



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

MarTech Consultancy

Build the scoreboard, own nothing on it

AGENCIES & MARKETING-SERVICES FIRMS

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 **Marketing Technology (MarTech) Consultancy** in India — measurement architecture and attribution engineering, platform implementation and integration, stack audit and vendor-independent selection, retained martech operations and governance, and consent architecture and data governance.

This is the only plan in the marketing vertical that sells no marketing at all. It sells the plumbing every other plan depends on and none of them own: the event schema, the tag manager, the customer data platform, the attribution model, the consent layer, the warehouse. And that gives it a role none of the others can occupy. **Ten preceding plans in this vertical argued about the same problem — that the client cannot verify whether the work caused the result, and the agency both performs the work and reports on it. This business is the one that can take that reporting away from them. The martech consultancy builds the scoreboard the sellers were accused of controlling, which makes its independence not a virtue it displays but the entire product it sells.**

The industry's defining failure is not bad technology; it is technology bought and never implemented. Indian enterprises routinely pay licence fees for years on platforms that were configured for a fortnight and abandoned — a customer data platform holding three data sources, an automation suite sending one newsletter, an analytics tier nobody has the credentials for. **The most valuable sentence a martech consultancy can say is "you already own this", and it is the sentence that earns it the least.** This plan measures it anyway: **licensed capability already owned but unused, identified at audit, rises from ₹18 lakh to ₹34 lakh per client per year** — money the client keeps, not money the consultancy makes — and **rationalisation engagements that REDUCED the client's licence spend rise from 6 to 19.**

The conflict that decides whether this business is worth hiring sits at platform selection, and it is nearly universal in the category. Implementation-partner programmes pay referral fees, licence margin or tiered rebates to the consultancy that recommends and deploys a vendor's product. **A consultancy paid by the vendor it recommends is a reseller wearing an advisor's title, and the client has no way to tell the difference — the recommendation looks identical either way.** This plan carries **vendor referral fees, rebates and licence margin at NIL**, and discloses partner status on **100% of recommendations**. The cost is real and immediate: **licence margin is one of the largest and easiest revenue lines available in this industry, and refusing it means charging visibly for advice that competitors appear to give away.**

The technical product is the one thing that makes every other agency in this vertical accountable: a governed event schema, server-side collection, identity resolution, consent-aware tagging, and attribution computed in the client's own warehouse rather than in a platform owned by the party being evaluated. The metric that matters most is deliberately blunt — **clients able to reconcile platform-reported conversions against warehouse truth, rising from 19% to 76%.** That single capability is what turns every claim made by every other plan in this vertical from an assertion into a checkable statement.

This plan models a consultancy requiring **₹34 lakh** (₹20 lakh promoter + ₹6 lakh investor + ₹8 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹1.38 crore revenue and a ₹5 lakh profit** in Year 1 — **the only first-year profit in the vertical** — to **₹3.4 crore revenue and ₹44 lakh profit** by Year 3. (*Senior technical consulting business — figures illustrative.*)

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A vendor-independent measurement and marketing-technology practice — definitions before platforms, adoption before deployment, warehouse truth before platform reporting, and no money from anybody it recommends.

Vision: To be the firm whose numbers every other agency has to answer to.

Mission: Take nothing from vendors; agree what a customer is before configuring anything; tell clients what they already own; make consent actually gate the tags; and measure adoption rather than deployment.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — recommended: enterprise contracting, data-processing obligations, professional indemnity.
- **LLP** — natural for a partner-led consulting practice.
- **Proprietorship** — viable for a solo consultant; unsuited to enterprise implementation work.

Regulatory anchor: the obligations here are architectural rather than promotional. **DPDP compliance is designed rather than declared** — this practice builds the consent layer, the retention rules, the data-subject-request plumbing and the purpose-limitation logic that every other business in the vertical relies on and few can implement. **The distinction that matters is that a consent banner which does not actually gate tag firing is theatre with a legal exposure attached**, and it is the norm in Indian implementations; this plan verifies gating rather than assuming it, on 84% of implementations by Year 3. Alongside that: **the consultancy is itself a processor** when it touches client customer data, with the same minimisation duties the lifecycle plan set out; cross-border transfer considerations in warehouse and platform selection; contractual clarity that **the client owns its data, its schema, its warehouse and its tag configuration**; and professional-indemnity cover, since a mis-specified measurement layer causes budget to be misallocated for months before anyone notices.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with marketing-technology, analytics-engineering or data-architecture background. Three competences decide outcomes: *technical depth*, since this is the one business in the vertical where a client's own engineers will interrogate the work; *definitional patience*, because the hardest part of every project is getting a company to agree what a customer is; and *commercial independence*, which is easy to declare and expensive to maintain. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand comes from enterprises and scale-ups that have bought marketing technology faster than they have learned to operate it, and from a measurement environment that has become genuinely harder — signal loss, privacy regulation, and platforms whose reported numbers increasingly diverge from reality.

Demand drivers

- **Accumulated tool sprawl** — most mid-to-large marketing teams own more capability than they use.
- **Signal loss and modelled reporting**, which have made independent measurement newly valuable.
- **DPDP implementation**, which converts consent from a banner into an architecture project.
- **Warehouse-native marketing stacks**, moving the source of truth to the client's own data.
- **Agency accountability pressure** — clients who now want to verify what their agencies report.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian martech consulting, implementation & measurement	Growing; senior supply very thin
SAM	Enterprises and scale-ups with real stacks	Maturity- and budget-bounded
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Clients × engagement value + retained governance	14 → 32 clients

Customer data platforms are sold as the solution to a data problem that is almost always an organisational problem, and this misdiagnosis wastes more money in Indian martech than any other single decision. The pitch is that scattered customer data will be unified into a single view. The reality encountered on site is that **the company has never agreed what a customer is.** Is a customer someone who registered, or someone who paid? Is a lapsed buyer from four years ago still one? Does a business account with six logins count as one customer or six? When does a session end? **Sales, finance and marketing each hold a different answer, each answer is defensible, and each produces materially different numbers** — which is precisely why their reports have never reconciled. **A platform cannot resolve this, because a platform implements a definition; it does not choose one.** Configuring a CDP before that argument is settled simply **encodes the disagreement into infrastructure, at which point it becomes expensive to revisit and everybody stops trying.** This plan therefore refuses to configure anything until the definitions are written down and signed — **rising from 31% to 88% of engagements** — and states the uncomfortable corollary plainly: **the most valuable part of a martech project is a series of meetings that produce a document, and no client has ever been excited to buy that.**

Target segments

- **Enterprises with accumulated stacks** needing rationalisation and governance.
- **D2C and scale-ups** outgrowing platform-native reporting.
- **Financial services, insurance and health**, where consent architecture is non-negotiable.
- **Clients auditing their agencies**, an increasingly common and well-defined engagement.
- **Agencies themselves**, as a white-label measurement partner.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: global consulting firms at the top, systems integrators, **vendor implementation partners whose revenue depends on the platform being chosen**, freelance analytics engineers, and agencies offering measurement as an add-on to the media they are being measured on. **The last group is the structural problem this business exists to solve.**

The business's edge

- **No vendor money, ever** — the only genuinely differentiating position available.
- **Definitions before platforms**, which is where projects are actually won or lost.
- **Warehouse-native measurement**, independent of the parties being evaluated.
- **Consent gating verified** rather than declared.
- **Adoption measured at 90 days**, not deployment measured at go-live.

The most consequential structural point in this plan is that measurement cannot credibly be bought from the party being measured, and yet in Indian marketing it almost always is. The media agency configures the analytics that report on media performance. The performance agency defines the conversion events its own return is calculated from.

The SEO agency chooses which keywords appear in the ranking report. **None of this requires dishonesty to produce distorted numbers — it only requires ordinary human judgment applied by someone with a stake in the outcome, which is how measurement goes wrong nearly all of the time.** Separating the measurement layer from every delivery agency is therefore not a governance nicety; **it is the only arrangement under which the ten preceding businesses in this vertical can be held to anything at all.** The commercial consequence is that this consultancy's natural buyer is often **the client's own finance or data function rather than its marketing team** — because marketing frequently prefers the current arrangement, and **an agency-appointed measurement partner is a contradiction that resolves itself quietly in the agency's favour.**

6. Services, Pricing & the Independence Premium

Line	Model	Basis
Measurement architecture & attribution engineering	Per programme	~31% of revenue
Platform implementation & integration	Per project	Delivery layer
Retained martech operations & governance	Monthly retainer	14.5% → 21.2%
Stack audit, rationalisation & vendor-independent selection	Per engagement	Entry product; often reduces spend
Consent architecture & data governance	Per programme	Fastest-growing line
Vendor referral fees, rebates or licence margin	NIL — by policy	The entire proposition
Undisclosed partner status on a recommendation	NIL — 100% disclosed	Verifiable, not asserted

Refusing vendor money changes the shape of the business in ways worth stating rather than glossing, because a plan that claims independence is costless is not describing this industry. Licence margin and referral fees are substantial, recurring, and — critically — **invisible to the client, which means a competitor can quote a lower professional fee while earning more in total.** This consultancy's fees therefore look higher than they are, and the difference has to be explained in every pitch. Two things make the position defensible rather than merely principled. **First, the client can verify it: partner status is disclosed on every recommendation, and a client can ask any competitor the same question and watch them answer carefully. Second, the position generates its own best evidence — a consultancy earning nothing from licences can recommend fewer of them, and rationalisation engagements that cut a client's licence spend are impossible for a margin-earning competitor to produce. Nineteen such recommendations by Year 3 is not a marketing claim; it is a list of clients who spent less because of advice they paid for, which is the only credible proof of independence in a business that sells nothing else.**

7. Go-to-Market — Selling the Absence of a Conflict

Acquisition

- **Paid stack audits** — the entry product, immediately concrete and frequently alarming.
- **Agency-verification engagements**, commissioned by clients who want to check what they are being told.
- **Consent and DPDP implementation**, a deadline-driven and well-funded trigger.
- **Referral from finance and data leadership**, which is where this service is genuinely valued.

Retention

- **Retained governance**, since a measurement layer decays without maintenance.
- **Warehouse ownership**, which deepens rather than expires.
- **Adoption support**, where most implementations quietly fail.
- **Independence itself** — a client who has switched agencies twice keeps the measurement partner.

Sales approach

Audit → definitions agreed and signed → architecture before platform → implement → verify consent gating → measure adoption at 90 days → retain governance. **The unusual feature of this business's pipeline is that its best engagements begin with a client's dissatisfaction with another supplier** — an agency whose numbers stopped making sense, a platform that never delivered, a board asking why three reports disagree. **That makes the consultancy's growth partly a function of the vertical's own failures**, which is uncomfortable to write and straightforwardly true. The discipline it requires is **refusing to become the client's weapon against an incumbent agency**: the engagement is to establish what is actually happening, **and a measurement partner that arrives with a conclusion is no more independent than the agency it was hired to check.**

8. Operations Plan (define, architect, implement, verify, govern)

- **Definitions first: customer, session, conversion, active user, channel** — written, argued out, signed, before any configuration.
- **Architecture:** event schema, naming conventions, identity resolution, server-side collection design.
- **Platform selection: requirements-led, vendor-independent, partner status disclosed, and existing licences examined first.**
- **Implementation:** tag management, integrations, warehouse pipelines, data quality tests in CI.
- **Consent: gating verified by testing that tags actually do not fire, not by inspecting the banner.**
- **Attribution:** warehouse-native modelling, reconciled against platform-reported figures with variance explained.
- **Adoption: training, documentation, and a 90-day usage review — deployment is not delivery.**
- **Governance:** retained schema stewardship, change control, and periodic reconciliation audits.

Engagement control points

Stage	Activity	Control point
Define	Definitions signed before configuration	31% → 88% of engagements
Audit	Existing licences examined before buying	Unused capability ₹18L → ₹34L found
Select	Requirements-led; partner status disclosed	Vendor fees NIL; disclosure 100%
Implement	Governed event schema, tested pipelines	Schema documented 24% → 81%
Verify	Consent gating tested, not assumed	21% → 84%
Govern	Warehouse reconciliation & adoption review	Reconcilable 19% → 76%; adoption 34% → 79%

The failure mode that quietly consumes most martech budget in India is not a bad implementation — it is a competent implementation nobody uses, and the industry measures the wrong milestone. Projects are declared successful at go-live, when the integration passes its tests and the dashboard renders. **Ninety days later the marketing**

team is back in a spreadsheet, the automation is running two of the eleven journeys that were built, and nobody has logged into the new tool since the training session. None of that appears in a project report, because the project ended at deployment. **Deployment is an event; adoption is an outcome, and only one of them was what the client was buying.** This plan therefore contracts a **90-day adoption review as part of the engagement rather than as a follow-on sale** — rising from 34% to 79% of implementations — and treats low adoption as the consultancy's problem rather than the client's failing, because **an implementation that a team cannot absorb was designed for a team that does not exist.** The practical remedies are ordinary and rarely budgeted: **fewer journeys built better, documentation written for the person who will inherit it rather than the person who commissioned it, and a named internal owner identified before build starts** — because a system with no owner has no future regardless of how well it was built.

9. Data, Consent & Governance Compliance (India)

- **DPDP compliance designed rather than declared** — consent layer, retention rules, purpose limitation and data-subject-request plumbing built into the architecture.
- **Consent gating verified by testing** — a banner that does not actually stop tags from firing is theatre with a legal exposure attached, and it is the Indian norm.
- **The consultancy as processor** when handling client customer data, with the same minimisation duties as any other processor.
- **Cross-border transfer** considerations in warehouse, CDP and platform selection.
- **Client ownership** of data, schema, warehouse, tag configuration and documentation, with no proprietary lock-in.
- **Vendor conflict disclosure** on every recommendation, maintained as a register rather than a statement.
- **Professional indemnity**, since **a mis-specified measurement layer misallocates budget for months before anyone notices.**
- GST on services; project versus retainer revenue recognition.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / managing partner	1	1	2
Martech engineers & implementation specialists	8	13	20
Measurement & analytics engineers	5	8	13
Solution architects & consultants	4	7	11
Data governance & consent specialists	2	4	6
Project management	2	3	5
Business development	1	2	3
Operations & admin	2	2	3
Total	25	40	63

Sixty-three people producing ₹3.4 crore — the highest revenue per head in the vertical, **because this is the only business here whose buyers are technical enough to know what senior work costs.**

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Setup	Month 0–3	Team, sandboxes, methodology, conflict-disclosure register
Launch	Month 3–12	14 clients; ₹1.38cr revenue, ₹5L profit — the only Year-1 profit in the vertical
Build	Year 2	Definitions-first 62%, reconcilable 48%, adoption 58%; ₹2.2cr, ₹20L profit
Scale	Year 3	32 clients; ₹3.4cr, ₹44L profit; 76% of clients can reconcile platform numbers against their own data

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. **Senior utilisation and retained governance are the levers; vendor margin is deliberately not one.**

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Working capital (salaries against enterprise credit periods)	12,00,000
Team recruitment & senior consultant hires	10,00,000
Tooling, sandboxes, testing & data infrastructure	5,00,000
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000
Certification & training	2,00,000
Business development	1,50,000
Legal & registrations	50,000
Total project cost	34,00,000
Promoter contribution	20,00,000
Investor funding	6,00,000
Working-capital finance	8,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Measurement architecture & attribution engineering	44,00,000	68,00,000	1,04,00,000
Platform implementation & integration	38,00,000	56,00,000	78,00,000
Retained martech operations & governance	20,00,000	40,00,000	72,00,000
Stack audit, rationalisation & vendor-independent selection	22,00,000	32,00,000	46,00,000
Consent architecture & data governance	14,00,000	24,00,000	40,00,000
Vendor referral fees, rebates or licence margin	NIL	NIL	NIL

Total revenue	1,38,00,000	2,20,00,000	3,40,00,000
Salaries (consultants, engineers, analysts, admin)	88,00,000	1,38,00,000	2,08,00,000
Unbilled scope creep & absorbed hours	11,00,000	12,00,000	13,00,000
Business development & marketing	10,00,000	15,00,000	22,00,000
Tooling, sandboxes & data infrastructure	9,00,000	13,00,000	20,00,000
Office, overheads & admin	8,00,000	12,00,000	18,00,000
Certification, training & development	4,00,000	6,00,000	9,00,000
Depreciation, interest & other	3,00,000	4,00,000	6,00,000
Total expenses	1,33,00,000	2,00,00,000	2,96,00,000
Net profit before tax	5,00,000	20,00,000	44,00,000
Net margin	3.6%	9.1%	12.9%
VENDOR REFERRAL FEES, REBATES OR LICENCE MARGIN	NIL	NIL	NIL
Recommendations where partner status with the vendor was disclosed	100%	100%	100%
Licensed capability already owned but unused, found at audit (₹/client/yr)	18,00,000	26,00,000	34,00,000
Engagements where the recommendation REDUCED the client's licence spend	6	12	19
Engagements where definitions were signed before any configuration	31%	62%	88%
Clients with a documented, governed event schema	24%	56%	81%
CLIENTS ABLE TO RECONCILE PLATFORM-REPORTED CONVERSIONS AGAINST WAREHOUSE TRUTH	19%	48%	76%
Implementations where consent state verifiably gates tag firing	21%	58%	84%
Implementations with documented adoption at 90 days	34%	58%	79%
Average client tenure (months)	13	19	24
Billable utilisation / Client concentration	62% / 26%	71% / 17%	78% / 12%
Clients served / Revenue per client per month (₹)	14 / 82,100	22 / 83,300	32 / 88,500

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **This is the only business in the vertical profitable in Year 1**, and the reasons are plain: **the highest day rates, the smallest team, project work billing from month one, no media pass-through, no production cost, and no creative revision cycles.**
- **Retained governance is the strategic line**, growing from 14.5% to 21.2% of revenue — **because a measurement layer decays: schemas drift, tags break silently, and a client without stewardship is back to unreliable numbers within a year.**
- **The independence position costs revenue in a way that does not appear anywhere in this P&L — the licence margin foregone is invisible precisely because it was never booked, which is exactly why competitors can undercut on fees and still earn more.**

- **Senior utilisation is the binding constraint:** this work cannot be delegated downward without the client's engineers noticing immediately.
- **Margins tie the email agency at 12.9% for the best in the vertical — and the two share a characteristic:** both sell engineering rather than persuasion.

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	14,00,000	11,00,000	10,00,000	10,00,000
Collections	30,00,000	32,00,000	34,00,000	35,00,000
Salaries, tooling, business development & overheads	33,00,000	33,00,000	34,00,000	33,00,000
Closing balance	11,00,000	10,00,000	10,00,000	12,00,000

Cash here is comfortable by the standards of this vertical, with one exposure worth naming because it is specific to enterprise consulting: the buyers are large organisations with long procurement cycles and rigid payment terms, and neither is negotiable by a firm of sixty-three people. A signed engagement can take eight weeks to produce a purchase order and a further sixty days to pay, while the consultants assigned to it were hired months earlier on the strength of the pipeline. Two controls follow: milestone billing tied to deliverables rather than to phase completion, so invoices leave earlier and more often; and concentration discipline — 26% concentration in Year 1 is the highest in the vertical and the honest consequence of a small firm selling to large buyers, which is why it is deliberately driven to 12%. Beyond that the model is undemanding: no inventory, no pass-through, no production spend, no media credit, and a retained base that pays monthly.

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Independence:** vendor revenue (must be nil); disclosure completeness; spend-reducing recommendations; unused capability identified.
- **Technical quality:** schema documentation; warehouse-to-platform reconciliation; consent gating verified; data-quality test coverage.
- **Delivery:** definitions-signed-before-build; adoption at 90 days; named internal owner assigned; rework rate.
- **Commercials:** senior utilisation; retained share of revenue; tenure; concentration; scope absorbed.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: ₹6 lakh investor funding plus ₹8 lakh working-capital finance against ₹20 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, this is the strongest quality of earnings in the vertical — Year-1 profitable, no pass-through, no media credit, no production risk, and a retained base that grows to 21% of revenue.** **Second, the credit risk is concentration rather than collection:** enterprise buyers pay reliably and slowly, and a firm this size selling to organisations that large carries client concentration as its principal exposure. **Third, and specific to this model, ask where the vendor money is.** A martech consultancy earning licence margin or referral fees has a revenue line whose existence changes every recommendation it makes, and it will not appear as "vendor commission" in any account — it appears as a better-than-expected margin on implementation work. **Fourth, the metric to underwrite is whether clients can reconcile their platform numbers against their own data** because that single capability is what this firm actually sells; a consultancy whose clients still cannot do it has deployed software rather than delivered measurement.

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Working capital (salaries against enterprise credit periods)	12,00,000	35.3%
Team recruitment & senior consultant hires	10,00,000	29.4%
Tooling, sandboxes, testing & data infrastructure	5,00,000	14.7%
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000	8.8%
Certification & training	2,00,000	5.9%
Business development	1,50,000	4.4%
Legal & registrations	50,000	1.5%
Total	34,00,000	100%

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
Independence is the whole product	TEN PRECEDING PLANS IN THIS VERTICAL ARGUED ABOUT THE SAME PROBLEM — THAT THE CLIENT CANNOT VERIFY WHETHER THE WORK CAUSED THE RESULT, AND THE AGENCY BOTH PERFORMS THE WORK AND REPORTS ON IT. THIS BUSINESS IS THE ONE THAT CAN TAKE THAT REPORTING AWAY FROM THEM: THE MARTECH CONSULTANCY BUILDS THE SCOREBOARD THE SELLERS WERE ACCUSED OF CONTROLLING, WHICH MAKES ITS INDEPENDENCE NOT A VIRTUE IT DISPLAYS BUT THE ENTIRE PRODUCT IT SELLS
Vendor money at the point of selection	Implementation-partner programmes pay referral fees, licence margin and tiered rebates — A CONSULTANCY PAID BY THE VENDOR IT RECOMMENDS IS A RESELLER WEARING AN ADVISOR'S TITLE, AND THE CLIENT HAS NO WAY TO TELL THE DIFFERENCE BECAUSE THE RECOMMENDATION LOOKS IDENTICAL EITHER WAY. NIL, with 100% disclosure. Cost is real: LICENCE MARGIN IS SUBSTANTIAL, RECURRING AND INVISIBLE TO THE CLIENT, WHICH MEANS A COMPETITOR CAN QUOTE A LOWER PROFESSIONAL FEE WHILE EARNING MORE IN TOTAL → defensible because the client can VERIFY it, and because A CONSULTANCY EARNING NOTHING FROM LICENCES CAN RECOMMEND FEWER OF THEM: NINETEEN SPEND-REDUCING RECOMMENDATIONS BY YEAR 3 IS NOT A MARKETING CLAIM, IT IS A LIST OF CLIENTS WHO SPENT LESS BECAUSE OF ADVICE THEY PAID FOR
Tools bought and never implemented	THE INDUSTRY'S DEFINING FAILURE IS NOT BAD TECHNOLOGY BUT TECHNOLOGY NEVER IMPLEMENTED: A CDP HOLDING THREE DATA SOURCES, AN AUTOMATION SUITE SENDING ONE NEWSLETTER, AN ANALYTICS TIER NOBODY HAS THE CREDENTIALS FOR — AND THE MOST VALUABLE SENTENCE A MARTECH CONSULTANCY CAN SAY IS "YOU ALREADY OWN THIS", WHICH IS THE SENTENCE THAT EARNS IT THE LEAST (unused licensed capability found ₹18L→₹34L per client per year — money the client KEEPS, not money the consultancy MAKES)

The CDP trap	CUSTOMER DATA PLATFORMS ARE SOLD AS THE SOLUTION TO A DATA PROBLEM THAT IS ALMOST ALWAYS AN ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEM: THE COMPANY HAS NEVER AGREED WHAT A CUSTOMER IS. Is it someone who registered or someone who paid? Is a lapsed buyer from four years ago still one? Does a business account with six logins count as one or six? When does a session end? SALES, FINANCE AND MARKETING EACH HOLD A DIFFERENT ANSWER, EACH IS DEFENSIBLE, AND EACH PRODUCES MATERIALLY DIFFERENT NUMBERS — WHICH IS PRECISELY WHY THEIR REPORTS HAVE NEVER RECONCILED. A PLATFORM CANNOT RESOLVE THIS, BECAUSE A PLATFORM IMPLEMENTS A DEFINITION; IT DOES NOT CHOOSE ONE — AND CONFIGURING BEFORE THE ARGUMENT IS SETTLED ENCODES THE DISAGREEMENT INTO INFRASTRUCTURE, AT WHICH POINT IT BECOMES EXPENSIVE TO REVISIT AND EVERYBODY STOPS TRYING (definitions signed first 31%→88%), with the uncomfortable corollary: THE MOST VALUABLE PART OF A MARTECH PROJECT IS A SERIES OF MEETINGS THAT PRODUCE A DOCUMENT, AND NO CLIENT HAS EVER BEEN EXCITED TO BUY THAT
Measurement bought from the party being measured	THE MEDIA AGENCY CONFIGURES THE ANALYTICS THAT REPORT ON MEDIA PERFORMANCE; THE PERFORMANCE AGENCY DEFINES THE CONVERSION EVENTS ITS OWN RETURN IS CALCULATED FROM; THE SEO AGENCY CHOOSES WHICH KEYWORDS APPEAR IN THE RANKING REPORT. NONE OF THIS REQUIRES DISHONESTY TO PRODUCE DISTORTED NUMBERS — IT ONLY REQUIRES ORDINARY HUMAN JUDGMENT APPLIED BY SOMEONE WITH A STAKE IN THE OUTCOME, WHICH IS HOW MEASUREMENT GOES WRONG NEARLY ALL OF THE TIME. Hence the natural buyer is THE CLIENT'S FINANCE OR DATA FUNCTION RATHER THAN ITS MARKETING TEAM, BECAUSE MARKETING FREQUENTLY PREFERS THE CURRENT ARRANGEMENT — AND AN AGENCY-APPOINTED MEASUREMENT PARTNER IS A CONTRADICTION THAT RESOLVES ITSELF QUIETLY IN THE AGENCY'S FAVOUR
Deployment mistaken for delivery	THE FAILURE MODE THAT QUIETLY CONSUMES MOST MARTECH BUDGET IS A COMPETENT IMPLEMENTATION NOBODY USES, AND THE INDUSTRY MEASURES THE WRONG MILESTONE: projects are declared successful at go-live when the integration passes and the dashboard renders — NINETY DAYS LATER THE TEAM IS BACK IN A SPREADSHEET, THE AUTOMATION IS RUNNING TWO OF THE ELEVEN JOURNEYS THAT WERE BUILT, AND NOBODY HAS LOGGED IN SINCE THE TRAINING SESSION. DEPLOYMENT IS AN EVENT; ADOPTION IS AN OUTCOME, AND ONLY ONE OF THEM WAS WHAT THE CLIENT WAS BUYING → 90-day adoption review contracted in, not sold on (34%→79%), treated as the consultancy's problem because AN IMPLEMENTATION A TEAM CANNOT ABSORB WAS DESIGNED FOR A TEAM THAT DOES NOT EXIST; remedies are ordinary and rarely budgeted — FEWER JOURNEYS BUILT BETTER, DOCUMENTATION WRITTEN FOR THE PERSON WHO WILL INHERIT IT RATHER THAN THE PERSON WHO COMMISSIONED IT, AND A NAMED INTERNAL OWNER BEFORE BUILD STARTS, BECAUSE A SYSTEM WITH NO OWNER HAS NO FUTURE REGARDLESS OF HOW WELL IT WAS BUILT
Consent as theatre	A BANNER THAT DOES NOT ACTUALLY STOP TAGS FROM FIRING IS THEATRE WITH A LEGAL EXPOSURE ATTACHED, AND IT IS THE INDIAN NORM — verified by testing that tags do not fire, not by inspecting the banner (21%→58%→84%); DPDP compliance DESIGNED RATHER THAN DECLARED, with retention rules, purpose limitation and data-subject-request plumbing built into the architecture
Becoming the client's weapon	Best engagements begin with dissatisfaction with another supplier, WHICH MAKES THIS CONSULTANCY'S GROWTH PARTLY A FUNCTION OF THE VERTICAL'S OWN FAILURES — UNCOMFORTABLE TO WRITE AND STRAIGHTFORWARDLY TRUE → the engagement is to establish what is actually happening, because A MEASUREMENT PARTNER THAT ARRIVES WITH A CONCLUSION IS NO MORE INDEPENDENT THAN THE AGENCY IT WAS HIRED TO CHECK

Concentration, procurement & liability	ENTERPRISE BUYERS PAY RELIABLY AND SLOWLY, AND A FIRM OF SIXTY-THREE PEOPLE SELLING TO ORGANISATIONS THAT LARGE CARRIES CLIENT CONCENTRATION AS ITS PRINCIPAL EXPOSURE (26%→12%); a signed engagement can take eight weeks to a purchase order and sixty more to pay, WHILE THE CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED TO IT WERE HIRED MONTHS EARLIER ON THE STRENGTH OF THE PIPELINE → milestone billing on deliverables. Professional indemnity, since A MIS-SPECIFIED MEASUREMENT LAYER MISALLOCATES BUDGET FOR MONTHS BEFORE ANYONE NOTICES. Competition from global firms above and from AGENCIES OFFERING MEASUREMENT AS AN ADD-ON TO THE MEDIA THEY ARE BEING MEASURED ON — THE STRUCTURAL PROBLEM THIS BUSINESS EXISTS TO SOLVE
--	---

15. SWOT Analysis & Vertical Close

Strengths The only Year-1-profitable model in the vertical; independence that competitors structurally cannot match; the highest revenue per head; retained governance growing to 21% of revenue; buyers technical enough to value senior work.	Weaknesses Fees look higher because the foregone vendor margin is invisible; senior utilisation cannot be relieved by delegation; highest client concentration in the vertical; long enterprise procurement cycles; the most valuable deliverable is a document nobody is excited to buy.
Opportunities Tool sprawl and rationalisation demand; DPDP converting consent from a banner into an architecture project; warehouse-native stacks moving truth to the client's own data; agency-verification engagements commissioned by finance functions; white-label measurement for agencies.	Threats Vendor-funded competitors quoting lower fees; global consultancies at the enterprise tier; platform vendors expanding services arms; in-housing by mature data teams; the perennial temptation to accept licence margin "just once".

15.1 The eleven marketing businesses compared

Plan	What is actually sold	Governing metric	Structural limit
digital-marketing-agency	Orchestration across channels	Clients advised to cut a channel on test evidence	Reports on its own work
performance-ads-agency	Return on the NEXT rupee	Clients on a marginal-return target	Succeeding lowers its own metric
social-media-agency	A real audience	Revenue per client against posts contracted	The numbers can simply be bought
seo-content-agency	Compounding search demand	Non-brand organic revenue	The verdict arrives after the money
branding-design-studio	Judgment under uncertainty	Revision rounds	No outcome measurable at all
pr-communications	Third-party credibility	Message penetration	Cannot buy its deliverable; the market buys it anyway
influencer-marketing-agency	Borrowed trust	Audited audiences & disclosure	The audience is not party to the deal
web-design-agency	A working system	Project overrun & Core Web Vitals	Machinery judged aesthetically

email-crm-agency	An owned, permissioned audience	Revenue per thousand contacts	Economics reward destroying the asset
video-marketing-agency	Assets at a cost per asset	Cost per finished asset	The money is spent before the answer exists
martech-consultancy	The measurement layer itself	Clients able to reconcile platform vs warehouse	Sells only its independence — the easiest thing to quietly sell out

Three patterns run through all eleven and are worth stating as the vertical closes. First, every marketing service has a guarantee that is deliverable and destructive — return on ad spend guaranteed by spending less, rankings guaranteed by choosing queries nobody searches, coverage guaranteed by buying it, followers guaranteed by purchasing them. **Four independent businesses, four different mechanisms, one identical structure: the promise can be kept and keeping it damages the client.** Second, the industry's headline metric was found broken in four separate plans and retired in none of them — advertising value equivalent, engagement rate, open rate and keyword rankings all measure something other than what they are quoted to prove, and all remain standard. **Marketing metrics are not retired when they break, because the people who report them are the people they flatter.** Third, and most usefully for anyone choosing which of these businesses to build: the three plans whose output is genuinely verifiable — web, email and martech — are the three that are engineering rather than persuasion, and they carry the vertical's three best margins and three longest tenures. That correlation is not a coincidence. A client who can check what they bought renews, and a firm that can prove what it did can charge for it.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This martech consultancy would use AiSevak's Marketing vertical tools in operations:

- **Independence: vendor conflict-disclosure register**, spend-reduction recommendation log, **unused-licence discovery tracker**.
- **Architecture: definitions sign-off gate before configuration**, event-schema documentation and change control, identity-resolution design record.
- **Verification: warehouse-to-platform reconciliation report with variance explained, consent-gating test harness**, data-quality test coverage.
- **Delivery: 90-day adoption review**, named internal owner register, documentation handover checklist, rework tracking.
- **Commercials:** senior utilisation, retained-governance share, concentration monitoring, milestone billing against deliverables.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- MarTech consultancy: measurement architecture and attribution engineering, platform implementation and integration, stack audit and vendor-independent selection, retained martech operations and governance, and consent architecture and data governance. **☐ CLOSSES THE MARKETING VERTICAL (11/11).**
- **⚠ THE ONLY PLAN IN THE VERTICAL THAT SELLS NO MARKETING AT ALL: IT SELLS THE PLUMBING EVERY OTHER PLAN DEPENDS ON AND NONE OF THEM OWN — THE EVENT SCHEMA, THE TAG MANAGER, THE CDP, THE ATTRIBUTION MODEL, THE CONSENT LAYER, THE WAREHOUSE. TEN PRECEDING PLANS ARGUED ABOUT THE SAME PROBLEM — THAT THE CLIENT CANNOT VERIFY WHETHER THE WORK CAUSED THE RESULT, AND**

THE AGENCY BOTH PERFORMS THE WORK AND REPORTS ON IT. THIS BUSINESS IS THE ONE THAT CAN TAKE THAT REPORTING AWAY FROM THEM: THE MARTECH CONSULTANCY BUILDS THE SCOREBOARD THE SELLERS WERE ACCUSED OF CONTROLLING, WHICH MAKES ITS INDEPENDENCE NOT A VIRTUE IT DISPLAYS BUT THE ENTIRE PRODUCT IT SELLS. AND MEASUREMENT CANNOT CREDIBLY BE BOUGHT FROM THE PARTY BEING MEASURED, YET IN INDIAN MARKETING IT ALMOST ALWAYS IS: THE MEDIA AGENCY CONFIGURES THE ANALYTICS THAT REPORT ON MEDIA PERFORMANCE; THE PERFORMANCE AGENCY DEFINES THE CONVERSION EVENTS ITS OWN RETURN IS CALCULATED FROM; THE SEO AGENCY CHOOSES WHICH KEYWORDS APPEAR IN THE RANKING REPORT — NONE OF WHICH REQUIRES DISHONESTY TO PRODUCE DISTORTED NUMBERS; IT ONLY REQUIRES ORDINARY HUMAN JUDGMENT APPLIED BY SOMEONE WITH A STAKE IN THE OUTCOME, WHICH IS HOW MEASUREMENT GOES WRONG NEARLY ALL OF THE TIME → natural buyer is THE CLIENT'S FINANCE OR DATA FUNCTION RATHER THAN MARKETING, BECAUSE MARKETING FREQUENTLY PREFERS THE CURRENT ARRANGEMENT, AND AN AGENCY-APPOINTED MEASUREMENT PARTNER IS A CONTRADICTION THAT RESOLVES ITSELF QUIETLY IN THE AGENCY'S FAVOUR (clients able to reconcile platform-reported conversions against warehouse truth 19%→48%→76% — THE SINGLE CAPABILITY THAT TURNS EVERY CLAIM MADE BY EVERY OTHER PLAN IN THIS VERTICAL FROM AN ASSERTION INTO A CHECKABLE STATEMENT).

- THE CONFLICT THAT DECIDES WHETHER THIS BUSINESS IS WORTH HIRING SITS AT PLATFORM SELECTION AND IS NEARLY UNIVERSAL: IMPLEMENTATION-PARTNER PROGRAMMES PAY REFERRAL FEES, LICENCE MARGIN OR TIERED REBATES TO THE CONSULTANCY THAT RECOMMENDS AND DEPLOYS A VENDOR'S PRODUCT — A CONSULTANCY PAID BY THE VENDOR IT RECOMMENDS IS A RESELLER WEARING AN ADVISOR'S TITLE, AND THE CLIENT HAS NO WAY TO TELL THE DIFFERENCE BECAUSE THE RECOMMENDATION LOOKS IDENTICAL EITHER WAY → VENDOR FEES/REBATES/LICENCE MARGIN: NIL; PARTNER STATUS DISCLOSED ON 100% OF RECOMMENDATIONS, at a real and immediate cost — LICENCE MARGIN IS SUBSTANTIAL, RECURRING AND INVISIBLE TO THE CLIENT, SO A COMPETITOR CAN QUOTE A LOWER PROFESSIONAL FEE WHILE EARNING MORE IN TOTAL, AND THIS FIRM'S FEES LOOK HIGHER THAN THEY ARE; defensible because THE CLIENT CAN VERIFY IT (ask any competitor the same question and watch them answer carefully) AND BECAUSE THE POSITION GENERATES ITS OWN BEST EVIDENCE: A CONSULTANCY EARNING NOTHING FROM LICENCES CAN RECOMMEND FEWER OF THEM, AND NINETEEN SPEND-REDUCING RECOMMENDATIONS BY YEAR 3 IS NOT A MARKETING CLAIM — IT IS A LIST OF CLIENTS WHO SPENT LESS BECAUSE OF ADVICE THEY PAID FOR, WHICH IS THE ONLY CREDIBLE PROOF OF INDEPENDENCE IN A BUSINESS THAT SELLS NOTHING ELSE. Related: THE INDUSTRY'S DEFINING FAILURE IS NOT BAD TECHNOLOGY BUT TECHNOLOGY BOUGHT AND NEVER IMPLEMENTED — A CDP HOLDING THREE DATA SOURCES, AN AUTOMATION SUITE SENDING ONE NEWSLETTER, AN ANALYTICS TIER NOBODY HAS THE CREDENTIALS FOR — AND THE MOST VALUABLE SENTENCE A MARTECH CONSULTANCY CAN SAY IS "YOU ALREADY OWN THIS", WHICH IS THE SENTENCE THAT EARNS IT THE LEAST (unused capability found ₹18L→₹26L→₹34L per client per year, MONEY THE CLIENT KEEPS, NOT MONEY THE CONSULTANCY MAKES).
- THE CDP TRAP: CUSTOMER DATA PLATFORMS ARE SOLD AS THE SOLUTION TO A DATA PROBLEM THAT IS ALMOST ALWAYS AN ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEM, AND THIS MISDIAGNOSIS WASTES MORE MONEY IN INDIAN MARTECH THAN ANY OTHER SINGLE DECISION — THE COMPANY HAS NEVER AGREED WHAT A CUSTOMER IS: IS IT SOMEONE WHO REGISTERED OR SOMEONE WHO PAID? IS A LAPSED BUYER FROM FOUR YEARS AGO STILL ONE? DOES A BUSINESS ACCOUNT WITH SIX LOGINS COUNT AS ONE OR SIX? WHEN DOES A SESSION END? SALES, FINANCE AND MARKETING EACH HOLD A DIFFERENT ANSWER, EACH IS DEFENSIBLE, AND EACH PRODUCES MATERIALLY DIFFERENT NUMBERS — WHICH IS PRECISELY WHY THEIR REPORTS HAVE NEVER RECONCILED. A PLATFORM CANNOT RESOLVE THIS BECAUSE A PLATFORM IMPLEMENTS A DEFINITION; IT DOES NOT CHOOSE ONE — AND CONFIGURING BEFORE THE ARGUMENT IS SETTLED SIMPLY ENCODES THE DISAGREEMENT INTO INFRASTRUCTURE, AT WHICH POINT IT BECOMES

EXPENSIVE TO REVISIT AND EVERYBODY STOPS TRYING (definitions signed before configuration 31%→62%→88%), with the corollary stated plainly: **THE MOST VALUABLE PART OF A MARTECH PROJECT IS A SERIES OF MEETINGS THAT PRODUCE A DOCUMENT, AND NO CLIENT HAS EVER BEEN EXCITED TO BUY THAT.** Second delivery failure: **A COMPETENT IMPLEMENTATION NOBODY USES — THE INDUSTRY MEASURES THE WRONG MILESTONE, DECLARING SUCCESS AT GO-LIVE WHEN THE INTEGRATION PASSES AND THE DASHBOARD RENDERS; NINETY DAYS LATER THE TEAM IS BACK IN A SPREADSHEET, THE AUTOMATION IS RUNNING TWO OF THE ELEVEN JOURNEYS BUILT, AND NOBODY HAS LOGGED IN SINCE TRAINING. DEPLOYMENT IS AN EVENT; ADOPTION IS AN OUTCOME, AND ONLY ONE OF THEM WAS WHAT THE CLIENT WAS BUYING**→ 90-day adoption review contracted in rather than sold on (34%→58%→79%), treated as the consultancy's problem because **AN IMPLEMENTATION A TEAM CANNOT ABSORB WAS DESIGNED FOR A TEAM THAT DOES NOT EXIST**→ **FEWER JOURNEYS BUILT BETTER, DOCUMENTATION WRITTEN FOR THE PERSON WHO WILL INHERIT IT RATHER THAN THE ONE WHO COMMISSIONED IT, AND A NAMED INTERNAL OWNER BEFORE BUILD STARTS, BECAUSE A SYSTEM WITH NO OWNER HAS NO FUTURE REGARDLESS OF HOW WELL IT WAS BUILT.** Consent: **A BANNER THAT DOES NOT ACTUALLY STOP TAGS FROM FIRING IS THEATRE WITH A LEGAL EXPOSURE ATTACHED, AND IT IS THE INDIAN NORM**→ verified by testing that tags do NOT fire (21%→58%→84%); DPDP **DESIGNED RATHER THAN DECLARED**; client owns data, schema, warehouse, tag configuration and documentation; professional indemnity because **A MIS-SPECIFIED MEASUREMENT LAYER MISALLOCATES BUDGET FOR MONTHS BEFORE ANYONE NOTICES.**

- Economics — **THE ONLY BUSINESS IN THE VERTICAL PROFITABLE IN YEAR 1 (₹5L, 3.6%):** highest day rates, smallest team, project work billing from month one, no media pass-through, no production cost, no creative revision cycles; retained governance 14.5%→21.2% of revenue **BECAUSE A MEASUREMENT LAYER DECAYS — SCHEMAS DRIFT, TAGS BREAK SILENTLY, AND A CLIENT WITHOUT STEWARDSHIP IS BACK TO UNRELIABLE NUMBERS WITHIN A YEAR; THE INDEPENDENCE POSITION COSTS REVENUE IN A WAY THAT DOES NOT APPEAR ANYWHERE IN THIS P&L — THE LICENCE MARGIN FOREGONE IS INVISIBLE PRECISELY BECAUSE IT WAS NEVER BOOKED, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHY COMPETITORS CAN UNDERCUT ON FEES AND STILL EARN MORE; 12.9% Y3 TIES THE EMAIL AGENCY FOR BEST IN THE VERTICAL, AND THE TWO SHARE A CHARACTERISTIC: BOTH SELL ENGINEERING RATHER THAN PERSUASION;** highest revenue per head **BECAUSE THIS IS THE ONLY BUSINESS HERE WHOSE BUYERS ARE TECHNICAL ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT SENIOR WORK COSTS.** Cash comfortable, with one exposure: **ENTERPRISE BUYERS PAY RELIABLY AND SLOWLY — A SIGNED ENGAGEMENT CAN TAKE EIGHT WEEKS TO A PURCHASE ORDER AND SIXTY MORE TO PAY, WHILE THE CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED WERE HIRED MONTHS EARLIER ON THE STRENGTH OF THE PIPELINE**→ milestone billing on deliverables, and concentration driven 26%→12% (**THE HIGHEST IN THE VERTICAL AND THE HONEST CONSEQUENCE OF A SMALL FIRM SELLING TO LARGE BUYERS**). Pipeline note: **THE BEST ENGAGEMENTS BEGIN WITH A CLIENT'S DISSATISFACTION WITH ANOTHER SUPPLIER, WHICH MAKES THIS CONSULTANCY'S GROWTH PARTLY A FUNCTION OF THE VERTICAL'S OWN FAILURES — UNCOMFORTABLE TO WRITE AND STRAIGHTFORWARDLY TRUE**→ discipline is **REFUSING TO BECOME THE CLIENT'S WEAPON AGAINST AN INCUMBENT, BECAUSE A MEASUREMENT PARTNER THAT ARRIVES WITH A CONCLUSION IS NO MORE INDEPENDENT THAN THE AGENCY IT WAS HIRED TO CHECK.** Lender note: **THE STRONGEST QUALITY OF EARNINGS IN THE VERTICAL — YEAR-1 PROFITABLE, NO PASS-THROUGH, NO MEDIA CREDIT, NO PRODUCTION RISK, AND A RETAINED BASE GROWING TO 21% OF REVENUE; THE CREDIT RISK IS CONCENTRATION RATHER THAN COLLECTION; ASK WHERE THE VENDOR MONEY IS, BECAUSE A MARTECH CONSULTANCY EARNING LICENCE MARGIN OR REFERRAL FEES HAS A REVENUE LINE WHOSE EXISTENCE CHANGES EVERY RECOMMENDATION IT MAKES, AND IT WILL NOT APPEAR AS "VENDOR COMMISSION" IN ANY ACCOUNT — IT APPEARS AS A BETTER-THAN-EXPECTED MARGIN ON IMPLEMENTATION WORK;** and **UNDERWRITE WHETHER CLIENTS CAN RECONCILE PLATFORM NUMBERS AGAINST THEIR OWN DATA, BECAUSE THAT SINGLE CAPABILITY IS WHAT THIS FIRM ACTUALLY SELLS — A CONSULTANCY WHOSE**

CLIENTS STILL CANNOT DO IT HAS DEPLOYED SOFTWARE RATHER THAN DELIVERED MEASUREMENT. ₹34L, 14→32 clients, 25→63 staff, rev 1.38→3.4cr, Y1 ₹5L → Y3 ₹44L. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

- **VERTICAL CLOSED WITH AN ELEVEN-PLAN COMPARISON TABLE (plan / what is actually sold / governing metric / structural limit) AND THREE CLOSING PATTERNS: (1) EVERY MARKETING SERVICE HAS A GUARANTEE THAT IS DELIVERABLE AND DESTRUCTIVE — ROAS GUARANTEED BY SPENDING LESS, RANKINGS BY CHOOSING QUERIES NOBODY SEARCHES, COVERAGE BY BUYING IT, FOLLOWERS BY PURCHASING THEM: FOUR INDEPENDENT BUSINESSES, FOUR MECHANISMS, ONE IDENTICAL STRUCTURE — THE PROMISE CAN BE KEPT AND KEEPING IT DAMAGES THE CLIENT. (2) THE INDUSTRY'S HEADLINE METRIC WAS FOUND BROKEN IN FOUR SEPARATE PLANS AND RETIRED IN NONE — ADVERTISING VALUE EQUIVALENT, ENGAGEMENT RATE, OPEN RATE AND KEYWORD RANKINGS ALL MEASURE SOMETHING OTHER THAN WHAT THEY ARE QUOTED TO PROVE, AND ALL REMAIN STANDARD: MARKETING METRICS ARE NOT RETIRED WHEN THEY BREAK, BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHO REPORT THEM ARE THE PEOPLE THEY FLATTER. (3) THE THREE PLANS WHOSE OUTPUT IS GENUINELY VERIFIABLE — WEB, EMAIL AND MARTECH — ARE THE THREE THAT ARE ENGINEERING RATHER THAN PERSUASION, AND THEY CARRY THE VERTICAL'S THREE BEST MARGINS AND THREE LONGEST TENURES; THAT CORRELATION IS NOT A COINCIDENCE: A CLIENT WHO CAN CHECK WHAT THEY BOUGHT RENEWS, AND A FIRM THAT CAN PROVE WHAT IT DID CAN CHARGE FOR IT.**

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

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on aisevak.in. Open the [Agencies & Marketing-Services Firms toolkit](#) to browse and use them all at <https://aisevak.in/verticals/marketing> — 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.