



**BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA**

# **Office-Furniture Manufacturing/Supply**

*Office furniture bid with its test data in the tender - user trial before award, floor-level  
emission loading published*

**FURNITURE MANUFACTURING & RETAIL**

**AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES**

August 2026

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

## 1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out an **Office-Furniture Manufacturing/Supply** business in India — workstations and seating manufactured and supplied to institutional buyers, covering desking systems, task and executive seating, storage and pedestals, meeting and collaborative furniture, turnkey fit-out projects, and testing, certification and refurbishment services, producing roughly 124,000 units and equipping 34,000 workstation positions a year by Year 3.

This plan inherits the ten furniture anchor rules set by **furniture-manufacturing** and adds the institutional case. **In every earlier plan somebody chose the furniture they would live with. Here the person who will sit in it for seven years is not a party to the transaction at any point.**

☐ **NOBODY IN THE ROOM WILL SIT IN IT. A facilities team writes the specification, procurement runs the tender, finance approves the award — and nine hundred chairs arrive at nine hundred desks belonging to people who saw no sample, attended no meeting and had no vote. THAT PERSON WILL OCCUPY IT EIGHT HOURS A DAY FOR SEVEN YEARS, WHICH IS MORE CONTINUOUS CONTACT THAN WITH ANY OBJECT HE OWNS, AND HE HAS NO STANDING IN THE PURCHASE WHATSOEVER. The tender that decides for him tests only for the PRESENCE of features — adjustable height, armrest, lumbar support, five-star base — every one of which is satisfied equally by a ₹4,200 chair and a ₹19,000 chair, SO THE WORDS ARE MET AND THE OUTCOME IS NOT SPECIFIED AT ALL. So this business PUTS THE TEST DATA IN THE BID: cycle and ergonomic results PUBLISHED PER SKU and included in every tender, 120,000 seat-impact cycles and 240,000 gas-lift cycles completed without failure, and A USER TRIAL BEFORE AWARD offered on 100% of tenders and accepted on 64%. WHERE THE BUYER NEVER SITS IN IT, THE TENDER SPECIFICATION IS THE ONLY ADVOCATE THE USER HAS — SO PUT THE TEST DATA IN IT.**

☐ **AND NINE HUNDRED WORKSTATIONS IN ONE AIR-HANDLING ZONE ARE NOT NINE HUNDRED INDEPENDENT EXPOSURES. An emission class is measured per panel; an open-plan floor concentrates panel area against a fixed volume of recirculated air, and nobody in this industry calculates the ratio. So OPEN-PLAN EMISSION LOADING IS CALCULATED AND PUBLISHED for the delivered configuration — panel area per cubic metre of air falling from 0.62 to 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup> — and measured formaldehyde ON THE OCCUPIED FLOOR is 0.021 mg/m<sup>3</sup> against a 0.08 reference.**

☐ **AND A WARRANTY IS A PROMISE ABOUT A COMPANY WHILE A CYCLE TEST IS A FACT ABOUT A CHAIR. So FAILURE IS PUBLISHED BY COMPONENT — gas lift, castor, armrest, mechanism, fabric — with units failing within the published service life falling from 4.8% to 1.2%, and 88 BIDS REFUSED in Year 3 where the specification could not honestly be met at the tendered price.**

This plan models an operator requiring **₹22.00 crore** (₹7.60 crore investor + ₹7.20 crore term loan + ₹4.00 crore working capital + ₹3.20 crore promoter), moving from **₹17.00 crore revenue and a ₹1.71 crore loss** to **₹68.00 crore revenue and ₹4.77 crore profit** by Year 3 — a 7.0% net margin and 32.5% return on capital. (Office furniture — figures illustrative.)

## 2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

**Concept:** An office-furniture maker that bids with its test results attached.

**Vision:** To make the tender specification describe an outcome rather than a feature list.

**Mission:** Publish what every SKU survived and for how many cycles; offer the chair to the people who will sit in it before anyone awards anything; calculate what the whole floor emits rather than what one panel does; publish failure by component instead of a warranty; and refuse the bid we cannot meet honestly.

## Legal structure

- **Private Limited** — recommended. Institutional and government tendering, EMD and performance guarantees, and outside capital all assume it.
- **Test data attached to every bid as a standing document — the structural precondition, since a bid team permitted to omit it under deadline will omit it exactly where the numbers are weakest.**
- **Testing laboratory reporting to the board, independent of production and bidding — because the SKU that fails a cycle test is always the SKU a live tender depends on.**

**Regulatory anchor:** BIS standards for office furniture and seating, and **BIFMA and EN-equivalent cycle and durability testing, which Indian manufacturers routinely perform for export and multinational clients and almost never publish for domestic tenders**; the absence of any mandatory formaldehyde emission-class labelling for domestic furniture, **which in an open-plan office becomes a floor-level question nobody is required to compute**; the Factories Act 1948 on machine guarding, dust extraction and occupational health across panel, metal and upholstery lines; public-procurement rules and General Financial Rules where government and PSU tenders apply, including L1 award mechanics; the Consumer Protection Act 2019 and contract law on durability and performance representations to institutional buyers; occupational-health guidance on display-screen and seated work; the Air and Water Acts with consent to operate for powder coating and finishing; hazardous-waste rules for solvents and foam; and EPF, ESI and POSH. **The decisive structural fact is that A TENDER CAN SPECIFY EVERY FEATURE OF A CHAIR WITHOUT SPECIFYING ANY PROPERTY THAT DETERMINES WHETHER IT IS STILL USABLE IN YEAR FOUR.**

## 3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with office-furniture manufacturing, contract furniture or workplace-fit-out background, with a testing and materials lead and a projects head. Three competences decide outcomes. *Test-and-publish discipline*, because a laboratory that exists only to satisfy an export client is a laboratory whose data never reaches an Indian buyer. *Tender literacy*, since institutional selling is won or lost on how a specification is written months before a bid opens. And *the willingness to lose an L1 award*, which is where this plan's proposition sits and which is tested every time a compliant cheaper bid exists. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs; **the testing laboratory reports to the board independently of production and bidding, and no employee's pay is linked to tender win rate alone.**

## 4. Market Analysis — India

Large, project-lumpy and tender-driven, competed almost entirely on lowest compliant price.

### Demand drivers

- **Commercial real-estate absorption** across IT, BFSI and shared-workspace occupiers.
- **Global capability centres** fitting out large floorplates to international standards.
- **Hybrid workplace redesign** converting fixed desking to collaborative layouts.
- **Government and PSU procurement** at scale through structured tendering.
- **Refurbishment cycles** as first-generation office stock reaches replacement age.
- **Occupier ESG and wellbeing programmes** beginning to reach furniture specification.

## Market sizing (illustrative framing)

| Layer        | Definition                                                             | Indicative scale                                       |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| TAM          | Indian office furniture manufacture and institutional supply           | Large; project-lumpy; L1-competed                      |
| SAM          | <b>Tenders that will accept published test data and a user trial</b>   | <b>Bounded by SPECIFICATION QUALITY, not by demand</b> |
| SOM (Yr 1-3) | Positions equipped with tested, trialled, loading-calculated furniture | ₹17cr → ₹68cr; 34,000 positions; 88 bids refused       |

## Revenue mix and share (Year 3)

| Stream                                             | Share        | Gross margin — and who decides the specification                |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Workstations &amp; desking systems</b>          | <b>32.0%</b> | <b>26.0% — largest panel area; the open-plan loading case</b>   |
| <b>Task &amp; executive seating</b>                | <b>24.0%</b> | <b>34.0% — eight hours a day; where cycle data matters most</b> |
| Storage, pedestals & filing                        | 14.0%        | 28.0% — bulk panel, lowest specification scrutiny               |
| Meeting, collaborative & soft seating              | 12.0%        | 32.0% — foam and fabric; a different VOC question               |
| <b>Turnkey fit-out &amp; installation projects</b> | <b>12.0%</b> | <b>22.0% — thinnest margin; where site cutting returns</b>      |
| Testing, certification & refurbishment services    | 6.0%         | 48.0% — selling the laboratory that governs us                  |

The second row is where the finding bites hardest and the price gap is most visible: a task chair is the single object an office worker has most contact with, and it is bought on a feature list that a chair costing a quarter as much satisfies word for word. The first row is where the open-plan loading question lives, because desking is the largest panel area on any floor and nine hundred positions in one air-handling zone is a concentration nobody computes. The sixth row is the useful inversion: we sell testing, certification and refurbishment to other manufacturers and to occupiers auditing their own installed stock, so the laboratory that constrains us is a 48%-margin revenue line rather than pure overhead.

## Constraints

- **Specification quality**, which is the hard ceiling on bidding honestly and winning.
- **L1 award mechanics**, under which the cheapest compliant bid wins by rule.
- **Project lumpiness**, with revenue arriving in large, irregular awards.
- **Working capital**, through project inventory, retention and long settlement.

## 5. Competition & Position

| Competitor type                         | Strength                                          | Weakness this plan exploits                                        |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| National office-furniture manufacturers | Scale, tender panels, product range, brand, price | <b>Cycle data held for export clients, never in a domestic bid</b> |
| Regional fabricators & job workshops    | Cheapest, flexible, fast, locally present         | No testing at all; feature-compliant on paper only                 |

|                                        |                                                                               |                                                                    |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Imported and multinational brands      | Design, published standards, global specification                             | Price point excludes most Indian institutional tenders             |
| Fit-out contractors bundling furniture | Single-point delivery, programme control, client relationship                 | Furniture bought on cost line; specification passed through unread |
| <b>This plan</b>                       | <b>Test data in the bid, user trial before award, floor loading published</b> | Loses L1 awards; higher price per position                         |

The positioning makes one claim a procurement officer can verify against a document and one an employee can verify by sitting down: this SKU survived this many cycles, and here is the chair — try it for a fortnight before anybody signs anything. No competitor offers the second, and few offer the first domestically, because the data exists for export clients and no Indian tender has ever asked for it. The commercial difficulty is structural rather than persuasive: under L1 the lowest compliant bid wins by rule, and a bid carrying published test data is not scored higher for carrying it — it is simply more expensive than a bid that meets the same words for less.

The cost of the honest position is stated in rupees rather than implied. Refusing 88 bids where the specification could not honestly be met at the tendered price cost ₹2.34 crore of Year-3 margin — the largest item, and the direct price of declining to win on a feature list. Cycle and ergonomic testing published per SKU and included in every bid cost ₹1.96 crore. Calculating and publishing open-plan emission loading for every delivered configuration cost ₹98 lakh. Publishing failure by component instead of a warranty period cost ₹86 lakh. Running a user trial before award rather than sending a sample to procurement cost ₹68 lakh. Total ₹6.82 crore against ₹4.77 crore of profit — so an operator with the same plant and the same tender panel running trade-standard practice would earn ₹11.59 crore.

## 6. Nobody in the Room Will Sit in It

This is the finding, and it is a property of institutional buying rather than of anyone's conduct.

| Role in the transaction                    | Relationship to the chair                     |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Facilities team                            | Writes the specification. Does not sit in it. |
| Procurement                                | Runs the tender. Does not sit in it.          |
| Finance                                    | Approves the award. Does not sit in it.       |
| The bidder                                 | Meets the words. Does not sit in it.          |
| <b>The employee</b>                        | <b>EIGHT HOURS A DAY FOR SEVEN YEARS</b>      |
| <b>The employee's role in the decision</b> | <b>NONE. HE IS NOT A PARTY.</b>               |

The last two rows are the finding, and the gap between them is wider here than anywhere else in this library. A person will spend roughly fourteen thousand hours in that chair — MORE CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL CONTACT THAN WITH ANY OBJECT HE OWNS, INCLUDING HIS BED — and he was not consulted, shown a sample, offered a choice or given a channel of complaint that does not run through his own manager. This is the corporate-canteen structure the food-service vertical described and the preventive-checkup structure the diagnostics vertical described, applied to a chair: THE PAYER AND THE USER ARE DIFFERENT PEOPLE, AND ONLY THE PAYER IS IN THE ROOM. What makes the office case sharper is that the specification is not merely written

without him — IT IS WRITTEN IN A LANGUAGE THAT CANNOT EXPRESS WHAT HE NEEDS. A tender says adjustable seat height, adjustable armrest, lumbar support, revolving five-star base, and every one of those terms is satisfied identically by a chair at ₹4,200 and a chair at ₹19,000. THE SPECIFICATION TESTS FOR THE PRESENCE OF FEATURES AND NEVER ONCE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THEM: it does not ask how many cycles the gas lift survived, what load the armrest carried, how the seat foam recovered after ten thousand impacts, or whether the mechanism still works after four years. So the words are all met, the L1 rule awards to the cheapest bid meeting them, and the outcome the words were written to protect is not addressed anywhere in the document. NOBODY DECEIVED ANYBODY. A COMPLIANT CHAIR ARRIVED, EXACTLY AS SPECIFIED.

So the missing dimension is supplied in the only document that reaches the decision: the bid. CYCLE AND ERGONOMIC TEST RESULTS ARE PUBLISHED PER SKU AND INCLUDED IN EVERY BID at 100%, with NIL SKUs bid without published test data — 120,000 seat-impact cycles and 240,000 gas-lift cycles completed without failure by Year 3, on BIFMA-equivalent protocols this industry already runs for export clients and has never once put in front of an Indian buyer. A USER TRIAL BEFORE AWARD is offered on 100% of tenders and ACCEPTED ON 64%, up from 22% — the chair placed with twenty people who will actually sit in it, for a fortnight, with their responses published to the buyer. That single mechanism does what no specification clause can: IT PUTS THE ABSENT PARTY IN THE ROOM AS EVIDENCE, and it changed the specification in 24 tenders in Year 3. AND FAILURE IS PUBLISHED BY COMPONENT — gas lift, castor, armrest, mechanism, fabric — with units failing within the published service life falling from 4.8% to 1.2%, because a warranty is a promise about a company and a cycle count is a fact about a chair. Cost ₹3.50 crore across the three commitments. WHERE THE BUYER NEVER SITS IN IT, THE TENDER SPECIFICATION IS THE ONLY ADVOCATE THE USER HAS — SO PUT THE TEST DATA IN IT.

## 7. The Specification Is a Fossil

Three further rules, plus the anchor obligations this plan carries into tendering.

☐ THE TENDER SPECIFICATION WAS NOT WRITTEN — IT ACCRETED. A facilities team preparing a tender copies the last one, which copied the one before it, so the document encodes whatever the market could supply at whatever price point was normal several cycles ago, carried forward by people who inherited it rather than authored it. NOBODY IN THE BUILDING KNOWS WHY THE SPECIFICATION SAYS WHAT IT SAYS, AND THEREFORE NOBODY IN THE BUILDING CAN DEFEND CHANGING IT. Under L1 award this fossil becomes binding: the cheapest bid meeting the inherited words wins by rule, and a better chair with published data is not scored higher for having it — it is simply dearer. So 88 BIDS WERE REFUSED IN YEAR 3 where the specification could not honestly be met at the tendered price, up from 34, with NIL bids submitted to a specification we could not meet honestly and every refusal PUBLISHED WITH THE REASON — because a bidder who declines quietly leaves the specification standing for the next tender, and the specification is the thing that has to change.

☐ AND NINE HUNDRED WORKSTATIONS IN ONE AIR-HANDLING ZONE ARE NOT NINE HUNDRED INDEPENDENT EXPOSURES. An emission class is a per-panel property; an open-plan floor is a fixed volume of recirculated air with an enormous and highly variable panel area in it — desking, screens, pedestals and storage, multiplied by the position count — and THE RATIO OF PANEL AREA TO AIR VOLUME IS THE VARIABLE THAT ACTUALLY DETERMINES WHAT PEOPLE BREATHE. Nobody in this industry computes it, because the certificate stops at the panel and the HVAC design stops at the air. So OPEN-PLAN EMISSION LOADING IS CALCULATED AND PUBLISHED FOR THE DELIVERED CONFIGURATION at 100%, with panel area per cubic metre falling from 0.62 to 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup> as specification improved, and MEASURED FORMALDEHYDE ON THE OCCUPIED FLOOR at 0.021

mg/m<sup>3</sup> against a 0.08 reference — taken after handover, on the floor, with people on it.

☐ **AND TURNKEY FIT-OUT REOPENS EVERY PROBLEM THE FACTORY CLOSED.** Site cutting for services, scribing to columns, drilling for cable management and trimming to floor level all expose raw core exactly as the modular plan documented — at a scale of hundreds of positions rather than one kitchen. So every site cut is **RE-SEALED AND VERIFIED** per anchor rules (a) and (g), installation teams are employed rather than engaged per project, and the loading calculation is re-run against the **AS-INSTALLED** configuration rather than the drawing.

### What an office worker can check in sixty seconds, at his own desk

None of this is his decision, which is exactly why it is worth him knowing.

- **Look under the seat for a test or standard marking.** If there is a brand name and nothing else, nobody published what it survived.
- **Ask facilities whether anyone tried the chair before it was bought.** A sample sent to procurement is not a trial; a fortnight at twenty desks is.
- **Count the panel surfaces within three metres of you.** Desk, screen, pedestal, storage — that is the loading nobody calculated when the floor was specified.
- **Ask what the warranty covers and what has actually failed.** A five-year warranty and a published gas-lift failure rate are different kinds of statement.
- **Check whether the armrest and lumbar actually adjust to you.** The tender required that they exist, not that they fit anybody in particular.
- **Ask who you tell if it hurts.** If the answer is your manager, there is no channel — there is a person with other priorities.

The asymmetry here is the longest-dated in this vertical, and the only one measured in a working lifetime. A wardrobe is chosen by the person who will open it; a kitchen by the household that will cook in it; a retail sofa by whoever sits on it that evening. **THE OFFICE CHAIR IS THE ONE PIECE OF FURNITURE IN THIS ENTIRE LIBRARY SELECTED ENTIRELY BY PEOPLE WHO WILL NEVER USE IT, FOR A PERSON WHO WILL USE IT MORE THAN ANY OTHER OBJECT IN HIS DAY.** And the harm is correspondingly slow and unattributable: back and neck problems accumulate over years, are multi-causal, are never traced to a procurement decision made before the employee joined, and would not be actionable if they were. **NOBODY WILL EVER CONNECT A 2026 TENDER TO A 2033 SPINE.** That is why the intervention cannot be a better argument to the buyer — the buyer is not being unreasonable, he is optimising the only variables his document contains. **IT HAS TO BE NEW VARIABLES IN THE DOCUMENT:** a cycle count he can compare across bidders, a loading figure he can compare across layouts, and twenty of his own colleagues telling him what a fortnight in the chair was actually like. Each of those converts the absent user from an assumption into a number, which is the only form in which he can enter a tender at all.

## 8. Operations Plan (test, publish, bid, install)

### The laboratory

- **Cycle and ergonomic testing per SKU** — BIFMA-equivalent protocols, run in-house.
- **Results published and attached to every bid** — nil SKUs bid without them.
- **120,000 seat-impact and 240,000 gas-lift cycles** completed without failure.
- **Testing reports to the board**, independent of production and bidding.

## The tender

- **User trial before award** offered on 100% of tenders; accepted on 64%.
- **Bids refused where the specification cannot honestly be met** — 88 in Year 3.
- **Refusals published with the reason**, so the specification is challenged.
- **Nil pay linked to tender win rate alone.**

## The floor

- **Open-plan emission loading calculated** for every delivered configuration.
- **Panel area per cubic metre published** — 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup> in Year 3.
- **Measured formaldehyde on the occupied floor** after handover — 0.021 mg/m<sup>3</sup>.
- **Loading re-run against the as-installed layout**, not the drawing.

## The installation

- **Site cuts re-sealed and verified** per anchor rules (a) and (g).
- **Installation teams employed**, not engaged per project.
- **Failure published by component** — gas lift, castor, armrest, mechanism, fabric.
- **Anchor rules a-g carried into tendering**, with 90th percentiles.

The operational hinge is a 2,400-position government tender at an estimated 21% of the year's revenue, whose seating specification is a feature list nine years old, whose ceiling price sits eleven per cent below our tested SKU, and where two bidders will meet every word of it with chairs whose gas lifts we have tested and know fail at around thirty thousand cycles. The evaluation committee is not permitted to consider our cycle data, because the tender document does not contain a field for it — under L1 the cheapest compliant bid must win, and compliance is defined entirely by the inherited words. So **THE BID SYSTEM CANNOT SUBMIT AGAINST A SPECIFICATION WE CANNOT MEET AT THE TENDERED PRICE**: it is a hard constraint with no project, quarter-end or executive override, and the bid is declined. The refusal is filed as a written pre-bid representation naming the missing test parameters, and published — because a bidder who simply does not turn up teaches the committee nothing, and the same specification will be reissued next year to the same three bidders. Twenty-four tenders changed their specification after receiving one.

## 9. Product, Procurement & Factory Compliance (India)

---

- **BIS standards for office furniture and seating**, and **BIFMA and EN-equivalent cycle testing** routinely run for export and multinational clients and almost never published for domestic tenders.
- **Absence of mandatory formaldehyde emission-class labelling** — which in an open-plan office becomes a floor-level loading question nobody is required to compute.
- **Factories Act 1948** — machine guarding, dust extraction and occupational health across panel, metal fabrication and upholstery lines.
- **Public-procurement rules and General Financial Rules** for government and PSU tenders, **including L1 award mechanics under which the cheapest compliant bid must win.**
- **Consumer Protection Act 2019 and contract law** — durability and performance representations to institutional buyers are enforceable statements.
- **Occupational-health guidance** on display-screen and seated work, which informs the ergonomic testing this plan publishes.

- **Air and Water Acts** — consent to operate for powder coating and finishing; hazardous-waste rules for solvents and foam.
- **EPF, ESI and POSH** for the factory and installation workforce. **A tender can specify every feature of a chair without specifying any property that determines whether it is still usable in year four.**

## 10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

| Function                                                              | Yr 1       | Yr 3       | Notes                                                         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Promoter / managing director                                          | 1          | 1          | Owens the bid-refusal gate                                    |
| <b>Production — fabrication, assembly, upholstery &amp; finishing</b> | 116        | 277        | <b>448 units per worker per year; all on the register</b>     |
| Project delivery, installation & site teams                           | 22         | 54         | Employed; site cuts re-sealed per rules (a) and (g)           |
| Factory supervision, planning & maintenance                           | 18         | 42         | Batch discipline across three material lines                  |
| Tender, bid management & institutional sales                          | 14         | 32         | <b>Nil pay linked to win rate alone</b>                       |
| <b>Cycle-testing, ergonomic laboratory &amp; emission loading</b>     | 9          | 22         | <b>Board-reporting; independent of production and bidding</b> |
| Admin, finance, legal, technology & business development              | 10         | 14         | Tender platform, guarantees, test registry                    |
| <b>Total</b>                                                          | <b>190</b> | <b>442</b> | <b>124,000 units; 34,000 positions equipped</b>               |

The production headcount is derived rather than assumed, and it reconciles three ways. By volume: 124,000 units at 448 units per production worker per year is 277 direct workers — roughly 1.9 units a worker a day across 240 days, unhurried by design because a chair mechanism assembled quickly is a chair mechanism that fails at thirty thousand cycles rather than two hundred and forty thousand. By cost per unit: the ₹3.62 crore of cycle testing, emission loading and user trials across 124,000 units is ₹292 per unit — which against a workstation position averaging twenty thousand rupees is under two per cent, and is the entire difference between a bid that states a feature and a bid that proves an outcome. By cost per head: the ₹1.36 crore laboratory salary line across twenty-two people is ₹6.2 lakh cost-to-company each, the most expensive team per head in the business, because cycle testing is instrumentation work and the people running it must be independent of the tender it might lose. The laboratory reports to the board rather than to production, because the SKU that fails a cycle test is always the SKU a live tender depends on.

## 11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

| Phase                                         | Window      | Milestones                                                             |
|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Land, building, consents & plant installation | Month 0–14  | Incorporation, consents, panel line, metal fabrication, powder coating |
| <b>Cycle-testing laboratory commissioned</b>  | Month 8–16  | <b>BIFMA-equivalent rigs; no SKU bids without published data</b>       |
| User-trial programme                          | Month 12–22 | Offered on every tender; acceptance 22% → 41%                          |
| <b>Open-plan loading calculation</b>          | Month 14–24 | <b>Panel area per cubic metre published per configuration</b>          |
| Component failure publication                 | Month 20–30 | Field failures tracked by component; service life published            |

|                     |             |                                                              |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Scale & publication | Month 28-36 | 34,000 positions; 88 bids refused; 24 specifications changed |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|

## Training and competence

- **Running a cycle rig** — and reporting a failure that costs a live tender.
- **Reading a tender for what it does not specify**, which is where the user's interest sits.
- **Conducting a user trial** without coaching the participants toward a result.
- **Writing a pre-bid representation** that challenges a specification without alleging anything.

## 12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

**All figures are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts or guarantees.** They exist to show the drivers of an office-furniture P&L under a test-data-in-the-bid rule. Every input is editable. **The defining economics are that this is a capital-heavy, project-lumpy business where the largest commitment is refused revenue rather than incurred cost — ₹2.34 crore of bids not submitted, in a market where the award rule cannot see the reason we declined.**

### 12.1 Project cost & funding

| Item                                                                                     | ₹<br>lakh    | Notes                                                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Plant &amp; machinery — panel line, metal fabrication, powder coating, upholstery</b> | <b>848</b>   | <b>Three material streams under one roof</b>                 |
| Working capital — project inventory, retention & receivables                             | 486          | Institutional settlement and retention money                 |
| <b>Cycle-testing and ergonomic laboratory</b>                                            | <b>268</b>   | <b>No SKU bids without published data</b>                    |
| Factory building, land development & utilities                                           | 246          | Two-shift capacity from commissioning                        |
| <b>Dust extraction, air handling &amp; workshop ventilation</b>                          | <b>152</b>   | <b>Anchor rule (d): wood dust is a carcinogen</b>            |
| Installation fleet, site tooling & project capability                                    | 118          | Employed teams; sealing kit as standard                      |
| Technology, configurator, test registry & tender platform                                | 52           | Test data attached to every bid automatically                |
| Licences, consents, certifications & pre-operative                                       | 30           | Consents, BIS, tender registrations, guarantees              |
| <b>Total project cost</b>                                                                | <b>2,200</b> | ₹760L investor + ₹720L term loan + ₹400L WC + ₹320L promoter |

### 12.2 Operating metrics

| Metric                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Yr 1                           | Yr 2                           | Yr 3                                  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>CYCLE AND ERGONOMIC TEST RESULTS PUBLISHED PER SKU AND INCLUDED IN EVERY BID / SKUs bid without published test data</b> / seat-impact cycles completed without failure / gas-lift cycles completed without failure           | 100% / NIL / 100,000 / 120,000 | 100% / NIL / 100,000 / 200,000 | <b>100% / NIL / 120,000 / 240,000</b> |
| <b>USER TRIAL BEFORE AWARD — the chair given to the people who will sit in it / trials replaced by a sample sent to the procurement officer / tenders where a user trial was offered / tenders where the buyer accepted one</b> | 100% / NIL / 100% / 22%        | 100% / NIL / 100% / 41%        | <b>100% / NIL / 100% / 64%</b>        |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                       |                                        |                                                  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <b>OPEN-PLAN EMISSION LOADING CALCULATED AND PUBLISHED for the delivered configuration / floors delivered without a loading calculation /</b><br>panel area per cubic metre of air, published (m <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>3</sup> ) / measured formaldehyde<br>ON THE OCCUPIED FLOOR (mg/m <sup>3</sup> , 0.08 reference) | 100% / NIL /<br>0.62 / 0.038          | 100% / NIL /<br>0.54 / 0.029           | <b>100% / NIL /<br/>0.46 / 0.021</b>             |
| <b>FAILURE PUBLISHED BY COMPONENT</b> — gas lift, castor, armrest,<br>mechanism, fabric / <b>warranty period quoted in place of failure data</b> / units<br>failing within the published service life / median years to first component failure                                                                       | 100% / NIL /<br>4.8% / 5.2            | 100% / NIL /<br>2.6% / 7.1             | <b>100% / NIL /<br/>1.2% / 9.4</b>               |
| <b>BIDS REFUSED where the specification cannot be met at the tendered price / bids submitted to a specification we could not meet honestly /</b><br>refusals published with the reason / <b>tenders where our published data changed the specification</b>                                                            | 34 / NIL /<br>100% / 3                | 62 / NIL /<br>100% / 11                | <b>88 / NIL /<br/>100% / 24</b>                  |
| Units produced / workstation positions equipped / <b>cost per unit of testing,</b><br><b>loading and user trials</b> / anchor rules a-g carried / on-time project completion                                                                                                                                          | 32k / 8,400 /<br>₹606 / 100% /<br>71% | 78k / 20,600 /<br>₹354 / 100% /<br>88% | <b>124k / 34,000<br/>/ ₹292 / 100%<br/>/ 96%</b> |

Row one's last two columns are what an entire industry already measures for export clients and has never placed in front of an Indian buyer: 120,000 seat-impact and 240,000 gas-lift cycles without failure, on protocols that exist and rigs that are installed. Row two's acceptance rising from 22% to 64% is the number that matters most, because a user trial is the only mechanism in institutional procurement that puts the person who will sit in the chair into the decision at all. Row three publishes a figure nobody in this trade computes — panel area per cubic metre of air — and the fall from 0.62 to 0.46 is specification improving rather than measurement drifting. Row five's 24 tenders whose specification changed after receiving our data is the only outcome in this plan that improves the market rather than our own position, since the revised specification applies to every bidder including the ones we lose to.

### 12.3 Revenue build

| Stream                                             | Yr 1 (₹L)    | Yr 2 (₹L)    | Yr 3 (₹L)    | Gross margin         |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|
| <b>Workstations &amp; desking systems</b>          | 544          | 1,312        | 2,176        | <b>26.0%</b>         |
| <b>Task &amp; executive seating</b>                | 408          | 984          | 1,632        | <b>34.0%</b>         |
| Storage, pedestals & filing                        | 238          | 574          | 952          | 28.0%                |
| Meeting, collaborative & soft seating              | 204          | 492          | 816          | 32.0%                |
| <b>Turnkey fit-out &amp; installation projects</b> | 204          | 492          | 816          | <b>22.0%</b>         |
| Testing, certification & refurbishment services    | 102          | 246          | 408          | 48.0%                |
| <b>Total revenue</b>                               | <b>1,700</b> | <b>4,100</b> | <b>6,800</b> | <b>29.8% blended</b> |

### 12.4 P&L summary

| Line                                                                      | Yr 1 (₹L)  | Yr 2 (₹L)    | Yr 3 (₹L)    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| Revenue                                                                   | 1,700      | 4,100        | 6,800        |
| Cost of goods — panel, steel, foam, fabric, components & production wages | (1,194)    | (2,880)      | (4,776)      |
| <b>Gross profit</b>                                                       | <b>506</b> | <b>1,220</b> | <b>2,024</b> |

|                                                                                       |                |              |              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|
| Factory operations, supervision & quality                                             | (128)          | (192)        | (268)        |
| Project delivery, installation & site teams                                           | (96)           | (156)        | (218)        |
| <b>Cycle-testing laboratory, ergonomic testing &amp; per-SKU publication</b>          | <b>(108)</b>   | <b>(152)</b> | <b>(196)</b> |
| Tender, bid management & institutional sales                                          | (86)           | (124)        | (168)        |
| <b>Open-plan emission loading calculation &amp; floor-level testing</b>               | <b>(52)</b>    | <b>(74)</b>  | <b>(98)</b>  |
| <b>User-trial programme before award</b>                                              | <b>(34)</b>    | <b>(50)</b>  | <b>(68)</b>  |
| Admin, finance, legal, technology & business development                              | (44)           | (58)         | (74)         |
| <b>EBITDA</b>                                                                         | <b>(42)</b>    | <b>414</b>   | <b>934</b>   |
| Depreciation & amortisation                                                           | (132)          | (176)        | (218)        |
| Finance cost                                                                          | (86)           | (128)        | (168)        |
| Other income — testing services to third parties & refurbishment ( <i>disclosed</i> ) | 32             | 58           | 88           |
| <b>PBT</b>                                                                            | <b>(228)</b>   | <b>168</b>   | <b>636</b>   |
| Tax                                                                                   | 57             | (42)         | (159)        |
| <b>PAT</b>                                                                            | <b>(171)</b>   | <b>126</b>   | <b>477</b>   |
| <b>Net margin</b>                                                                     | <b>(10.1%)</b> | <b>3.1%</b>  | <b>7.0%</b>  |
| <b>ROCE</b>                                                                           | <b>(7.9%)</b>  | <b>10.8%</b> | <b>32.5%</b> |

Cost of goods at ₹47.76 crore is 70.2% of revenue across three volatile input streams — panel, steel and foam — none of which moves with the others, so input hedging is harder here than in a single-material factory. Depreciation and finance cost together are ₹3.86 crore, 5.7% of revenue, because ₹22 crore of plant against ₹68 crore of revenue makes utilisation the variable that decides the year. The three integrity lines — testing, loading and user trials — total ₹3.62 crore, 5.3% of revenue and ₹292 a unit. Other income of ₹88 lakh is testing services sold to third parties and refurbishment, disclosed as a line and 1.3% of revenue; it exists because a commissioned laboratory has capacity other manufacturers will pay for. Commitments of ₹6.82 crore against ₹4.77 crore of profit mean an operator with the same plant and tender panel running trade-standard practice would earn ₹11.59 crore.

## 12.5 Break-even & sensitivity

| Scenario                                                                             | Yr 3 revenue | Yr 3 PAT | Comment                                                  |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Base                                                                                 | ₹68.0cr      | ₹4.77cr  | As modelled, test data in every bid                      |
| <b>Trade-standard — bid the copied specification, publish nothing, no user trial</b> | ₹83.0cr      | ₹13.22cr | <b>The trade's model, computed rather than dismissed</b> |
| <b>Order intake 20% below plan</b>                                                   | ₹54.4cr      | ₹1.73cr  | <b>₹22cr of plant does not idle cheaply</b>              |
| Steel & component cost +20%                                                          | ₹68.0cr      | ₹2.05cr  | Three input streams, none correlated                     |
| Seating book halved                                                                  | ₹59.8cr      | ₹2.69cr  | The stream where cycle data earns its price              |

|                                  |         |         |                                            |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------|
| Gross margin compressed 3 points | ₹68.0cr | ₹3.24cr | L1 pressure from feature-compliant bidders |
|----------------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------------|

### 13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

| Source                   | ₹ lakh       | Terms (indicative)                                |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Investor equity          | 760          | Plant and laboratory; test-publication covenant   |
| Term loan                | 720          | Machinery, building and extraction plant; 7 years |
| Working capital facility | 400          | Project inventory, retention and receivables      |
| Promoter contribution    | 320          | Cash and manufacturing leadership                 |
| <b>Total</b>             | <b>2,200</b> | Illustrative structure                            |

An investor should read cycle counts, user-trial acceptance, published component failure and the bid-refusal count, and should understand that the largest commitment is revenue declined rather than cost incurred. The starkest figure is that bidding the copied specification, publishing nothing and skipping the user trial would take profit from ₹4.77 crore to ₹13.22 crore on the same plant — and under L1 award mechanics no evaluation committee would be permitted to notice the difference. That is precisely why it is a covenant. The sharpest exposure is order intake: 20% below plan takes profit to ₹1.73 crore, because ₹22 crore of plant carries fixed cost through project gaps that arrive without warning in a tender-driven business. An investor should also weigh the slower asset the model builds — 24 tenders changed their specification after receiving our data, and every one of those revisions raises the floor for the whole market including our competitors, which is a public good this business pays for and does not capture.

- **Use of funds** — 39% plant and machinery, 22% working capital, 12% testing laboratory, 11% building and utilities, 7% dust extraction, 5% installation capability, 2% technology, 1% consents and certification.
- **Repayment** — term loan over 7 years from Year 3 cash flow; working capital revolving against project inventory and retention.
- **Investor exit** — sale to a furniture group, a workplace-solutions firm or a contract-furniture multinational; or promoter buyback. **Test-publication, user-trial and loading-calculation commitments survive change of control.**

### 14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

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

|                                                                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Nobody in the room will sit in it</b></p>                            | <p>Facilities writes the specification, procurement runs the tender, finance approves — AND NINE HUNDRED CHAIRS ARRIVE AT NINE HUNDRED DESKS BELONGING TO PEOPLE WHO SAW NO SAMPLE, ATTENDED NO MEETING AND HAD NO VOTE. That person spends ROUGHLY FOURTEEN THOUSAND HOURS IN IT — MORE CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL CONTACT THAN WITH ANY OBJECT HE OWNS, INCLUDING HIS BED — with NO STANDING IN THE PURCHASE WHATSOEVER. And the specification is written IN A LANGUAGE THAT CANNOT EXPRESS WHAT HE NEEDS: adjustable height, armrest, lumbar support, five-star base are SATISFIED IDENTICALLY BY A ₹4,200 CHAIR AND A ₹19,000 CHAIR. IT TESTS FOR THE PRESENCE OF FEATURES AND NEVER ONCE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THEM. NOBODY DECEIVED ANYBODY — A COMPLIANT CHAIR ARRIVED, EXACTLY AS SPECIFIED</p> | <p><b>SUPPLY THE MISSING DIMENSION IN THE ONLY DOCUMENT THAT REACHES THE DECISION — THE BID. CYCLE AND ERGONOMIC TEST RESULTS PUBLISHED PER SKU AND INCLUDED IN EVERY BID (100%), NIL SKUs bid without them: 120,000 SEAT-IMPACT AND 240,000 GAS-LIFT CYCLES WITHOUT FAILURE, on protocols THIS INDUSTRY ALREADY RUNS FOR EXPORT AND HAS NEVER PUT IN FRONT OF AN INDIAN BUYER. A USER TRIAL BEFORE AWARD offered on 100% and ACCEPTED ON 64% (from 22%) — the chair placed with twenty people who will actually sit in it, for a fortnight, responses published to the buyer: THE ONE MECHANISM THAT PUTS THE ABSENT PARTY IN THE ROOM AS EVIDENCE, and it CHANGED THE SPECIFICATION IN 24 TENDERS. FAILURE PUBLISHED BY COMPONENT, units failing within published service life 4.8% → 1.2% (₹3.50cr). GENERAL RULE: WHERE THE BUYER NEVER SITS IN IT, THE TENDER SPECIFICATION IS THE ONLY ADVOCATE THE USER HAS — SO PUT THE TEST DATA IN IT</b></p> |
| <p><b>The 2,400-position tender with a nine-year-old specification</b></p> | <p>At 21% OF THE YEAR'S REVENUE, with a ceiling price 11% BELOW OUR TESTED SKU, and two bidders who will meet EVERY WORD OF IT with chairs whose gas lifts WE HAVE TESTED AND KNOW FAIL AT AROUND THIRTY THOUSAND CYCLES. THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE IS NOT PERMITTED TO CONSIDER OUR CYCLE DATA, BECAUSE THE TENDER DOCUMENT DOES NOT CONTAIN A FIELD FOR IT — under L1 THE CHEAPEST COMPLIANT BID MUST WIN</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <p><b>THE BID SYSTEM CANNOT SUBMIT AGAINST A SPECIFICATION WE CANNOT MEET AT THE TENDERED PRICE — a hard constraint with NO PROJECT, QUARTER-END OR EXECUTIVE OVERRIDE. THE SYSTEM REFUSES RATHER THAN WARNS (rule j). The refusal is filed as A WRITTEN PRE-BID REPRESENTATION NAMING THE MISSING TEST PARAMETERS, and PUBLISHED — because a bidder who simply does not turn up TEACHES THE COMMITTEE NOTHING, AND THE SAME SPECIFICATION WILL BE REISSUED NEXT YEAR TO THE SAME THREE BIDDERS (₹2.34cr)</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| <p><b>The specification is a fossil</b></p>                                | <p>A facilities team preparing a tender COPIES THE LAST ONE, WHICH COPIED THE ONE BEFORE, so the document encodes WHATEVER THE MARKET COULD SUPPLY AT WHATEVER PRICE POINT WAS NORMAL SEVERAL CYCLES AGO. NOBODY IN THE BUILDING KNOWS WHY IT SAYS WHAT IT SAYS, AND THEREFORE NOBODY CAN DEFEND CHANGING IT — while L1 makes the fossil binding</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <p><b>88 BIDS REFUSED (from 34) where the specification could not honestly be met at the tendered price, NIL bids submitted to a specification we could not meet, EVERY REFUSAL PUBLISHED WITH THE REASON — BECAUSE A BIDDER WHO DECLINES QUIETLY LEAVES THE SPECIFICATION STANDING FOR THE NEXT TENDER, AND THE SPECIFICATION IS THE THING THAT HAS TO CHANGE. 24 tenders revised theirs after receiving our data</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <p><b>Nine hundred workstations in one air-handling zone</b></p>           | <p>An emission class is A PER-PANEL PROPERTY; an open-plan floor is A FIXED VOLUME OF RECIRCULATED AIR WITH AN ENORMOUS PANEL AREA IN IT, and THE RATIO OF PANEL AREA TO AIR VOLUME IS THE VARIABLE THAT ACTUALLY DETERMINES WHAT PEOPLE BREATHE. NOBODY COMPUTES IT, BECAUSE THE CERTIFICATE STOPS AT THE PANEL AND THE HVAC DESIGN STOPS AT THE AIR</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <p><b>OPEN-PLAN EMISSION LOADING CALCULATED AND PUBLISHED FOR THE DELIVERED CONFIGURATION (100%), panel area per cubic metre 0.62 → 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup> AS SPECIFICATION IMPROVED, and MEASURED FORMALDEHYDE ON THE OCCUPIED FLOOR at 0.021 mg/m<sup>3</sup> against a 0.08 reference — TAKEN AFTER HANDOVER, ON THE FLOOR, WITH PEOPLE ON IT; loading re-run against the AS-INSTALLED layout rather than the drawing (₹98L)</b></p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

|                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Turnkey fit-out reopens what the factory closed</b> | Site cutting for services, scribing to columns, drilling for cable management and trimming to floor level EXPOSE RAW CORE exactly as the modular plan documented — AT A SCALE OF HUNDREDS OF POSITIONS RATHER THAN ONE KITCHEN | <b>Every site cut RE-SEALED AND VERIFIED per anchor rules (a) and (g); installation teams EMPLOYED rather than engaged per project; and the loading calculation re-run against the as-installed configuration. Failure published by component so an occupier can see what actually broke rather than what was warranted (₹86L)</b> |
| Order intake and capital intensity                     | ₹22cr of plant against ₹68cr of revenue; 20% below plan takes profit to ₹1.73cr, and awards arrive irregularly                                                                                                                 | Refurbishment and testing services as counter-cyclical capacity fill; storage and meeting furniture to smooth line loading between large awards; multi-year framework agreements pursued over single tenders; and two-shift capability held rather than added                                                                      |
| Three uncorrelated input streams                       | Panel, steel and foam move independently; a 20% steel movement takes profit to ₹2.05cr                                                                                                                                         | Input index published and pricing reviewed quarterly; contracts above a threshold carry escalation clauses; substitution options qualified in advance for each stream; and inventory cover sized per stream rather than in aggregate                                                                                               |

## 15. SWOT Analysis

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Strengths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test data published per SKU and in every bid</li> <li>• 240,000 gas-lift cycles without failure</li> <li>• User trial accepted on 64% of tenders</li> <li>• Open-plan loading published — 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Component failure published; 1.2% within service life</li> </ul>                              | <b>Weaknesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ₹6.82cr forgone against ₹4.77cr of profit</li> <li>• Loses L1 awards by rule, not by argument</li> <li>• 88 bids refused; revenue declined not incurred</li> <li>• Capital-heavy; order intake decides the year</li> </ul>                          |
| <b>Opportunities</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occupiers with wellbeing and ESG programmes</li> <li>• 24 tenders already rewriting their specifications</li> <li>• Testing sold to other manufacturers at 48% margin</li> <li>• Global capability centres specifying to international standards</li> <li>• Any mandatory emission or durability standard favours us</li> </ul> | <b>Threats</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• L1 mechanics that cannot score published test data</li> <li>• Feature-compliant bidders at materially lower prices</li> <li>• Input volatility across three uncorrelated streams</li> <li>• Project gaps in a tender-driven revenue pattern</li> </ul> |

## 16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

- **Test registry** — cycle and ergonomic results per SKU, attached to every bid automatically.
- **Bid gate** — a tender we cannot meet at the tendered price cannot be submitted; no override exists.
- **Pre-bid representation builder** — names the missing test parameters in the buyer's own format.
- **User-trial manager** — placement, fortnight schedule and response capture, published to the buyer.
- **Loading calculator** — panel area against air volume for the delivered and as-installed layout.
- **Component failure register** — gas lift, castor, armrest, mechanism and fabric, tracked to years in service.
- **Refusal log** — bids declined, published with the specification and the reason.

## 17. Key Assumptions & Notes

---

- **All financials are illustrative model assumptions, not forecasts, projections or guarantees.** Revenue, unit volumes, positions equipped, input costs, cycle results and failure rates are editable inputs; actual outcomes depend on tender flow, award mechanics, input prices and capacity utilisation. Figures are in Indian rupees. **This plan inherits the ten furniture anchor rules set by `furniture-manufacturing` and adds the institutional-buyer case.**
- **The central integrity finding is that nobody in the room will sit in it.** Facilities writes the specification, procurement runs the tender, finance approves the award, and nine hundred chairs arrive at nine hundred desks belonging to people who saw no sample and had no vote. **That person spends roughly fourteen thousand hours in it — more continuous physical contact than with any object he owns — and has no standing in the purchase whatsoever.**
- **And the specification is written in a language that cannot express what he needs.** Adjustable seat height, adjustable armrest, lumbar support, revolving five-star base — every term satisfied identically by a chair at ₹4,200 and a chair at ₹19,000. **The specification tests for the presence of features and never once for the performance of them: it does not ask how many cycles the gas lift survived, what load the armrest carried, or whether the mechanism still works after four years. So the words are met, L1 awards to the cheapest bid meeting them, and the outcome the words existed to protect is not addressed anywhere. Nobody deceived anybody — a compliant chair arrived, exactly as specified.**
- **So the missing dimension is supplied in the only document that reaches the decision.** Cycle and ergonomic results are published per SKU and included in every bid, with 120,000 seat-impact and 240,000 gas-lift cycles completed without failure on protocols this industry already runs for export. A user trial before award is offered on every tender and accepted on 64% — the chair placed with twenty people who will actually sit in it, for a fortnight, responses published. **That mechanism puts the absent party in the room as evidence, and it changed the specification in 24 tenders. It costs ₹3.50 crore. WHERE THE BUYER NEVER SITS IN IT, THE TENDER SPECIFICATION IS THE ONLY ADVOCATE THE USER HAS — SO PUT THE TEST DATA IN IT.**
- **The specification is a fossil, and L1 makes it binding.** A facilities team copies the last tender, which copied the one before, so the document encodes what the market could supply at a price point normal several cycles ago — and nobody in the building knows why it says what it says, so nobody can defend changing it. **So 88 bids were refused where the specification could not honestly be met at the tendered price, with every refusal published and filed as a written pre-bid representation naming the missing parameters, because a bidder who declines quietly leaves the specification standing for the next tender.**
- **Nine hundred workstations in one air-handling zone are not nine hundred independent exposures.** An emission class is a per-panel property; an open-plan floor is a fixed volume of recirculated air with an enormous panel area in it, and the ratio of the two is what determines what people breathe. Nobody computes it, because the certificate stops at the panel and the HVAC design stops at the air. **So open-plan loading is calculated and published for every delivered configuration, panel area per cubic metre fell from 0.62 to 0.46 m<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>3</sup>, and formaldehyde is measured on the occupied floor at 0.021 mg/m<sup>3</sup> against a 0.08 reference — after handover, with people on it.**
- **The asymmetry is the longest-dated in this vertical and the only one measured in a working lifetime.** A wardrobe is chosen by the person who opens it and a kitchen by the household that cooks in it; the office chair is the one piece of furniture in this library selected entirely by people who will never use it, for a person who will use it more than any other object in his day. **And the harm is correspondingly slow and unattributable: back and neck problems accumulate over years, are multi-causal, and nobody will ever connect a 2026 tender to a 2033 spine. That is why the intervention cannot be a better argument to the buyer — he is not being unreasonable, he is optimising the only variables his document contains. It has to be new variables in the document: a cycle count comparable across bidders, a loading figure comparable across layouts, and**

twenty of his own colleagues telling him what a fortnight in the chair was like.

- **Compliance and professional advice.** BIS standards for office furniture and seating, **and BIFMA and EN-equivalent cycle testing routinely run for export and multinational clients and almost never published for domestic tenders**; the absence of mandatory formaldehyde emission-class labelling, which in an open-plan office becomes a floor-level loading question nobody is required to compute; the Factories Act 1948 on guarding, dust extraction and occupational health across panel, metal and upholstery lines; **public-procurement rules and General Financial Rules including L1 award mechanics, under which the cheapest compliant bid must win and compliance is defined by the inherited words**; the Consumer Protection Act 2019 and contract law on durability representations to institutional buyers; occupational-health guidance on display-screen and seated work; the Air and Water Acts with consent to operate for powder coating and finishing; hazardous-waste rules for solvents and foam; and EPF, ESI and POSH. **A tender can specify every feature of a chair without specifying any property that determines whether it is still usable in year four — which is why publishing test data is a business decision rather than a compliance one.** Professional advice should be taken on pre-bid representation practice, durability claims to institutional buyers, test-protocol accreditation, and liability arising from published performance data.

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

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