is **BOUGHT BY AN ADMINISTRATOR AND USED BY LEARNERS**, so features accumulate because they **WIN PROCUREMENT CHECKLISTS**, not because anyone uses them, and **THE RFP IS IN A REAL SENSE THE ENEMY OF THE PRODUCT, SINCE EVERY "DOES IT HAVE X?" ANSWERED YES ADDS CODE TO BE MAINTAINED FOREVER** → report **FEATURE ADOPTION** (share of shipped features used by >10% of customers, 54%→78%), **A NUMBER MOST VENDORS WOULD RATHER NOT CALCULATE**, and deprecate rather than accumulate. **(2) SERVICES DRIFT** — an institution offers ₹15L for a feature only it will use; the money is real, engineering is already hired, refusing feels wasteful → **ACCEPT ENOUGH AND THE ROADMAP BELONGS TO CUSTOMERS RATHER THAN THE PRODUCT, ENGINEERING SERVES SINGLE ACCOUNTS, AND THE COMPANY HAS QUIETLY BECOME THE CONTENT AGENCY FROM THE PREVIOUS PLAN — A SERVICES BUSINESS WITH WORSE MARGINS AND A CODEBASE NOBODY CAN MAINTAIN; rule = build only if THREE-PLUS customers want it, price it as product not bespoke** (custom dev 9.2%→4.1%). Related: **implementation fees must FALL as a share (15%→8.4%) — a GROWING one-time line means onboarding is getting HARDER, the opposite of what a product should do, and it flatters revenue while disguising a product problem.**
- **SEGMENT CHOICE MATTERS MORE HERE THAN IN ANY OTHER PLAN IN THE VERTICAL BECAUSE SCHOOLS, HIGHER EDUCATION AND CORPORATES ARE THREE DIFFERENT BUSINESSES WEARING ONE PRODUCT** — schools buy on price, need parent-facing features and children's-data compliance, and **churn when a principal changes**; higher ed buys through committees on 9-12 month cycles, needs compliance reporting and SIS integration, and once implemented **ALMOST NEVER LEAVES — THE STICKEST CUSTOMER AVAILABLE**; corporates buy fastest, pay best, need HR integration and audit-grade records, and **churn hardest when an L&D head changes. A PLATFORM CHASING ALL THREE SIMULTANEOUSLY IN YEAR 1 BUILDS THREE ROADMAPS AND FINISHES NONE — THE MOST COMMON WAY EARLY LMS COMPANIES DISSIPATE THEIR CAPITAL** → lead with higher ed +

corporates (defensible retention), schools later. **THE MIGRATION BARRIER CUTS BOTH WAYS: once courses, learners, records and integrations are in, moving is expensive, risky and POLITICALLY UNATTRACTIVE FOR WHOEVER PROPOSES IT — so THE HARDEST SALE IS PRISING A CUSTOMER AWAY FROM AN INCUMBENT, AND THE DEAL THAT MUST NEVER BE LOST IS RENEWAL; a competitor's customer will not switch for a better feature, they switch when something has FAILED badly enough to justify the pain. EVERY RETAINED RENEWAL COMPOUNDS; EVERY LOST ONE HANDS A COMPETITOR A MOAT THAT WAS YOURS.**

- **IMPLEMENTATION IS WHERE SOFTWARE COMPANIES OF THIS KIND DIE QUIETLY, AND THE DEATH IS INVISIBLE FOR ELEVEN MONTHS — contract signed, revenue recognised, pipeline healthy, and the platform NEVER ACTUALLY GOES LIVE because migration stalled, an integration was harder than scoped, or the champion who bought it moved on and nobody else owns it; THE CUSTOMER IS NOT UNHAPPY, THEY ARE SIMPLY NOT USING THE PRODUCT — then renewal arrives with no case to spend the money, the account churns and THE CAC IS WRITTEN OFF ENTIRELY → measure TIME-TO-FIRST-ACTIVE-LEARNER rather than time-to-contract (AN ACCOUNT IS NOT WON WHEN IT IS SIGNED, IT IS WON WHEN LEARNERS ARE ON IT), treat a stall as a month-two emergency not a month-twelve surprise, and note that reducing 68→26 days IS WORTH MORE TO THE BUSINESS THAN ANY SINGLE FEATURE ON THE ROADMAP because it converts signed contracts into RENEWABLE ones.**
- **NET REVENUE RETENTION CROSSING 100% IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT EVENT IN THIS PLAN (96%→108%→121%) — below it the business must sell new logos MERELY TO STAND STILL; above it existing customers grow the revenue base with NO new selling, and at 121% THE INSTALLED BASE ALONE WOULD GROW THE BUSINESS 21% A YEAR IF SALES STOPPED ENTIRELY. CAC PAYBACK AT 26 MONTHS AGAINST A 9.5-MONTH SALES CYCLE IS THE HONEST PICTURE OF INSTITUTIONAL SaaS IN INDIA — it is why this needs two years of capital and WHY A PROMOTER MODELLING IT ON PAYBACK ASSUMPTIONS BORROWED FROM CONSUMER SOFTWARE WILL RUN OUT OF MONEY. Gross margin 68%→79% is the marginal-cost property: the 218th customer costs far less to serve than the 34th, WHICH IS THE ENTIRE REASON TO BUILD SOFTWARE RATHER THAN SELL SERVICES. Engineering is 42% of Y1 headcount against 34 customers — the software shape stated in people: THE PRODUCT MUST LARGELY EXIST BEFORE THE MARKET IS ASKED TO PAY FOR IT; implementation + customer success grow faster than sales because in a subscription business THE REVENUE IS WON AT RENEWAL, NOT AT SIGNATURE.**
- Cash is **fundamentally different from every other plan in this vertical: ~₹90L burned in Y1 against A FIXED COST BASE THAT DOES NOT FLEX WITH REVENUE — engineering salaries are identical in a bad quarter, so RUNWAY RATHER THAN PROFITABILITY GOVERNS DECISIONS, and a delayed enterprise close DOES NOT REDUCE COSTS, IT CONSUMES A MONTH OF LIFE → bill ANNUALLY IN ADVANCE (worth more than a price increase; converts twelve-month collection into one upfront, the standard reason SaaS businesses survive their own growth); watch DSO honestly since Indian institutions pay slowly and government slower — A SIGNED ₹40L CONTRACT COLLECTED AT 92 DAYS IS NOT ₹40L OF CASH, AND A BUSINESS PLANNING ON BOOKED REVENUE WILL BE SURPRISED BY ITS OWN BANK BALANCE; and SIZE THE RAISE FOR EIGHTEEN MONTHS BEYOND THE PLAN, NOT TWELVE, because THE MOST COMMON CAUSE OF FAILURE IN THIS CATEGORY IS NOT A BAD PRODUCT BUT A COMPANY THAT RAN OUT OF MONEY FOUR MONTHS BEFORE ITS RETENTION CURVE TURNED. Compliance: DPDP children's-data obligations (verifiable parental consent; no tracking or behavioural advertising directed at children) ARCHITECTED IN, NOT RETROFITTED, data residency, ISO 27001/SOC 2 as a procurement GATE not a differentiator, and customer data ownership and exit written down BEFORE the institution asks, in an export format that genuinely works. Funding note: this is an EQUITY proposition not a debt one — no security (code, a customer list, a team), and a business losing money for two years BY DESIGN cannot service term debt from cash flow; underwrite NRR not revenue growth, since A PLATFORM GROWING REVENUE 60% WITH NRR AT 85% IS BUYING CUSTOMERS WHO LEAK AWAY AND WILL STOP GROWING THE MOMENT THE FUNDING DOES, WHILE ONE GROWING 40% AT NRR**

120% HAS A COMPOUNDING ASSET; ask what proportion of SIGNED accounts are actually LIVE (signed-but-unimplemented contracts are how this category flatters itself); and ask how much revenue came from CUSTOM DEVELOPMENT, since a rising share means a services business with a software valuation — THE SINGLE MOST COMMON QUIET FAILURE IN INDIAN B2B SOFTWARE, showing up in margins two years after it shows up in the roadmap. ₹1.85cr, 34→218 customers, ~1.4L→14.8L learners, rev 1.6→8.05cr, Y1 —₹72L → Y2 —₹12L → Y3 ₹1.35cr. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

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

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

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.