BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Personal-Care and Cosmetics Brand

The gross margin is an advertising budget that has not been spent yet

FMCG

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out a **Personal-Care & Cosmetics Brand** in India — an own-brand skin, hair and personal-care business manufactured by third-party cosmetic contract manufacturers and sold through e-commerce and quick commerce, general and modern trade, beauty specialty retail and its own website.

> **The anchor plan in this vertical established that an FMCG brand's margin is earned once and spent three times. Personal care appears to escape that arithmetic, and the appearance is what makes it the most seductive category in this library. Gross margins here are not 44% but 67% — a shampoo costing ₹62 to make sells at ₹299 — and every founder who sees that number for the first time concludes the category is structurally more profitable than food.** It is not. **On this plan a 67.4% gross margin produces a 17.4% net loss in Year 1, a worse result than the food manufacturer achieved on a margin twenty-three points lower**, and the reason is the single most important thing to understand about cosmetics: **the gross margin is not a manufacturing margin at all. It is an advertising budget that has not been spent yet.**

> **The second point is the one that decides whether this is a business or a hobby: the formulation is not a moat, because it is a catalogue item. The overwhelming majority of Indian personal-care brands are built on a contract manufacturer's existing formulation, chosen from a folder, adjusted on fragrance and colour, and packed under a new name.** This is legal, standard, and how nearly everyone starts — **but it means a competitor can walk into the same factory next month and buy a product that is chemically identical to yours, and be selling it in eleven weeks. What is being sold, therefore, is not a product but a story about a product that anybody can replicate**, and the only durable answers are a proprietary formulation, a genuinely earned brand, or a distribution position nobody else has. This plan takes SKUs on formulations exclusive to the brand from **8% to 41%** and treats that number as the real measure of whether an asset is being built.

> **The third is a trap specific to this category and precisely inverse to the food problem — the shelf life is long enough to hide the mistake.** In packaged food, a failed SKU writes itself off within nine months and the loss is unavoidable and immediate. **A cosmetic has a shelf life of two to three years, so a failed launch does not confront the founder at all: it sits in the warehouse, valued at cost, appearing on the balance sheet as inventory rather than as the mistake it is. Brands routinely carry three-year-old stock as an asset, and discover the loss only during a diligence exercise when somebody asks how much of it has moved in the last twelve months.** This plan measures inventory older than twelve months — **18% falling to 5%** — and takes write-offs on a schedule rather than when forced.

> **And the fourth: this is the most heavily claim-regulated category in the vertical, and the line most brands cross is one they do not know exists. A cosmetic may clean, beautify and alter appearance. The moment a label or an advertisement says a product treats, cures, prevents or reduces a condition — hair fall, acne, pigmentation — it has made a therapeutic claim, and the product is legally a drug being sold without a drug licence.** An "ayurvedic" positioning invokes a third regime again under AYUSH. **The founder rarely intends to break the law; they were writing marketing copy and did not know that a verb changes a product's legal classification.** This plan holds therapeutic claims on cosmetic-licensed products at **NIL** and takes claim substantiation from 41% to 100%.

This plan models a brand requiring **₹1.43 crore** (₹58 lakh promoter + ₹30 lakh term loan + ₹55 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹2.58 crore net sales and a ₹45 lakh loss** to **₹6.86 crore net sales and ₹24 lakh profit** by Year 3 — *with advertising consuming 30.2% of net sales in Year 1, which is the honest shape of the category rather than an overspend. (Own-brand cosmetics, third-party manufactured — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: An own-brand personal-care business built on progressively proprietary formulations rather than catalogue products, with claims substantiated before they are made, obsolete stock written off on schedule, and advertising treated as the true cost of goods.

Vision: To own the formulation, not just the label on somebody else's.

Mission: Substantiate every claim before it is printed; never describe a cosmetic in the language of a medicine; move each successful product onto an exclusive formulation; write off what has not moved in twelve months; and disclose every paid endorsement without being asked.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — recommended: cosmetic licensing, marketplace onboarding, modern-trade vendor registration and eventual investment all assume it.
- **LLP** — workable for a founder-led regional brand not seeking equity.
- **Proprietorship** — common at entry, but weak for licensing correspondence, trade credit and platform onboarding.

> **Regulatory anchor:** the classification question comes first and governs everything after it. **A cosmetic is regulated under the Drugs and Cosmetics Act and the Cosmetics Rules, administered by CDSCO — manufacture requires a cosmetic manufacturing licence held by the maker, and the brand owner's obligations run to labelling, claims, safety substantiation and traceability. A product making a therapeutic claim is a drug, requiring an entirely different licence the brand almost certainly does not hold. A product positioned as ayurvedic falls under AYUSH licensing, with its own manufacturing and claim rules** — and a brand using ayurvedic ingredient names for marketing while holding only a cosmetic licence is in a genuinely ambiguous position it should resolve deliberately rather than by hoping. Alongside these: **BIS standards where applicable, Legal Metrology packaged-commodity declarations including the actual manufacturer's identity for third-party production, mandatory ingredient listing (INCI), shelf life and batch coding**; **ASCI on advertising claims and paid-endorsement disclosure**; **Extended Producer Responsibility under plastic-waste rules, which for cosmetics is heavy because primary packaging is almost entirely plastic**; a **prohibition on animal testing for cosmetics in India**, which must be verified through the supply chain rather than assumed; and GST with the distributor input-credit chain.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with beauty, FMCG, retail or performance-marketing background. Three competences decide outcomes: *claim discipline*, because the difference between a cosmetic and an unlicensed drug is a verb, and the person writing the copy is usually not the person who knows that; *formulation ambition*, since a founder content to sell catalogue products has built a marketing operation with no asset underneath it; and *the willingness to write off*, which in a long-shelf-life category requires deliberate action rather than the forced recognition food imposes. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Indian personal care is large, fast-growing and unusually open to new entrants — low capital requirements, abundant contract manufacturing and platform-led distribution have produced a wave of brands. The same conditions that make entry easy make differentiation hard and customer acquisition expensive.

Demand drivers

- **Premiumisation and category expansion** — consumers buying more products, more often, at higher price points.
- **Ingredient-led and "clean beauty" positioning**, where provenance and transparency beat legacy scale.
- **Beauty specialty retail and quick commerce**, which have transformed discovery and impulse purchase.
- **Men's grooming and hair care**, growing from a small base with less entrenched loyalty.
- **Contract-manufacturing depth**, which lets a brand launch without a plant — **and is exactly why the shelf is crowded.**

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian personal care & cosmetics	Very large; category-defined
SAM	Chosen categories and price tiers in served channels	Channel- and listing-bounded
SOM (Yr 1–3)	**Repeat buyers × purchase frequency × basket**	SKUs 34 → 52; exclusive formulations 8% → 41%

> **The most useful thing a founder can be told about this market is that the barrier to entry and the barrier to survival are set at completely different heights, and the first is what attracts capital while the second is what consumes it. Launching is genuinely easy: a contract manufacturer will supply a tested, licensed, shelf-stable formulation from an existing folder; packaging suppliers work to small runs; marketplaces list for free; and a credit card buys attention immediately.** The result is a category with hundreds of brands, **most of which are selling materially similar products with different stories attached.** In that environment, **the marginal cost of persuading a consumer to try an unfamiliar cream is high and rising, because every competitor faces the same undifferentiated product problem and responds the same way — by bidding for attention.** This is the mechanism that converts a 67% gross margin into a Year-1 loss, **and it is not a failure of execution; it is the equilibrium of a market where the product cannot do the differentiating.** Two responses are available and this plan pursues both. **The first is to make the product actually different — moving from catalogue formulations to exclusive ones, which costs development money and time but is the only thing that turns marketing spend into a durable asset rather than a rental payment. The second is to earn repeat purchase, because in a category bought every six to ten weeks, a retained customer is worth several times an acquired one** — cohort repeat rises from 19% to 34% here, **and a brand that cannot move that number is buying the same customer over and over and calling it growth.**

Target channels

- **E-commerce and beauty marketplaces** — the volume base, with commission, advertising and returns.
- **Quick commerce**, fast-growing and demanding listing fees and margins that can exceed the manufacturing cost.
- **Beauty specialty retail**, high visibility and credibility, with slow payment and listing conditions.
- **General and modern trade** via distributors — slower to build, and the most defensible once built.
- **Own website**, best margin and full customer ownership, but every visitor must be bought or earned.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: multinational majors with vast advertising budgets and shelf control, established Indian brands with deep distribution, venture-funded digital-first brands buying growth at a loss, retailer and platform private labels, and a very long tail of small brands built on the same contract manufacturers' catalogues. **The competitor a new brand should fear is not a famous name but an unknown one selling the identical formulation at a lower price.**

The business's edge

- **Exclusive formulations built progressively** — the only asset this category actually creates.
- **Claims substantiated before they are made**, which is both a legal position and a marketing one.
- **Cohort repeat measured**, so the business knows whether it is retaining or re-buying.
- **Obsolete stock written off on schedule**, so the balance sheet says something true.
- **Batch consistency enforced at the co-packer**, because a shade or fragrance shift ends repeat purchase silently.

> **The claims boundary is where well-intentioned personal-care brands break the law, and it is worth stating the rule precisely because almost nobody in the category can. A cosmetic is a product intended to be applied to the body for cleansing, beautifying, promoting attractiveness or altering appearance. That is the entire permitted scope. The moment a product is said to treat, cure, prevent, heal or reduce a condition, it has made a therapeutic claim — and a product making a therapeutic claim is, in law, a drug.** The consequence is not a marketing reprimand: **it is a product being manufactured and sold without the drug licence such a product requires, by a company that holds only a cosmetic licence.** The line is finer than founders expect. **"Adds shine to hair" is cosmetic. "Reduces hair fall" is not. "Evens skin tone" is cosmetic. "Clears acne" is not. "Moisturises dry skin" is cosmetic. "Treats eczema" is not. The words that cross the line are ordinary marketing verbs, and the person writing the caption is typically a marketer who has never been told that a verb determines a product's legal classification.** The disciplines are unremarkable and non-negotiable: **a written claims policy listing permitted and prohibited constructions; every claim substantiated by a test, panel study or ingredient dossier before it appears anywhere; a single reviewer approving pack copy, website text, marketplace listings and influencer briefs against the same standard; and an explicit decision on whether the brand is cosmetic, ayurvedic or both — made once, deliberately, rather than drifting between them because the language sells better.** This plan takes substantiated claims from 41% to 100% and holds therapeutic claims at NIL, **and treats the substantiation file as an asset rather than as compliance paperwork, because it is also the only defensible basis for saying anything a competitor cannot.**

6. Portfolio, Pricing & the Formulation Question

Product basis	What it costs	What it is worth
Catalogue formulation (co-packer's existing product)	Fast, cheap, low MOQ	**No moat — replicable in weeks**
Modified catalogue (fragrance, colour, minor actives)	Modest development cost	**Marginally defensible; still buyable**
Exclusive formulation (developed for and owned by the brand)	**Development time, stability testing, higher MOQ**	**The only durable asset in the category**
Hero SKU with substantiated claim	Panel study or clinical support	Marketing that competitors cannot copy honestly
Therapeutic claims on a cosmetic licence	**NIL — by policy**	**It reclassifies the product as a drug**
Undisclosed paid endorsements	**NIL — by policy**	**ASCI, and it is simply dishonest**
Grammage reduction without pack disclosure	**NIL — by policy**	**Vertical convention, set by the anchor plan**

> **The economics of a personal-care SKU are almost the opposite of a food SKU, and reading one with the other's instincts produces consistently wrong decisions.** A food product has **thin margins, fast turns and a short shelf life** : it forgives a pricing error because volume corrects quickly, and it punishes a demand error immediately because the stock expires. A cosmetic has **fat margins, slow turns and a long shelf life**: **it forgives a demand error for years, and punishes a positioning error permanently, because the consumer who tried the product and was unimpressed does not come back and cannot be re-acquired at any sensible cost.** Three practical consequences follow. **First, launch fewer SKUs than the margin appears to permit** — 67% gross margin makes every proposed variant look affordable, **and each one consumes MOQ cash, warehouse space and marketing attention that the hero product needed more. Second, spend on the trial rather than on the range**, since in this category the expensive event is persuading someone to try at all, and a brand with four products and one strong claim outperforms one with twenty products and a catalogue. **Third, price for the repeat rather than the first purchase**: **a discount that buys a first bottle is worth it only if the second is bought at full price, and a brand that discounts continuously has taught its customers that its list price is fictional** — which in a category where price signals quality is a considerably more damaging lesson than it is in food.

7. Go-to-Market — Trial, then Repeat

Acquisition

- **Hero-SKU focus** — one product doing the persuading, not a range doing the confusing.
- **Marketplace and beauty-retail presence** where intent already exists, entered with the full cost stack understood.
- **Creator and dermatologist-adjacent content**, disclosed, and never making claims the file cannot support.
- **Sampling and trial packs**, which in a high-margin, trial-limited category are unusually efficient.

Retention — where the margin finally lands

- **Replenishment prompts** timed to actual usage cycles, since consumption is predictable in this category.
- **Batch consistency**, because a customer who notices the shade or scent changed assumes the brand cheapened the product.
- **Full-price second purchase** as an explicit objective, not a hope.
- **Complaint handling**, with adverse reactions logged, investigated and reported rather than refunded quietly.

The sequencing discipline that separates brands that compound from brands that plateau is refusing to widen the range before the hero product retains. A brand with one product at 34% cohort repeat has a business it can scale; a brand with twenty products at 12% repeat has a catalogue and a marketing bill — and the second is far more common, because launching a variant feels like progress and is measurable in a week, while raising repeat is slow, unglamorous and only visible six months later.

8. Operations Plan (develop, substantiate, make, ship, retain, write off)

- **Formulation:** catalogue products at launch, **with each proven SKU migrated onto an exclusive formulation the brand owns — the migration schedule is the strategy, not an operational detail.**
- **Co-packer management:** cosmetic manufacturing licence verified and held on file, audits conducted, **and batch-to-batch shade, viscosity and fragrance tolerances specified in writing and tested on receipt.**
- **Safety & stability:** stability testing, challenge testing and safety assessment completed **before launch rather than after a complaint.**

- **Claims: substantiation file opened per claim, single-reviewer approval across pack, website, marketplace and influencer copy, and a written list of prohibited constructions.**
- **Labelling:** INCI ingredient listing, batch code, shelf life, actual manufacturer identity and Legal Metrology declarations **verified before artwork goes to print.**
- **Inventory: ageing tracked by batch with a 12-month flag, and write-offs taken on schedule rather than deferred to protect a balance sheet.**
- **Adverse reactions: logged, investigated, batch-traced and retained — a cosmetic complaint is a safety signal before it is a customer-service event.**
- **Portfolio:** SKU performance reviewed at six and twelve months, with delisting normal and expected.

Brand control points

Area	Activity	Control point
Is an asset being built?	**SKUs on exclusive (non-catalogue) formulations**	**8% → 22% → 41%**
The real cost of goods	**Advertising & brand as % of net sales**	**30.2% → 25.2% → 23.6%**
Legal boundary	**Claims substantiated before use / therapeutic claims**	**41% → 100% / NIL**
The hidden loss	**Inventory older than 12 months carried at cost**	**18% → 11% → 5%**
Retention	**Cohort M6 repeat purchase**	**19% → 27% → 34%**
Product integrity	Batch shade/fragrance deviations	6.2% → 3.1% → 1.2%
Portfolio	Active SKUs / delisted for non-performance	34/0 → 46/9 → 52/14

> **Long shelf life is the most under-recognised hazard in this category, and it is dangerous precisely because it feels like an advantage.** A food brand that misjudges demand **discovers it within months: the stock expires, the write-off is compulsory, and the founder is forced to confront the decision. A cosmetic brand that misjudges demand discovers nothing at all.** The product has a two- to three-year shelf life, so **it sits in the warehouse, valued at cost, appearing in the accounts as inventory — an asset — while being in substance a launch that failed.** The distortion compounds. **Working capital is consumed by goods that will never sell; warehouse space and management attention go to a range that is not moving; gross margin looks healthy because the failure has not passed through the profit and loss account; and the founder, seeing inventory rather than loss, launches the next variant instead of asking why the last one did not move. Brands routinely carry three-year-old stock and discover the position only in a diligence exercise, when an investor asks what proportion of inventory has moved in the past twelve months and the answer is produced for the first time.** The correction is a single discipline applied without exception: **inventory aged by batch, a twelve-month flag, and a write-off taken on schedule rather than when it becomes unavoidable.** This plan moves ageing stock from 18% to 5% and takes write-offs on schedule on 100% of qualifying inventory by Year 3, **and the honest reading of the Year-1 figure is that nearly a fifth of what the balance sheet called an asset was a decision the business had not yet admitted to.**

9. CDSCO, Labelling & Claims Compliance (India)

- **Cosmetic manufacturing licence held by the contract manufacturer** under the Cosmetics Rules, **verified and held on file by the brand — responsibility for the product does not follow the licence.**
- **Classification decided deliberately — cosmetic, ayurvedic (AYUSH) or drug** — since **a therapeutic claim converts a cosmetic into a drug being sold without a drug licence.**

- **Written claims policy with permitted and prohibited constructions**, and **substantiation by test, panel study or ingredient dossier before any claim is published.**
- **Labelling:** INCI ingredient listing, net quantity, MRP, batch number, manufacture date and shelf life, **actual manufacturer's name and address for third-party production**, and consumer-care details.
- **ASCI compliance** on advertising claims and **paid-endorsement disclosure, held at 100% rather than at whatever the platform enforces.**
- **Prohibition on animal testing for cosmetics in India**, verified through the supply chain rather than assumed.
- **EPR under plastic-waste rules — heavy in this category, because cosmetic primary packaging is almost entirely plastic.**
- Safety assessment, stability and challenge testing on file; adverse-reaction log with batch traceability; GST with the distributor input-credit chain.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / managing director	1	1	2
Marketing, brand & performance	**6**	**9**	**12**
Sales & channel (e-com, retail, distributors)	5	8	12
Supply chain, warehouse & fulfilment	5	8	11
Product development, regulatory & quality	**3**	**4**	**6**
Customer support	2	3	5
Finance & admin	3	4	5
Total	**25**	**37**	**53**

Three people in product development and regulatory before the business is profitable is the plan's most deliberate allocation, and it does two jobs at once. It is the function that keeps the brand on the correct side of the claims boundary — the one failure that can remove products from sale — and it is also the function that migrates SKUs off catalogue formulations onto exclusive ones. In a category where the formulation is the only durable asset, the team that develops it is not overhead; it is the part of the business that is building something.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Setup	Month 0–5	Co-packer contracted and licence verified, classification decided, stability and safety testing complete, claims substantiation file opened, artwork cleared against Legal Metrology and INCI
Launch	Month 5–12	₹3.20cr gross / ₹2.58cr net; ₹45L loss; 34 SKUs; A&P 30.2% of net sales; exclusive formulations 8%; cohort repeat 19%
Build	Year 2	46 SKUs with 9 delisted; exclusive formulations 22%; claims substantiation 78%; ageing stock 11%; ₹4.44cr net, ₹15L loss

Scale	Year 3	52 SKUs; **₹6.86cr net, ₹24L profit; exclusive formulations 41%; claims 100% substantiated; ageing stock 5%; cohort repeat 34%**

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. ***Repeat purchase, exclusive formulations and stock ageing are the levers; the gross margin is not one, because it is spent on attention before it is banked.***

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Inventory & first production runs (co-packer MOQ)	**38,00,000**
Launch advertising, creator & brand building	**34,00,000**
Product development, formulation, stability & safety testing	**16,00,000**
Brand, packaging design, artwork & photography	14,00,000
Warehouse setup, fulfilment & packaging material	12,00,000
Regulatory, licensing & claim substantiation	**10,00,000**
Working-capital buffer	8,00,000
Technology (D2C stack, ERP, DMS, analytics)	7,00,000
Legal, registrations & trademarks	4,00,000
Total project cost	**1,43,00,000**
Promoter contribution	58,00,000
Term loan	30,00,000
Working-capital finance	55,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
GROSS SALES (before trade schemes)	**3,20,00,000**	**5,40,00,000**	**8,20,00,000**
Less: trade schemes, listing fees & discounts	**(62,00,000)**	**(96,00,000)**	**(1,34,00,000)**
Net sales	**2,58,00,000**	**4,44,00,000**	**6,86,00,000**
— E-commerce & beauty marketplaces	98,00,000	1,64,00,000	2,40,00,000
— General & modern trade (via distributors)	62,00,000	1,16,00,000	1,92,00,000
— Beauty specialty retail	44,00,000	76,00,000	1,18,00,000
— Quick commerce	30,00,000	54,00,000	88,00,000
— Own website (D2C)	24,00,000	34,00,000	48,00,000
Cost of goods (co-packer, formulation, primary pack)	**84,00,000**	**1,40,00,000**	**2,12,00,000**

ADVERTISING, CREATOR & BRAND BUILDING	**78,00,000**	**1,12,00,000**	**1,62,00,000**
Salaries	40,00,000	56,00,000	76,00,000
Distributor margin & channel servicing	22,00,000	36,00,000	55,00,000
Freight, warehousing & logistics	18,00,000	28,00,000	41,00,000
Platform commission & marketplace fees	16,00,000	27,00,000	42,00,000
Returns, damages & obsolete-stock write-off	**14,00,000**	**18,00,000**	**20,00,000**
Product development, testing & regulatory	**9,00,000**	**12,00,000**	**16,00,000**
Finance cost (interest)	8,00,000	11,00,000	13,00,000
Depreciation	4,00,000	5,00,000	7,00,000
Admin & other	10,00,000	14,00,000	18,00,000
Total expenses	**3,03,00,000**	**4,59,00,000**	**6,62,00,000**
Net profit / (loss) before tax	**(45,00,000)**	**(15,00,000)**	**24,00,000**
Net margin (on net sales)	(17.4%)	(3.4%)	3.5%
GROSS MARGIN (the number that misleads)	**67.4%**	**68.5%**	**69.1%**
ADVERTISING AS % OF NET SALES (the real cost of goods)	**30.2%**	**25.2%**	**23.6%**
SKUs ON FORMULATIONS EXCLUSIVE TO THIS BRAND	**8%**	**22%**	**41%**
SKUs on catalogue (replicable) formulations	92%	78%	59%
INVENTORY OLDER THAN 12 MONTHS CARRIED AT COST	**18%**	**11%**	**5%**
Obsolete-stock write-offs taken on schedule (not deferred)	**34%**	**68%**	**100%**
COHORT M6 REPEAT PURCHASE RATE	**19%**	**27%**	**34%**
CLAIMS SUBSTANTIATED BY TEST/STUDY BEFORE USE	**41%**	**78%**	**100%**
THERAPEUTIC CLAIMS ON COSMETIC-LICENSED PRODUCTS	**NIL**	**NIL**	**NIL**
Undisclosed paid endorsements / undisclosed grammage cuts	**NIL / NIL**	**NIL / NIL**	**NIL / NIL**
Batch shade/fragrance deviations outside tolerance	6.2%	3.1%	1.2%
Trade spend as % of gross sales / returns & damages as % of net	19.4% / 5.4%	17.8% / 4.1%	16.3% / 2.9%
Active SKUs / delisted for non-performance	34 / 0	46 / 9	52 / 14

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **A 67.4% gross margin produces a 17.4% net loss, which is a worse Year-1 result than the food manufacturer in this vertical achieved on a margin twenty-three points lower. That single comparison is the entire lesson of the sub-model: in cosmetics the gross margin is an advertising budget that has not been spent yet.**
- **Advertising at 30.2% of net sales is the honest shape of the category, not an overspend. A personal-care brand spending 12% on marketing in Year 1 is not disciplined — it is invisible, and its Year-3 position will be worse for it.**

- **Exclusive formulations rising from 8% to 41% is the only line in this plan that describes an asset being created. Everything else describes money being spent to rent attention; this describes something a competitor cannot buy from the same factory.**
- **Cohort repeat from 19% to 34% is what converts the margin into profit.** In a category bought every six to ten weeks, **a retained customer is worth several times an acquired one, and a brand that cannot move this number is re-buying the same customer and calling it growth.**
- **Break-even: Year 3. Working capital, not capacity, is the constraint — there is no plant to fund, only inventory bought against co-packer minimums and marketing paid before the revenue exists.**

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	52,00,000	36,00,000	22,00,000	11,00,000
Collections	48,00,000	56,00,000	62,00,000	68,00,000
Inventory, advertising, salaries, freight & overheads	64,00,000	70,00,000	73,00,000	74,00,000
Closing balance	**36,00,000**	**22,00,000**	**11,00,000**	**5,00,000**

> **The cash trap in personal care is that the long shelf life makes over-ordering feel prudent, and the high gross margin makes over-launching feel affordable — so the two most expensive mistakes in the category both present themselves as good judgement. A co-packer's minimum order quantity on a cosmetic is typically large, and because the product will not expire for three years, ordering the full MOQ looks like sensible buying rather than the forecast bet it actually is.** Meanwhile **a 67% gross margin makes each additional variant appear self-funding, so a brand with one product that works launches four more before discovering whether the first one retains.** The two errors compound into the same place: **a warehouse holding a wide range of slow-moving stock, financed by a working-capital limit, none of it forcing a decision because none of it is expiring.** Four controls follow. **Production runs sized against measured sell-through rather than against MOQ convenience, accepting a higher unit cost on small runs as the price of not betting. New SKUs gated on the hero product's repeat rate rather than on available margin. Inventory aged by batch with a twelve-month flag and write-offs taken on schedule, so the balance sheet tells the truth while it can still be acted on.** And **advertising budgeted against contribution and cohort repeat rather than against revenue, because in this category it is genuinely possible to buy revenue indefinitely and never build a business.**

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Asset creation: share of SKUs on exclusive formulations; substantiated-claim count; trademark and formulation IP registered.**
- **Retention: cohort M6 and M12 repeat; second purchase at full price; replenishment-cycle adherence; hero-SKU repeat versus range repeat.**
- **Hidden loss: inventory aged beyond 12 months; write-offs taken on schedule versus deferred; SKU sell-through at 6 and 12 months.**
- **Legal & product integrity:** claims substantiated before publication; therapeutic claims (must be NIL); disclosed endorsements; batch deviations; adverse-reaction log and batch traceability.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹30 lakh term loan plus ₹55 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹58 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, this plan asks a lender to fund two loss-making years against inventory and a trademark, with no plant and no securable machinery — a profile that suits promoter, angel or strategic capital better than a conventional term loan, and where Mudra or CGTMSE support will be assessed on the promoter and the co-packer contract rather than on this balance sheet. Second, the working-capital facility must be sized against the co-packer MOQ cycle and the marketing spend that precedes revenue, not against receivables: marketplace and retail receivables are real but modest, while inventory bought ahead of demand and advertising paid before it works are where the money actually goes. Third, and the most useful diagnostic available: ask what proportion of inventory has moved in the last twelve months, and what proportion of SKUs sit on formulations exclusive to the brand. The first exposes the loss the long shelf life is concealing; the second says whether there is an asset here at all or only a marketing operation renting attention on a catalogue product. A brand that cannot answer either is not necessarily failing, but it does not know whether it is. Fourth, treat claims compliance as a covenant rather than as good practice: a therapeutic claim on a cosmetic-licensed product is not a marketing infraction but an unlicensed drug, and the remedy — withdrawal of the product — removes the revenue the loan is served from.**

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Inventory & first production runs (co-packer MOQ)	38,00,000	26.6%
Launch advertising, creator & brand building	34,00,000	23.8%
Product development, formulation, stability & safety testing	16,00,000	11.2%
Brand, packaging design, artwork & photography	14,00,000	9.8%
Warehouse setup, fulfilment & packaging material	12,00,000	8.4%
Regulatory, licensing & claim substantiation	10,00,000	7.0%
Working-capital buffer	8,00,000	5.6%
Technology (D2C stack, ERP, DMS, analytics)	7,00,000	4.9%
Legal, registrations & trademarks	4,00,000	2.7%
Total	**1,43,00,000**	**100%**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation

The gross margin is an advertising budget	**SETS THIS PLAN'S GOVERNING CONVENTION: PERSONAL CARE APPEARS TO ESCAPE THE ANCHOR PLAN'S ARITHMETIC AND DOES NOT. GROSS MARGINS ARE 67% NOT 44% — A SHAMPOO COSTING ₹62 SELLS AT ₹299 — AND EVERY FOUNDER SEEING THAT CONCLUDES THE CATEGORY IS STRUCTURALLY MORE PROFITABLE THAN FOOD. A 67.4% GROSS MARGIN PRODUCES A 17.4% NET LOSS IN YEAR 1, A WORSE RESULT THAN THE FOOD MANUFACTURER ACHIEVED ON A MARGIN TWENTY-THREE POINTS LOWER, BECAUSE THE GROSS MARGIN IS NOT A MANUFACTURING MARGIN AT ALL — IT IS AN ADVERTISING BUDGET THAT HAS NOT BEEN SPENT YET** (A&P 30.2%→25.2%→23.6% of net sales; **A BRAND SPENDING 12% IN YEAR 1 IS NOT DISCIPLINED, IT IS INVISIBLE**)
The formulation is a catalogue item	**THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF INDIAN PERSONAL-CARE BRANDS ARE BUILT ON A CONTRACT MANUFACTURER'S EXISTING FORMULATION — CHOSEN FROM A FOLDER, ADJUSTED ON FRAGRANCE AND COLOUR, PACKED UNDER A NEW NAME. LEGAL, STANDARD, AND HOW NEARLY EVERYONE STARTS — BUT A COMPETITOR CAN WALK INTO THE SAME FACTORY NEXT MONTH, BUY A CHEMICALLY IDENTICAL PRODUCT, AND BE SELLING IT IN ELEVEN WEEKS. WHAT IS BEING SOLD IS NOT A PRODUCT BUT A STORY ABOUT A PRODUCT THAT ANYBODY CAN REPLICATE** → exclusive formulations 8%→22%→41%, **THE ONLY LINE IN THIS PLAN THAT DESCRIBES AN ASSET BEING CREATED RATHER THAN ATTENTION BEING RENTED**
Long shelf life hides the mistake	**PRECISELY INVERSE TO THE FOOD PROBLEM AND DANGEROUS BECAUSE IT FEELS LIKE AN ADVANTAGE: A FOOD BRAND THAT MISJUDGES DEMAND DISCOVERS IT WITHIN MONTHS BECAUSE THE STOCK EXPIRES AND THE WRITE-OFF IS COMPULSORY; A COSMETIC BRAND DISCOVERS NOTHING AT ALL. TWO- TO THREE-YEAR SHELF LIFE MEANS A FAILED LAUNCH SITS IN THE WAREHOUSE VALUED AT COST, APPEARING AS AN ASSET WHILE BEING IN SUBSTANCE A LAUNCH THAT FAILED — WORKING CAPITAL CONSUMED, GROSS MARGIN LOOKING HEALTHY BECAUSE THE FAILURE HAS NOT PASSED THROUGH THE P&L, AND THE FOUNDER LAUNCHING THE NEXT VARIANT INSTEAD OF ASKING WHY THE LAST ONE DID NOT MOVE. BRANDS ROUTINELY CARRY THREE-YEAR-OLD STOCK AND DISCOVER IT ONLY IN DILIGENCE, WHEN SOMEBODY ASKS WHAT PROPORTION HAS MOVED IN TWELVE MONTHS** → ageing by batch, 12-month flag, write-offs on schedule (ageing stock 18%→11%→5%; write-offs on schedule 34%→100%), with the honest reading that **IN YEAR 1 NEARLY A FIFTH OF WHAT THE BALANCE SHEET CALLED AN ASSET WAS A DECISION THE BUSINESS HAD NOT YET ADMITTED TO**
The claims boundary — where honest brands break the law	**A COSMETIC MAY CLEAN, BEAUTIFY, PROMOTE ATTRACTIVENESS AND ALTER APPEARANCE — THAT IS THE ENTIRE PERMITTED SCOPE. THE MOMENT A PRODUCT IS SAID TO TREAT, CURE, PREVENT, HEAL OR REDUCE A CONDITION IT HAS MADE A THERAPEUTIC CLAIM, AND A PRODUCT MAKING A THERAPEUTIC CLAIM IS IN LAW A DRUG — BEING MANUFACTURED AND SOLD WITHOUT THE DRUG LICENCE SUCH A PRODUCT REQUIRES, BY A COMPANY HOLDING ONLY A COSMETIC LICENCE. "ADDS SHINE TO HAIR" IS COSMETIC; "REDUCES HAIR FALL" IS NOT. "EVENS SKIN TONE" IS COSMETIC; "CLEARS ACNE" IS NOT. THE WORDS THAT CROSS THE LINE ARE ORDINARY MARKETING VERBS, AND THE PERSON WRITING THE CAPTION HAS NEVER BEEN TOLD THAT A VERB DETERMINES A PRODUCT'S LEGAL CLASSIFICATION** → written claims policy with permitted/prohibited constructions; substantiation by test, panel study or ingredient dossier before publication (41%→78%→100%); single reviewer across pack, website, marketplace and influencer copy; **AN EXPLICIT DECISION ON WHETHER THE BRAND IS COSMETIC, AYURVEDIC OR BOTH — MADE ONCE, DELIBERATELY, RATHER THAN DRIFTING BETWEEN THEM BECAUSE THE LANGUAGE SELLS BETTER**; therapeutic claims NIL

Trial is expensive; the range is not the answer	**FAT MARGINS, SLOW TURNS AND LONG SHELF LIFE MEAN THIS CATEGORY FORGIVES A DEMAND ERROR FOR YEARS AND PUNISHES A POSITIONING ERROR PERMANENTLY — THE CONSUMER WHO TRIED THE PRODUCT AND WAS UNIMPRESSED DOES NOT COME BACK AND CANNOT BE RE-ACQUIRED AT ANY SENSIBLE COST. 67% GROSS MARGIN MAKES EVERY PROPOSED VARIANT LOOK AFFORDABLE, AND EACH CONSUMES MOQ CASH, WAREHOUSE SPACE AND MARKETING ATTENTION THE HERO PRODUCT NEEDED MORE — A BRAND WITH ONE PRODUCT AT 34% COHORT REPEAT HAS A BUSINESS IT CAN SCALE; ONE WITH TWENTY PRODUCTS AT 12% HAS A CATALOGUE AND A MARKETING BILL** → new SKUs gated on the hero product's repeat rate rather than on available margin; delisting normal (14 delisted by Y3); cohort repeat 19%→34%
Batch inconsistency ends repeat silently	A customer who notices the shade or scent changed **CONCLUDES THE BRAND CHEAPENED THE PRODUCT, AND SIMPLY DOES NOT REORDER — THERE IS NO COMPLAINT TO INVESTIGATE** → shade, viscosity and fragrance tolerances specified in writing and tested on receipt; co-packer licence verified and audited; deviations 6.2%→1.2%
Discount dependency & price signalling	**A DISCOUNT THAT BUYS A FIRST BOTTLE IS WORTH IT ONLY IF THE SECOND IS BOUGHT AT FULL PRICE, AND A BRAND THAT DISCOUNTS CONTINUOUSLY HAS TAUGHT ITS CUSTOMERS THAT ITS LIST PRICE IS FICTIONAL — WHICH IN A CATEGORY WHERE PRICE SIGNALS QUALITY IS CONSIDERABLY MORE DAMAGING THAN IN FOOD** → trade spend held to 19.4%→16.3% of gross; second purchase at full price as an explicit objective
Safety, EPR & supply-chain assurance	Stability, challenge and safety testing before launch not after a complaint; **ADVERSE REACTIONS LOGGED, INVESTIGATED AND BATCH-TRACED — A COSMETIC COMPLAINT IS A SAFETY SIGNAL BEFORE IT IS A CUSTOMER-SERVICE EVENT**; animal-testing prohibition verified through the supply chain rather than assumed; **EPR HEAVY BECAUSE COSMETIC PRIMARY PACKAGING IS ALMOST ENTIRELY PLASTIC**; INCI, batch code, shelf life and actual-manufacturer identity verified before artwork prints

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths **Exclusive formulations built progressively — the only durable asset this category creates**; claims substantiated before publication, which is a marketing position as well as a legal one; **obsolete stock written off on schedule, so the balance sheet says something true**; cohort repeat measured; batch consistency enforced at the co-packer.	**Weaknesses** **67% gross margin producing a 17.4% Year-1 loss**; two loss-making years; **92% of SKUs initially on replicable catalogue formulations**; no plant and no securable asset beyond inventory and a trademark; dependent on a co-packer it does not control.
Opportunities Premiumisation and ingredient-led positioning; **beauty specialty retail and quick commerce transforming discovery**; men's grooming growing from a small base with weak loyalty; **substantiated claims as a differentiator competitors cannot copy honestly**; predictable replenishment cycles.	**Threats** **An unknown competitor selling the identical formulation cheaper**; multinational advertising budgets and shelf control; platform and retailer private labels; **a claims or classification breach removing products from sale**; rising cost of attention in a crowded, undifferentiated category.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This personal-care brand would use AiSevak's FMCG vertical tools in operations:

- **Asset creation: formulation register tracking catalogue versus exclusive status by SKU, migration schedule, trademark and IP tracker.**
- **Claims & compliance: claims substantiation file per claim, permitted/prohibited construction checklist, single-reviewer approval workflow across pack, website, marketplace and influencer copy, cosmetic-versus-AYUSH classification decision record.**
- **The hidden loss: batch-level inventory ageing with a 12-month flag, scheduled write-off prompts, SKU sell-through at 6 and 12 months.**
- **Retention:** cohort M6/M12 repeat by acquisition month, full-price second-purchase tracking, replenishment-cycle prompts, hero-SKU versus range repeat comparison.
- **Product integrity & cash:** co-packer licence and audit register, batch tolerance and deviation log, adverse-reaction traceability, MOQ-versus-sell-through production sizing, A&P budgeted against contribution and cohort repeat.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- Personal-care and cosmetics brand: own-brand skin, hair and personal-care products manufactured by third-party cosmetic contract manufacturers, sold through e-commerce and beauty marketplaces, quick commerce, beauty specialty retail, general and modern trade, and own website. □ **SIXTH PLAN IN THE FMCG VERTICAL — BRAND-OWNER SUB-MODEL, INHERITING THE ANCHOR'S CONVENTIONS AND SETTING THE COSMETICS-SPECIFIC ONES.**
- **⚠ GOVERNING CONVENTION FOR THE PERSONAL-CARE / COSMETICS SUB-MODEL, SET HERE: (a) THE GROSS MARGIN IS NOT A MANUFACTURING MARGIN — IT IS AN ADVERTISING BUDGET THAT HAS NOT BEEN SPENT YET; 67.4% GROSS PRODUCES −17.4% NET IN YEAR 1, WORSE THAN THE FOOD MANUFACTURER ON A MARGIN TWENTY-THREE POINTS LOWER. (b) THE FORMULATION IS NOT A MOAT, IT IS A CATALOGUE ITEM — A COMPETITOR CAN BUY A CHEMICALLY IDENTICAL PRODUCT FROM THE SAME FACTORY AND SELL IT IN ELEVEN WEEKS. (c) LONG SHELF LIFE HIDES THE MISTAKE, WHICH IS PRECISELY INVERSE TO THE FOOD PROBLEM — A FAILED LAUNCH SITS FOR THREE YEARS AS AN "ASSET" INSTEAD OF FORCING A DECISION. (d) THE CLAIMS BOUNDARY IS WHERE HONEST BRANDS BREAK THE LAW: A THERAPEUTIC CLAIM RECLASSIFIES A COSMETIC AS A DRUG, AND THE WORDS THAT CROSS THE LINE ARE ORDINARY MARKETING VERBS. (e) TRIAL IS THE EXPENSIVE EVENT AND THE RANGE IS NOT THE ANSWER.**
- **ON THE CLAIMS BOUNDARY, STATED PRECISELY BECAUSE ALMOST NOBODY IN THE CATEGORY CAN: A COSMETIC IS A PRODUCT INTENDED TO BE APPLIED TO THE BODY FOR CLEANSING, BEAUTIFYING, PROMOTING ATTRACTIVENESS OR ALTERING APPEARANCE — THAT IS THE ENTIRE PERMITTED SCOPE. "ADDS SHINE TO HAIR" IS COSMETIC; "REDUCES HAIR FALL" IS NOT. "EVENS SKIN TONE" IS COSMETIC; "CLEARS ACNE" IS NOT. "MOISTURISES DRY SKIN" IS COSMETIC; "TREATS ECZEMA" IS NOT. THE FOUNDER RARELY INTENDS TO BREAK THE LAW — THEY WERE WRITING MARKETING COPY AND DID NOT KNOW THAT A VERB CHANGES A PRODUCT'S LEGAL CLASSIFICATION** → written claims policy, substantiation before publication (41%→78%→100%), single reviewer across all copy surfaces, deliberate cosmetic/AYUSH/drug classification decision, therapeutic claims NIL, disclosed endorsements 100%. **THE SUBSTANTIATION FILE IS TREATED AS AN ASSET RATHER THAN AS COMPLIANCE PAPERWORK, BECAUSE IT IS ALSO THE ONLY DEFENSIBLE BASIS FOR SAYING ANYTHING A COMPETITOR CANNOT.**
- **ON THE MARKET: THE BARRIER TO ENTRY AND THE BARRIER TO SURVIVAL ARE SET AT COMPLETELY DIFFERENT HEIGHTS, AND THE FIRST IS WHAT ATTRACTS CAPITAL WHILE THE SECOND CONSUMES IT — A CO-PACKER SUPPLIES A TESTED, LICENSED, SHELF-STABLE FORMULATION FROM A FOLDER, PACKAGING SUPPLIERS WORK TO SMALL RUNS, MARKETPLACES LIST FREE, AND A CREDIT CARD BUYS ATTENTION IMMEDIATELY; THE RESULT IS HUNDREDS OF BRANDS SELLING MATERIALLY SIMILAR PRODUCTS WITH**

DIFFERENT STORIES ATTACHED, IN WHICH THE MARGINAL COST OF PERSUADING A CONSUMER TO TRY AN UNFAMILIAR CREAM IS HIGH AND RISING BECAUSE EVERY COMPETITOR RESPONDS TO THE SAME UNDIFFERENTIATED-PRODUCT PROBLEM BY BIDDING FOR ATTENTION. THIS IS NOT A FAILURE OF EXECUTION — IT IS THE EQUILIBRIUM OF A MARKET WHERE THE PRODUCT CANNOT DO THE DIFFERENTIATING → the two available responses, both pursued: exclusive formulations (8%→41%) and earned repeat (cohort M6 19%→34%), since **IN A CATEGORY BOUGHT EVERY SIX TO TEN WEEKS A RETAINED CUSTOMER IS WORTH SEVERAL TIMES AN ACQUIRED ONE, AND A BRAND THAT CANNOT MOVE THAT NUMBER IS BUYING THE SAME CUSTOMER OVER AND OVER AND CALLING IT GROWTH.**

- Economics & cash — **THE CASH TRAP IS THAT LONG SHELF LIFE MAKES OVER-ORDERING FEEL PRUDENT WHILE HIGH GROSS MARGIN MAKES OVER-LAUNCHING FEEL AFFORDABLE, SO THE TWO MOST EXPENSIVE MISTAKES IN THE CATEGORY BOTH PRESENT THEMSELVES AS GOOD JUDGEMENT: A LARGE CO-PACKER MOQ LOOKS LIKE SENSIBLE BUYING RATHER THAN THE FORECAST BET IT IS, AND EACH ADDITIONAL VARIANT APPEARS SELF-FUNDING — COMPOUNDING INTO A WAREHOUSE OF SLOW-MOVING STOCK FINANCED BY A WORKING-CAPITAL LIMIT, NONE OF IT FORCING A DECISION BECAUSE NONE OF IT IS EXPIRING** (Y1 −₹45L → Y3 ₹24L; net margin −17.4%→−3.4%→+3.5%; gross margin 67.4%→69.1%; A&P 30.2%→23.6% of net sales; break-even Year 3; **WORKING CAPITAL NOT CAPACITY IS THE CONSTRAINT — THERE IS NO PLANT, ONLY INVENTORY BOUGHT AGAINST MOQ AND MARKETING PAID BEFORE THE REVENUE EXISTS**) → runs sized against measured sell-through accepting higher unit cost as the price of not betting; new SKUs gated on hero repeat; batch ageing with 12-month flag and scheduled write-offs; A&P budgeted against contribution and cohort repeat, **BECAUSE IN THIS CATEGORY IT IS GENUINELY POSSIBLE TO BUY REVENUE INDEFINITELY AND NEVER BUILD A BUSINESS.** Regulatory: cosmetic manufacturing licence held by the co-packer and **VERIFIED AND HELD ON FILE BY THE BRAND SINCE RESPONSIBILITY DOES NOT FOLLOW THE LICENCE**; deliberate cosmetic/AYUSH/drug classification; INCI listing, batch code, shelf life, actual-manufacturer identity and Legal Metrology declarations verified before print; ASCI claims and paid-endorsement disclosure; **ANIMAL-TESTING PROHIBITION VERIFIED THROUGH THE SUPPLY CHAIN RATHER THAN ASSUMED**; EPR heavy because primary packaging is almost entirely plastic; stability, challenge and safety testing pre-launch; adverse-reaction log with batch traceability; GST with distributor credit chain. Lender note: **TWO LOSS-MAKING YEARS AGAINST INVENTORY AND A TRADEMARK, WITH NO PLANT AND NO SECURABLE MACHINERY — A PROFILE SUITING PROMOTER, ANGEL OR STRATEGIC CAPITAL BETTER THAN A CONVENTIONAL TERM LOAN**; **SIZE WORKING CAPITAL AGAINST THE MOQ CYCLE AND PRE-REVENUE MARKETING, NOT RECEIVABLES**; **ASK WHAT PROPORTION OF INVENTORY HAS MOVED IN THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS AND WHAT PROPORTION OF SKUs SIT ON EXCLUSIVE FORMULATIONS — THE FIRST EXPOSES THE LOSS THE LONG SHELF LIFE IS CONCEALING, THE SECOND SAYS WHETHER THERE IS AN ASSET HERE AT ALL OR ONLY A MARKETING OPERATION RENTING ATTENTION ON A CATALOGUE PRODUCT; A BRAND THAT CANNOT ANSWER EITHER IS NOT NECESSARILY FAILING, BUT IT DOES NOT KNOW WHETHER IT IS**; and **TREAT CLAIMS COMPLIANCE AS A COVENANT, BECAUSE A THERAPEUTIC CLAIM ON A COSMETIC-LICENSED PRODUCT IS NOT A MARKETING INFRACTION BUT AN UNLICENSED DRUG, AND THE REMEDY — WITHDRAWAL OF THE PRODUCT — REMOVES THE REVENUE THE LOAN IS SERVED FROM.** ₹1.43cr, gross sales 3.20→8.20cr, net sales 2.58→6.86cr, 34→52 SKUs, 25→53 staff, exclusive formulations 8%→41%, cohort repeat 19%→34%. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

▶ Use these tools now — free on AiSevak

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on **aisevak.in**. Open the **FMCG toolkit** to browse and use them all at **https://aisevak.in/verticals/fmcg** — 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.