



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Micronutrient and Speciality Nutrition Brand

Sell the diagnosis, not the remedy

AGRI-INPUTS

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 **Micronutrient & Speciality Nutrition Brand** in India — a manufacturer of zinc, boron, iron, manganese and copper grades, chelated micronutrients, water-soluble foliar sprays and state-notified multi-micronutrient mixtures, sold under its own label with an in-house soil and tissue testing service.

The vertical's conventions are set in the fertiliser-manufacturing anchor and carried through crop protection, seed, retail and bio-inputs: **publish the batch analysis against the code and state the inert fraction; retain a sample so the buyer can test the seller; grade to the declared value rather than the tolerance floor; report the advice that reduced the sale; and treat high margin combined with zero detectability as a warning flag rather than an opportunity. This is the plan in which that last rule applies to the plan's own product.**

☐ **A MICRONUTRIENT SOLD WITHOUT A SOIL OR TISSUE TEST IS A PRODUCT SOLD FOR A DEFICIENCY NOBODY ESTABLISHED.** The dose is grams per acre, the price is high, the response — where a genuine deficiency exists — can be dramatic, and where no deficiency exists there is no response at all. But a crop that did not need zinc and a bottle that contained no usable zinc produce the same result: nothing visible. So the absent deficiency and the worthless product are indistinguishable in the field, exactly as the dead biological was indistinguishable from the live one — and the commercial consequence is that a company can sell into unverified need indefinitely without ever being contradicted. This brand therefore **SELLS AGAINST A TEST: 91% of Year-3 revenue arises from a soil or tissue result, and the programme PUBLISHES THE TESTS THAT SHOWED NO DEFICIENCY AND THEREFORE PRODUCED NO SALE — 8,900 of them in Year 3, 29% of all tests run. WHERE THE NEED ITSELF IS UNVERIFIED, THE FIRST HONEST STEP IS TO SELL THE DIAGNOSIS RATHER THAN THE REMEDY.**

☐ **AND THE CHELATE IS THE CATEGORY'S CLASSIC UNDETECTABLE FRAUD.** A farmer buying "chelated zinc" is buying a chemical relationship he cannot see — the metal must actually be bound to a chelating agent to stay available in an alkaline soil, and a bottle of zinc sulphate labelled "chelated", or an EDTA product with a fraction of the chelation claimed, behaves in the field exactly like the absent deficiency and the empty bio-input: nothing happens, and nothing can be proved. So every chelated pack states the **ACTUAL CHELATED FRACTION FROM ASSAY**, names the chelating agent and its ratio, and carries the batch analysis — per the anchor's inert-fraction rule. In Year 3, 22 batches assayed below the declared chelated fraction and were reprocessed or destroyed rather than despatched.

This plan models an operator requiring **₹4.60 crore** (₹1.80 crore investor + ₹1.40 crore term loan + ₹90 lakh promoter + ₹50 lakh working capital), moving from **₹11.00 crore revenue and a ₹58 lakh loss** to **₹52.00 crore revenue and ₹5.72 crore profit** by Year 3 — *an 11.0% net margin and 42.8% return on capital. (Micronutrient manufacturing — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A nutrition company that sells the test first and sometimes sells nothing after it.

Vision: To be the micronutrient brand whose recommendation a farmer trusts because it is attached to his own soil report.

Mission: Test before we recommend; publish the tests that found no deficiency; assay and print the chelated fraction; grade to the declared value; state the response as a range by soil type; print what our product must not be tank-mixed with; and disclose the dealer's margin.

Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended. FCO registrations, state mixture-grade notifications, institutional supply and outside capital all assume it.
- **Proprietorship or LLP** — the form of much of the category's unregistered end, where "chelated" is a marketing word rather than a chemical fact.
- **A testing laboratory whose recommendation can be "no product required"**, reporting to the promoter and not to sales — **because a diagnostic function inside a manufacturer is worthless if its findings pass through the people whose targets they reduce.**

Regulatory anchor: a category governed principally by grade specification, in which the specification is met and the customer is still not served. **Micronutrients are specified under the Fertiliser (Control) Order, which prescribes grades, minimum nutrient content, permissible tolerance and — importantly — that only notified grades may be sold, with multi-micronutrient mixtures requiring state-specific notification based on regional soil deficiency, so a mixture lawful in one state may be unlawful in the next. The chelated grades carry a declared chelated content and the FCO prescribes the chelating agent and its ratio, which makes an under-chelated product a non-standard fertiliser rather than a commercial disappointment — and is precisely the parameter no farmer and few dealers can test. The second exposure is claims: a micronutrient marketed for yield increase, disease resistance or stress tolerance may cross into bio-stimulant or pesticide territory requiring a different registration, and describing a nutrient product in plant-protection language is the characteristic drift.** Then: Legal Metrology on net content; labelling of grade, content, batch, manufacture and expiry; state manufacturing and sale licences; pollution consent; GST; and EPF/ESI and POSH.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with agri-chemical formulation, soil science or agri-input background. Three competences decide outcomes. *Chelation chemistry*, because the difference between a real chelate and a labelled one is a manufacturing capability rather than a purchasing decision, and it is where the category's quality actually diverges. *Diagnostic credibility*, since a testing service run inside a selling company is only believed if its no-deficiency findings are visible. And *the discipline to hold the claim down*, because micronutrient marketing in India drifts steadily toward yield promises that the product cannot support and the registration does not permit. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **the laboratory reports to the promoter, its recommendations are issued to the farmer directly, and the proportion finding no deficiency is published.**

4. Market Analysis — India

Micronutrient deficiency in Indian soils is real, widespread and unevenly mapped — which is what makes both the genuine opportunity and the easy abuse.

Demand drivers

- **Documented zinc, boron and iron deficiency** across large parts of the Indo-Gangetic plain and peninsular India.
- **Soil Health Card data** creating awareness of deficiency as a diagnosable condition.
- **Intensive cropping** depleting micronutrients faster than they are replaced.
- **Horticulture and high-value crops**, where correcting a deficiency has a measurable return.
- **Alkaline and calcareous soils**, where only chelated forms remain available to the plant.
- **State subsidy and mixture notification** programmes for region-specific grades.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian micronutrient and speciality nutrition consumption	Large and growing; quality highly variable
SAM	Fields with a DEMONSTRATED deficiency in served regions	Materially smaller than the sold market
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Own-label plus contract and bulk chelate supply	₹11cr → ₹52cr; 0.39m → 1.83m units

Revenue mix and share (Year 3)

Stream	Share of revenue	Why it is there
Zinc, boron & single-nutrient grades	31.9%	Volume core; deficiency best documented
Chelated micronutrients	23.8%	Where the category's quality actually diverges
Foliar & water-soluble speciality	18.9%	Fast correction; tank-mix risk highest
Multi-micronutrient mixtures	13.8%	State-notified grades only
Contract manufacturing & bulk chelate	8.5%	Capacity utilisation; assay carried through
Soil & tissue testing and advisory	3.1%	Small revenue; determines all the rest

The last row is 3.1% of revenue and governs the other 96.9%, which is the structural point of this business. The testing service is not a marketing device attached to a product range; it is the mechanism that decides whether a sale should happen at all, and it is priced as a service so that the farmer is paying for a diagnosis rather than receiving a free one whose purpose is to generate a prescription. A free soil test offered by a fertiliser company is not a diagnosis — it is a sales call with a laboratory attached, and everybody in the trade knows it.

Constraints

- **Genuine deficiency incidence**, which bounds the honest market well below the sold one.
- **State-by-state mixture notification**, which fragments the product range geographically.
- **Chelation raw material cost**, largely imported and volatile.
- **Testing turnaround** against the short window in which a foliar correction is useful.

5. Competition & Position

Competitor type	Strength	Weakness this plan exploits
Unregistered and small local blenders	Very low price, high dealer margin, flexible grades	"Chelated" claimed with no chelating agent; content at or below tolerance floor
Large agri-input companies' micronutrient ranges	Distribution, brand, field force, notified mixtures	Sold on dealer push rather than on a test; claims drift toward yield
Imported speciality nutrition brands	Formulation quality, chelate integrity, data	Price; limited Indian soil-specific response data

State agencies and cooperatives	Subsidised notified mixtures, official channel	Generic regional grades; little field-level diagnosis
This plan	Sold against a test, no-deficiency findings published, chelated fraction assayed and printed, response stated as a range	Refuses sales; smaller addressable base by design

The positioning is the vertical's recurring move applied to a category where it bites hardest: sell the measurement, and let the measurement decide the sale. A competitor's field officer arrives with a product and finds a use for it; this company's arrives with a test and reports the result, which in 29% of cases is that the field does not have the deficiency the farmer suspected. Horticulture growers, contract-farming supply chains and progressive large farmers respond first, because a wasted foliar application on a high-value crop costs them real money and they can count it.

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. The 8,900 tests that found no deficiency and produced no sale forfeited an estimated ₹2.24 crore of Year-3 revenue. Declining to make the yield-increase claims the category makes routinely cost a further ₹1.36 crore. Grading to the declared value rather than the permitted tolerance floor costs ₹68 lakh a year in raw material. Batches reprocessed or destroyed on chelated-fraction assay failure cost ₹52 lakh. Against that: 78% repeat purchase, a contract-farming and export-linked book that requires a certificate of analysis, and the fact that a farmer who was once told he did not need a product tends to believe the next recommendation.

6. Selling Into Unverified Need

This is the category's structural problem and it deserves to be named precisely.

What the farmer observes	What may have happened	Why he cannot tell
Applied it, no visible response	The field never had the deficiency	A healthy crop responds to nothing
Applied it, no visible response	The product had little available nutrient	Grams per acre; nothing is visible either way
Applied it, no visible response	It was "chelated" in name only and locked up in the soil	Chelation cannot be seen, smelled or field-tested
Applied it, no visible response	It was antagonised by what it was tank-mixed with	Nobody told him the incompatibility
Applied it, good crop	The season was good	Nothing was controlled

Four different failures and one absent deficiency all produce the identical observation — and the fifth line shows that success is equally uninformative. This is the bio-inputs problem in a new form, and it is worse in one respect: with a biological, at least the seller knows whether he put the organism in. Here the seller may genuinely not know whether the customer needed the product, because nobody tested, and "the farmer asked for zinc" is an answer that satisfies everybody in the chain. A category in which need is unverified, response is invisible and margin is high has every structural feature of a market that will drift toward selling more than is required — which per the anchor's rule (high margin plus zero detectability) is a warning flag about this business, not only about its competitors.

So the diagnosis is separated from the sale and priced. Soil and tissue testing is offered as a paid service rather than as a free call, the report goes to the farmer with the recommendation stated in his own field's terms, and the recommendation is permitted to be "no micronutrient application required this season" — which it was for 8,900 of 30,700 tests in Year 3. That proportion is published, because a testing programme inside a manufacturer that never finds an absence of need is not a testing programme; it is a sales script. **WHERE THE NEED ITSELF IS UNVERIFIED, THE FIRST HONEST STEP IS TO SELL THE DIAGNOSIS RATHER THAN THE REMEDY** — and to make the diagnosis capable of returning nothing.

The economics of that decision should be stated plainly rather than presented as virtue. A soil test costs this company roughly ₹700 all-in once sampling, analysis, interpretation and the field visit are counted, and it recovers around ₹520 from the farmer — so the diagnostic service loses money on every test and would be indefensible as a standalone line. It earns its place because the 71% of tests that DO find a deficiency produce a recommendation the farmer acts on, repeats and tells his neighbours about, at a repeat-purchase rate of 78% against a category where a farmer typically tries a micronutrient once. The loss-making diagnosis buys the credibility that the profitable product cannot buy for itself — which is the actual commercial argument, and it depends entirely on the 29% being real.

7. The Chelate, the Grade and the Tank Mix

Three product-level commitments, each addressing something the buyer cannot check.

☐ **THE CHELATED FRACTION IS ASSAYED AND PRINTED.** Chelation is a chemical relationship, not an ingredient — the metal must be bound to an agent that keeps it plant-available in alkaline and calcareous soils, which is exactly where Indian micronutrient demand concentrates. A product sold as "chelated zinc" that is zinc sulphate with a trade name, or an EDTA grade chelated to a fraction of its declaration, will precipitate in the soil and do nothing — and this is undetectable by the farmer, by the dealer, and by anybody without a laboratory. So every chelated pack states the **ACTUAL CHELATED FRACTION FROM ASSAY**, the chelating agent and its molar ratio, with the batch analysis available on the batch number. Twenty-two batches assayed below declaration in Year 3 and were reprocessed or destroyed rather than despatched, at a cost of ₹52 lakh.

☐ **GRADED TO THE DECLARED VALUE, NOT THE TOLERANCE FLOOR.** The FCO permits a tolerance below declared content, and the category's standard commercial practice is to target the bottom of that band — lawful, invisible, and worth several per cent of raw material on every batch. Per the vertical anchor's rule, this plant formulates to the **DECLARED** value with the tolerance treated as a manufacturing safety margin rather than as a design target, and publishes the average delivered content against declaration: 100.8% in Year 3. It costs ₹68 lakh a year in raw material and is the single clearest illustration of what "grading to the floor" quietly transfers from the buyer to the seller across an entire industry.

☐ **AND THE TANK MIX IS WHERE A GOOD PRODUCT IS DESTROYED BY THE ADVICE THAT ACCOMPANIED IT.** Foliar micronutrients are mixed in the farmer's tank with whatever else is being sprayed that morning, and antagonism is routine — calcium precipitating boron, phosphate locking zinc, high-pH mixtures degrading a chelate, incompatible surfactants breaking the formulation. The product then fails for a reason that has nothing to do with its quality, and the brand carries the blame. So every foliar pack prints the **INCOMPATIBILITIES AND ANTAGONISMS** explicitly, with the sequence of addition, rather than a general instruction to "check compatibility" that assumes a user who has no way to check anything.

□ **AND THE DEALER MARGIN IS DISCLOSED**, per the anchor's rule and the retail plan's finding. Micronutrients carry the highest dealer margins in the agri-input shop, which is precisely why they are recommended so freely by a person the farmer treats as an adviser. Stating the margin on the pack does not remove the conflict, but it lets the farmer weigh a recommendation whose enthusiasm has a visible cause — and it is why 46% gross margin in this business is reported as a risk indicator in §12 rather than as an achievement.

8. Operations Plan (test, formulate, assay, label, follow up)

Diagnosis first

- **Soil and tissue testing offered as a paid service**, with the report issued to the farmer rather than to the sales officer.
- **Recommendation permitted to be "no application required"**, and the proportion so recommended published.
- **Tissue testing for standing crops**, where a soil result cannot explain a symptom.
- **Turnaround managed against the correction window**, since a result after the window has closed is advice about next year.

Formulation and chelation

- **Chelation carried out in-house with reaction monitoring**, rather than blending a purchased "chelate" of unknown integrity.
- **Formulated to declared content** with tolerance as safety margin, not as target.
- **Notified grades only**, with mixtures made to the specific state notification for the market they enter.
- **Water-soluble and foliar grades tested for solubility and residue** at field dilution.

Assay and release

- **Every batch assayed for total and chelated content**, with the chelated fraction printed on the pack.
- **Batch reprocessed or destroyed on assay failure** — never released against a deviation note.
- **Retained samples held to expiry** so a buyer can test the seller, per the anchor's rule.
- **Independent laboratory cross-checks** on a sample of batches each quarter.

Field follow-up

- **Response measured on a sample of treated fields** against untreated strips, and reported as a range by soil type.
- **Null results published** alongside positive ones.
- **Field staff paid on advice quality and follow-up**, not on volume, per the anchor's rule.
- **Tank-mix incompatibilities collected from the field** and added to the label rather than to a technical file.

The operational hinge is the test result that says no deficiency in a district where the sales target says otherwise. The commercially convenient response is to recommend a "maintenance dose" — a phrase with no agronomic content that converts a negative result into a sale and is used across the industry. So the report template has no maintenance-dose option, the laboratory issues its recommendation directly to the farmer without passing through the territory manager, and the count of no-deficiency findings is a published metric that the sales function cannot influence. Control-independence is the point: the finding must not be reviewable by the person it costs.

The four things a competitor could copy tomorrow, and why none has

- **Printing the assayed chelated fraction** — costs an assay and exposes every batch that misses.
- **Grading to declaration** — costs raw material on every batch, invisibly, forever.
- **Publishing the no-deficiency proportion** — costs the sales the finding prevents.
- **Printing incompatibilities** — costs nothing at all, and admits the product can fail.

The fourth item is the instructive one: it is free, it protects the customer, and almost nobody does it — which shows that the barrier in this category is not cost but disclosure itself. Every one of these commitments creates a document that could later be used against the company, and the trade's settled preference is to hold no such document. That preference, rather than any technical difficulty, is what this plan is competing against, and it is also why the position is more durable than it looks: a competitor can match the chemistry in a season and cannot easily start publishing figures it has spent a decade not collecting.

9. Registration, Grades & Operating Compliance (India)

- **Company & tax** — Private Limited, PAN/TAN, GST, factory licence, premises approval.
- **FCO grades** — only notified grades may be sold, with prescribed minimum content and permissible tolerance; **grading to the tolerance floor is lawful and is treated here as a transfer from buyer to seller rather than as an efficiency.**
- **Chelated grades** — declared chelated content with prescribed chelating agent and ratio; **an under-chelated product is a NON-STANDARD FERTILISER, not a disappointment — and it is precisely the parameter no farmer and few dealers can test.**
- **Multi-micronutrient mixtures** — state-specific notification based on regional deficiency, so **a mixture lawful in one state may be unlawful in the next**; grades are made to the notification of the market they enter.
- **Claims** — **marketing a nutrient for yield increase, disease resistance or stress tolerance can cross into bio-stimulant or pesticide territory requiring different registration; describing a nutrient in plant-protection language is the characteristic drift and is not done here.**
- **Labelling & metrology** — grade, total and chelated content, batch, manufacture and expiry, incompatibilities, and net content under Legal Metrology.
- **Environment & workforce** — pollution consent, chemical handling, EPF/ESI and POSH.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Function	Yr 1	Yr 3	Notes
Promoter / managing director	1	1	Owens the publication and claims policy
Chelation & formulation plant	8	21	Reaction monitored, not blended blind
Analytical laboratory — assay & chelated fraction	4	11	Every batch; retained samples to expiry
Soil & tissue testing laboratory	5	16	Reports to promoter; may recommend no product
Field agronomy & response trials	5	15	Paid on advice quality; publishes null results
Sales & channel	7	22	Cannot review or alter a test finding
Warehouse, despatch & logistics	3	9	Batch traceability to the pack

Finance, regulatory & admin	4	11	State-by-state notification management
Total	37	106	Laboratories at 25% of headcount

A quarter of headcount sits in two laboratories that between them decide whether a sale should occur and whether the product is what the label says. Both report to the promoter and neither reports to sales, which matters more here than in most businesses: a soil-testing service inside a fertiliser company is the textbook case of a control that exists on the organogram and is neutralised in practice, and the neutralisation is never a decision — it is a territory manager reviewing a report before it goes out, once, helpfully. So the report does not pass through him at all.

The sales function is deliberately built without four of its usual instruments — it cannot promise a yield increase, cannot recommend without a test, cannot alter a laboratory finding, and cannot offer the maintenance dose that resolves an inconvenient result. What remains is a report, a range and a margin disclosure, and a territory takes about two seasons longer to build on that basis than on conventional dealer push. That lag is a financing requirement rather than a presentational point, and it is why Year 1 carries a loss on a 43% gross margin — the constraint is paid for upfront and returns as an 78% repeat rate that the constraint itself created.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Window	Milestones
Formation & plant	Month 0-6	Incorporation, chelation and formulation lines, FCO grade registrations
Laboratories	Month 3-9	Assay laboratory with chelated-fraction method; soil and tissue laboratory
State notifications	Month 5-16	Mixture grades notified market by market
Diagnosis-led selling	Month 8-18	Paid testing service live; no-deficiency findings published
Response trials	Month 10-26	Treated-versus-untreated strips; response ranges by soil type published
Scale	Month 22-36	1.83m units; 30,700 tests; contract and bulk chelate supply

Training and competence

- **Chelation chemistry and reaction control** for plant staff, including what an incomplete reaction looks like.
- **Assay method discipline** for the analytical laboratory, with independent cross-checks.
- **Diagnostic interpretation** for the soil laboratory, including confident reporting of an absent deficiency.
- **Claims discipline** for sales and marketing — what a nutrient registration does and does not permit them to say.

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees. They exist to show the drivers of a micronutrient P&L and how the diagnostic and assay disciplines move them. Every input is editable. **Gross margin at 46% is the highest in this vertical, and per the anchor's rule that high margin combined with zero detectability is a warning flag, it is reported here as a risk indicator about this business rather than as an achievement — it is exactly the margin that funds an industry's drift toward selling into need nobody established.**

12.1 Project cost & funding

Item	₹ lakh	Notes
Land, building & plant	124	Chelation reactors, blending, water-soluble line
Filling, packing & batch coding	68	Batch traceability to the pack
Analytical laboratory — assay & chelated fraction	74	Tests the parameter nobody else can
Soil & tissue testing laboratory	62	Decides whether the sale should happen
FCO registrations & state mixture notifications	42	Market by market
Response trials & field programme	34	Treated versus untreated strips
Utilities, effluent & pollution consent	26	Chemical handling
Working capital & contingency	30	Imported chelating agent; seasonal build
Total project cost	460	₹180L investor + ₹140L term loan + ₹90L promoter + ₹50L WC

12.2 Operating metrics

Metric	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Revenue arising from a soil or tissue test / soil and tissue tests run / tests finding NO deficiency and producing NO sale	74% / 6,200 / 1,860 (30%)	85% / 15,400 / 4,700 (31%)	91% / 30,700 / 8,900 (29%)
Chelated fraction assayed and printed on pack / batches assaying BELOW declaration — reprocessed or destroyed / "chelated" claimed without a chelating agent	100% / 14 / NIL	100% / 19 / NIL	100% / 22 / NIL
Average delivered content against declaration / batches formulated to the tolerance floor / FCO non-standard notices	100.9% / NIL / NIL	100.8% / NIL / NIL	100.8% / NIL / NIL
Response published as a RANGE by soil type / trials showing no significant response — published / yield-increase claims made	100% / 9 / NIL	100% / 17 / NIL	100% / 26 / NIL
Tank-mix incompatibilities and antagonisms printed on pack / dealer margin disclosed / field staff paid on volume	100% / 100% / NIL	100% / 100% / NIL	100% / 100% / NIL
Units despatched / blended realisation / gross margin / repeat purchase	0.39m / ₹273 / 43.0% / n/a	0.92m / ₹274 / 45.0% / 71%	1.83m / ₹275 / 46.0% / 78%

Row one is the row this business exists to report, and its third figure must not fall toward zero: 8,900 tests in Year 3 found no deficiency and produced no sale — 29% of everything tested. A testing programme inside a manufacturer that never finds an absence of need is not a testing programme, per the library's rule that a gate with no rejections is not a gate. Row three's 100.8% average delivered content is the anchor's grade-to-declaration rule made auditable, and its second figure — nil batches formulated to the tolerance floor — is what the number actually costs. The blended realisation of ₹275 in row six carries its underlying figures per the library's rule: chelates ₹520, foliar speciality ₹385, mixtures ₹240, single-nutrient grades ₹215, contract manufacturing ₹165 — the blend moves with mix, not with price.

12.3 Revenue build

Stream	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)	Driver
--------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--------

Zinc, boron & single-nutrient grades	360	840	1,660	Volume core; ₹215 per unit
Chelated micronutrients	250	610	1,240	₹520 per unit; assay printed
Foliar & water-soluble speciality	210	490	980	₹385 per unit; incompatibilities printed
Multi-micronutrient mixtures	150	350	720	₹240 per unit; state-notified grades only
Contract manufacturing & bulk chelate	95	230	440	₹165 per unit; assay carried through
Soil & tissue testing and advisory	35	80	160	Paid service; may return no sale
Total revenue	1,100	2,600	5,200	Illustrative

12.4 P&L summary

Line	Yr 1 (₹L)	Yr 2 (₹L)	Yr 3 (₹L)
Revenue	1,100	2,600	5,200
Cost of goods sold	(627)	(1,430)	(2,808)
Gross profit	473	1,170	2,392
Plant operations & chelation	(108)	(178)	(268)
Analytical laboratory & chelated-fraction assay	(78)	(124)	(186)
Soil & tissue testing programme	(92)	(142)	(214)
Response trials & range studies	(58)	(92)	(128)
Distribution & channel	(56)	(108)	(172)
Sales & agronomy	(102)	(176)	(264)
Marketing & farmer demonstration	(36)	(62)	(94)
Admin, regulatory, insurance & other	(66)	(108)	(156)
EBITDA	(123)	180	910
Depreciation & amortisation	(58)	(72)	(86)
Finance cost	(46)	(62)	(78)
Other income — state soil-health programme support (tapering), technology licensing & interest (disclosed)	154	106	34
PBT	(73)	152	780
Tax	15	(38)	(208)
PAT	(58)	114	572
Net margin	(5.3%)	4.4%	11.0%
ROCE	(12.2%)	17.6%	42.8%

Three lines are shown separately because they are the plan: the analytical laboratory at ₹1.86 crore, the soil and tissue testing programme at ₹2.14 crore, and response trials at ₹1.28 crore — ₹5.28 crore, or 10.2% of Year-3 revenue. The testing programme is the largest of the three and is the only one that actively destroys revenue, since 29% of its findings end a sale before it starts. A competitor carrying none of these costs and selling on dealer push earns roughly ₹7.6 crore more at this revenue and sells a product the farmer cannot distinguish at the counter — which is the honest description of the competitive position and the reason 46% gross margin is flagged as a hazard rather than celebrated. State programme support is disclosed separately and tapers from ₹1.54 crore to ₹34 lakh, so Year-3 profit rests on trading.

12.5 Break-even & sensitivity

Scenario	Yr 3 revenue	Yr 3 PAT	Comment
Base	₹52.0cr	₹5.72cr	As modelled
Sold on dealer push, no testing programme	₹54.2cr	₹9.86cr	What the category's economics reward
Yield claims made as competitors make them	₹53.4cr	₹6.74cr	The ₹1.36cr forgone, restored
Graded to the tolerance floor	₹52.0cr	₹6.23cr	Lawful, invisible, and a transfer from the buyer
Chelating agent cost +40%	₹52.0cr	₹3.94cr	Imported input; the real margin risk
A mixture found non-standard on FCO sampling	₹47.6cr	₹3.18cr	Recall, licence exposure, channel damage

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Source	₹ lakh	Terms (indicative)
Investor equity	180	Growth capital; testing and assay covenants
Term loan	140	Plant and laboratories; 5–6 years
Promoter contribution	90	Cash and formulation know-how
Working capital facility	50	Imported chelating agent; seasonal build
Total	460	Illustrative structure

A lender should read two numbers before any other: the proportion of revenue arising from a test, and the proportion of tests finding no deficiency. The first at 91% says the revenue rests on established need rather than on channel enthusiasm, which is what makes it repeatable; the second at 29% says the first number is real, because a diagnostic function that always finds a problem is not diagnosing. The principal credit risks are the imported chelating agent — a 40% cost move takes Year-3 profit from ₹5.72 crore to ₹3.94 crore and cannot be passed on quickly in a price-sensitive channel — and an FCO non-standard finding on a notified mixture, which combines recall, licence exposure and channel damage in a single event.

- **Use of funds** — 27% building and plant, 16% analytical laboratory, 15% filling and packing, 13% soil and tissue laboratory, 9% registrations and notifications, 7% response trials, balance utilities and working capital.
- **Repayment** — term loan from Year 2–3 cash flow; working capital revolving against the seasonal cycle and imported raw material lead times.

- **Investor exit** — strategic sale to an agri-input group building a speciality nutrition portfolio, a global micronutrient company seeking Indian manufacture, or promoter buyback.

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Impact	Mitigation
Selling into need nobody established	The dose is grams per acre, the price is high, and a crop that never had the deficiency responds exactly as a worthless product does — nothing visible. Four different failures and one absent deficiency produce an identical observation, and success is equally uninformative, so a company can sell into unverified need indefinitely without being contradicted	SELL AGAINST A TEST — 91% of Year-3 revenue arises from a soil or tissue result; the testing service is PAID rather than free , so the farmer buys a diagnosis instead of receiving a sales call with a laboratory attached; the recommendation is PERMITTED TO BE "NO APPLICATION REQUIRED" and was for 8,900 of 30,700 tests; and THAT PROPORTION IS PUBLISHED , because a testing programme inside a manufacturer that never finds an absence of need is a sales script. WHERE THE NEED ITSELF IS UNVERIFIED, SELL THE DIAGNOSIS RATHER THAN THE REMEDY
The "maintenance dose" that converts a negative result into a sale	A phrase with no agronomic content, used across the industry, which quietly neutralises every no-deficiency finding a company's own laboratory produces	The report template has NO maintenance-dose option ; the laboratory issues its recommendation DIRECTLY TO THE FARMER without passing through the territory manager; the no-deficiency count is a published metric the sales function cannot influence; and field staff are paid on advice quality and follow-up rather than on volume — control-independence means the finding must not be reviewable by the person it costs
Chelation claimed but not delivered	Chelation is a chemical relationship the buyer cannot see; zinc sulphate with a trade name, or an EDTA grade chelated to a fraction of declaration, precipitates in the alkaline soils where Indian demand concentrates and does nothing — undetectable by farmer, dealer or anyone without a laboratory, and under the FCO it is a NON-STANDARD FERTILISER rather than a disappointment	Chelation carried out IN-HOUSE WITH REACTION MONITORING rather than blending a purchased "chelate" of unknown integrity; every batch assayed for total AND chelated content with the ACTUAL CHELATED FRACTION , the agent and its molar ratio PRINTED ON THE PACK ; batch analysis retrievable on the batch number; retained samples held to expiry so the buyer can test the seller; 22 batches reprocessed or destroyed on assay failure at ₹52 lakh ; and independent laboratory cross-checks each quarter
Grading to the tolerance floor	The FCO permits content below declaration, so the industry standard is to target the bottom of the band — lawful, invisible, and worth several per cent of raw material on every batch, taken silently from every buyer	Formulated to the DECLARED value with tolerance treated as a manufacturing safety margin rather than a design target ; average delivered content PUBLISHED against declaration at 100.8% ; nil batches formulated to the floor; costs ₹68 lakh a year in raw material and is the clearest illustration of what grading to the floor transfers from buyer to seller across an entire industry

Tank-mix antagonism destroying a good product	Foliar micronutrients go into the farmer's tank with whatever else is sprayed that morning — calcium precipitating boron, phosphate locking zinc, high pH degrading a chelate, incompatible surfactants breaking the formulation — and the product fails for reasons unconnected to its quality while the brand carries the blame	INCOMPATIBILITIES AND ANTAGONISMS PRINTED EXPLICITLY ON EVERY FOLIAR PACK with the sequence of addition, rather than an instruction to "check compatibility" that assumes a user with no way to check anything; field-reported incompatibilities added to the LABEL rather than filed in a technical dossier; and demonstration protocols that show the mix, not only the product
Claim drift into plant-protection language	Marketing a nutrient for yield increase, disease resistance or stress tolerance can cross into bio-stimulant or pesticide territory requiring different registration, and the drift is the category's characteristic regulatory failure	NO yield-increase claims made; response published as a RANGE BY SOIL TYPE with the 26 trials showing no significant response published alongside; claims discipline trained into sales and marketing with the registration's permitted language stated; and dealer margin disclosed on the pack, since micronutrients carry the shop's highest margins and that is why they are recommended so freely
Imported chelating agent cost and availability	A 40% cost move takes Year-3 profit from ₹5.72cr to ₹3.94cr and cannot be passed on quickly in a price-sensitive channel	Multiple qualified suppliers with alternate chelating chemistries validated in advance; forward cover on the largest exposure; formulation flexibility across EDTA and EDDHA grades; a product range weighted so that single-nutrient and mixture lines can carry volume when chelate pricing is adverse; and pricing reviewed by season rather than annually
An FCO non-standard finding on a notified mixture	Recall, licence exposure and channel damage in one event; Year-3 profit to ₹3.18cr	Only notified grades sold, made to the specific state notification for the market they enter; every batch assayed and released on result rather than on deviation note; retained samples enabling this company to reproduce any regulator's finding; and a state-by-state notification register maintained by the regulatory function rather than by sales

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths • 91% of revenue arising from a soil or tissue test • 8,900 no-deficiency findings published — 29% of tests • Chelated fraction assayed and printed on every pack • Delivered content 100.8% of declaration, not the floor • Tank-mix incompatibilities and dealer margin on the pack	Weaknesses • Addressable base smaller by design • Laboratories at 25% of headcount and 10.2% of revenue • Refuses the yield claims the channel expects • Imported chelating agent exposure
Opportunities • Documented zinc and boron deficiency across large regions • Soil Health Card data creating diagnostic awareness • Horticulture and contract-farming chains requiring analysis • State mixture notifications for region-specific grades • Selling the diagnosis as a service in its own right	Threats • Unregistered blenders claiming chelation they do not deliver • Chelating agent price and availability • An FCO non-standard finding on a notified mixture • Channel preference for whatever pays the highest margin

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Soil & tissue test register** — result, recommendation and outcome, with no-deficiency findings counted and published.
- **Chelated-fraction assay log** — declared versus assayed, by batch, with the reprocess or destroy decision recorded.
- **Grade-to-declaration tracker** — delivered content against declaration, published as an average.
- **Response-range library** — treated versus untreated results by soil type, including null findings.
- **Tank-mix compatibility register** — field-reported antagonisms feeding the label.
- **State notification register** — which mixture grades are lawful in which market.
- **Contribution per unit dashboard** — by grade, never blended alone.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, volumes, realisation, test counts, assay failures and headcount are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on deficiency incidence, chelating agent cost, state notifications and channel behaviour. Figures are in Indian rupees.
- **The central integrity finding is that a micronutrient sold without a soil or tissue test is a product sold for a deficiency nobody established.** The dose is grams per acre, the price is high, the response where a genuine deficiency exists can be dramatic — and where none exists there is no response at all. **A crop that did not need zinc and a bottle containing no usable zinc produce the same result: nothing visible. Four distinct failures and one absent deficiency give an identical observation, and a good season makes success equally uninformative, so a company can sell into unverified need indefinitely without ever being contradicted. This is the bio-inputs problem in a new form and worse in one respect: with a biological the seller at least knows whether he put the organism in, whereas here he may genuinely not know whether the customer needed the product, because nobody tested — and "the farmer asked for zinc" satisfies everybody in the chain.**
- **So the diagnosis is separated from the sale and priced.** Soil and tissue testing is offered as a paid service rather than a free call, the report goes to the farmer with the recommendation in his own field's terms, and the recommendation is permitted to be "no micronutrient application required this season" — which it was for 8,900 of 30,700 tests in Year 3, 29% of everything tested, while 91% of revenue arose from a test result. **That proportion is published because a testing programme inside a manufacturer that never finds an absence of need is not a testing programme; it is a sales script. WHERE THE NEED ITSELF IS UNVERIFIED, THE FIRST HONEST STEP IS TO SELL THE DIAGNOSIS RATHER THAN THE REMEDY — and to make the diagnosis capable of returning nothing. The 8,900 findings cost ₹2.24 crore of Year-3 revenue.**
- **The industry's neutralising device is the "maintenance dose", and it is designed out rather than discouraged.** It is a phrase with no agronomic content that converts a negative test into a sale, and it is what quietly disposes of every no-deficiency finding a fertiliser company's own laboratory produces. **So the report template has no maintenance-dose option, the laboratory issues its recommendation directly to the farmer without passing through the territory manager, and the no-deficiency count is a published metric the sales function cannot influence. Control-independence means the finding must not be reviewable by the person it costs — and the neutralisation is never a decision, it is a manager helpfully reviewing a report before it goes out, once.**
- **The chelate is the category's classic undetectable fraud.** Chelation is a chemical relationship the buyer cannot see: the metal must be bound to an agent that keeps it available in the alkaline and calcareous soils where Indian demand concentrates, and zinc sulphate with a trade name — or an EDTA grade chelated to a fraction of its declaration

— will precipitate and do nothing, undetectable by farmer, dealer or anyone without a laboratory. Under the FCO it is a non-standard fertiliser, not a disappointment. **So chelation is carried out in-house with reaction monitoring rather than by blending a purchased "chelate" of unknown integrity; every pack states the actual chelated fraction from assay, the chelating agent and its molar ratio; retained samples are held to expiry so the buyer can test the seller; and 22 batches were reprocessed or destroyed on assay failure at a cost of ₹52 lakh.**

- **Graded to the declared value, not the tolerance floor.** The FCO permits content below declaration and the category's standard practice is to target the bottom of that band — lawful, invisible, and worth several per cent of raw material on every batch. **This plant formulates to the declared value with tolerance treated as a manufacturing safety margin rather than a design target, and publishes average delivered content against declaration at 100.8% with nil batches formulated to the floor. It costs ₹68 lakh a year and is the clearest available illustration of what grading to the floor silently transfers from buyer to seller across an entire industry.**
- **Two further disclosures address failures the product is blamed for and conflicts it benefits from.** Foliar micronutrients enter the farmer's tank with whatever else is sprayed that morning, and antagonism is routine — calcium precipitating boron, phosphate locking zinc, high pH degrading a chelate — so incompatibilities and the sequence of addition are printed explicitly rather than covered by an instruction to "check compatibility" that assumes a user with no way to check anything. **And the dealer margin is disclosed on the pack, because micronutrients carry the highest margins in the agri-input shop, which is precisely why they are recommended so freely by a person the farmer treats as an adviser.** No yield-increase claims are made; response is published as a range by soil type with the 26 null trials alongside.
- **The economics are reported against the plan's own product.** Gross margin at 46% is the highest in this vertical, and per the anchor's rule that high margin combined with zero detectability is a warning flag, it is stated as a risk indicator about this business rather than as an achievement — it is exactly the margin that funds an industry's drift toward selling into need nobody established. **The analytical laboratory (₹1.86cr), the testing programme (₹2.14cr) and response trials (₹1.28cr) total ₹5.28 crore, or 10.2% of Year-3 revenue, and the testing programme is the only one of the three that actively destroys revenue. A competitor carrying none of them and selling on dealer push earns roughly ₹7.6 crore more at this revenue and sells a product the farmer cannot distinguish at the counter.** State programme support is disclosed separately and tapers from ₹1.54 crore to ₹34 lakh; contribution is reported per grade and the blended realisation of ₹275 carries its underlying figures — chelates ₹520, foliar ₹385, mixtures ₹240, single-nutrient ₹215, contract ₹165.
- **Compliance and professional advice.** FCO notified grades with prescribed minimum content and tolerance; declared chelated content with prescribed agent and ratio; state-specific notification for multi-micronutrient mixtures, so a mixture lawful in one state may be unlawful in the next; registration boundaries where a nutrient claim crosses into bio-stimulant or pesticide territory; labelling of grade, total and chelated content, batch, dates and incompatibilities; Legal Metrology on net content; state manufacturing and sale licences; pollution consent; GST; and EPF/ESI and POSH. Professional advice should be taken on grade registrations, state notifications, label claims and the terms of the chelated-fraction declaration.

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

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

