BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

School & Employee Transport Contractor

Silence is not evidence of safety

TRANSPORT

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out a **School & Employee Transport Contractor** in India — school transport contracts on term-cycle agreements, corporate and institutional staff transport, vacation-period charters and camps, school-linked excursion and sports movement, and ad-hoc hire, operated as a specification-compliant owned fleet.

> **The preceding plan in this vertical established that a contracted passenger has no exit. This one goes further, and the difference is the whole business: a child cannot assess whether a driver is competent, cannot judge whether a route is safe, and frequently cannot describe an incident accurately even when one occurs. This is therefore the only transport business in the library where the absence of complaints proves nothing at all** — and an operator who reads a quiet term as evidence of a safe one has misunderstood what he is running. **Safety here must be verified by systems rather than inferred from silence**, which is why this plan's controls are physical and logged rather than reported and assumed: **independent, non-driver verification of arrival and headcount rises from 34% to 96% of routes.**

> **The single most important operational control in the entire transport vertical is the post-trip vehicle sweep, and it is worth stating plainly why.** A child asleep on a rear seat, or hiding, or simply not noticed, who remains on a locked bus in an Indian summer, **is the failure mode this business exists to prevent — and it is a failure that has killed children in this country and every other.** The control is embarrassingly simple: **a physical walk-through of the vehicle by the attendant after the last child alights, front to back, logged, every single trip.** It costs ninety seconds. This plan takes logged sweeps from 41% to **100%** of trips, and carries **children left on a vehicle at NIL — stated as an absolute rather than as a trend, because it is the one number in this library that must be zero rather than improving.**

> **The structural asymmetry that explains most non-compliance in this sector is that the party who pays is not the party who bears the risk.** The school negotiates the rate and signs the contract. **The parent bears the consequence and has no contractual relationship with the operator at all — cannot inspect the vehicle, cannot check the driver's licence or record, cannot see the speed data, and cannot change operator; they can only change school.** That is why regulation in this area is unusually prescriptive and compliance is nevertheless uneven: **a compliant vehicle costs more to run than a non-compliant one, so in practice the tender rate sets the safety standard.** This plan's response is to route information past the school to the people who actually carry the risk — **parents with direct live tracking access rise from 22% to 84% of contracts.**

> **Finally, the economics are the hardest in this vertical, and for two structural reasons that compound.** Every school vehicle carries **two staff rather than one — a driver and a mandatory attendant — so wages exceed diesel**, which is true of no other plan here. And **school contracts run roughly ten months: the vehicle is financed for twelve and earns for ten, on top of the twin-peak idleness it already inherits. This vehicle has both a short day and a short year**, which is why vacation-period utilisation rising from 12% to 58% is not opportunism but necessity.

This plan models an operator requiring **₹1.32 crore** (₹50 lakh promoter + ₹56 lakh vehicle term loan + ₹26 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹2.68 crore revenue and a ₹2 lakh loss** on 16 vehicles to **₹4.82 crore revenue and ₹32 lakh profit** on 26 vehicles by Year 3. *(Safety-critical contracted fleet operation — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A school and institutional transport contractor built on verified compliance, logged safeguarding controls, parent-visible tracking, and deliberate vacation deployment.

Vision: To be the operator a parent would choose if a parent were ever asked.

Mission: Sweep every vehicle, every trip, and write it down; give parents the tracking the school holds; never run a route without an attendant; keep journeys short because a child's time is not a rounding error; and treat a quiet term as unproven rather than safe.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — strongly recommended: safeguarding liability, institutional contracting, vehicle financing.
- **LLP** — workable but weaker in school tenders that assess corporate standing.
- **Proprietorship** — unsuited: this model carries child-safety liability that should not sit against personal assets.

> **Regulatory anchor:** school transport is the most prescriptively regulated activity in this vertical. Following Supreme Court directions and state school-bus rules, vehicles must generally carry **the prescribed yellow livery and SCHOOL BUS marking, a speed limit typically capped at 40 km/h with a functioning governor, window grilles, lockable doors, a first-aid box, a fire extinguisher, GPS and in many states CCTV, and seating computed for children rather than adults.** Drivers must typically hold **five or more years of heavy-vehicle experience with no record of dangerous-driving offences**, and **an attendant is mandatory. POCSO obligations apply to every adult who is alone with children, which includes the driver and the attendant** — making background verification, induction and periodic re-verification a legal duty rather than a courtesy. Alongside these sit the ordinary permits, fitness, road tax and PUC, and third-party liability which — as everywhere in this vertical — **is uncapped, and in this model attaches to passengers who are minors.**

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with fleet, institutional-contracting or school-operations background. Three competences decide outcomes: *safeguarding seriousness*, since this is the one plan in the vertical where a single failure ends the business and something worse than the business; *compliance economics*, because bidding a rate that cannot fund a compliant vehicle is the mechanism by which standards actually fall; and *vacation commercial ability*, which is a genuinely different selling job from school contracting and is where the margin lives. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand is near-universal in urban private education and increasingly outsourced, as schools recognise that owning buses means owning the liability. Institutional staff transport provides a complementary, differently-timed contract base.

Demand drivers

- **Private school growth** across metros and tier-2 cities, with transport as an expected service.
- **Outsourcing by schools** seeking to move compliance burden and capital off their own books.
- **Tightening enforcement** of school-bus specifications, which favours documented operators.
- **Parent expectations** around tracking and communication, now a competitive factor between schools.
- **Institutional staff transport**, which fills different hours and different months.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian institutional & school transport	Large; steadily outsourcing
SAM	Schools & institutions in served catchments	Catchment- and route-bounded
SOM (Yr 1–3)	**Vehicles × routes × children carried**	16 → 26 vehicles

> **The reason compliance is uneven despite unusually clear rules deserves to be stated without euphemism, because it is the market's central dynamic and no operator entering it should be surprised by it.** A vehicle that meets the full specification — governor maintained and functioning, grilles, CCTV, GPS with a live feed, a trained attendant on every trip, a driver with five years' experience and a clean record commanding a higher wage — **costs materially more per route-month than one that has the yellow paint and little else.** Schools tender on rate. **The consequence is a market where the lowest bid frequently cannot fund the specification it has undertaken to meet, and everybody involved understands this at the moment of signing.** The operator who wins that tender then economises where it cannot be seen: **the attendant becomes occasional, the governor is disconnected because the route cannot be run in time at 40 km/h, the driver's record is not re-checked. None of this is visible to a parent, and none of it produces a complaint until the day it produces something far worse.** This plan's position is therefore commercial as much as ethical — **it declines routes priced below compliant cost, and tells the school in writing what the specification actually costs** — on the reasoning that **a school that understands the number will either pay it or will at least have been told, and the letter that told them is the operator's only protection when the question is asked afterwards.**

Target segments

- **Private schools** outsourcing on multi-year contracts.
- **School groups and chains**, where a single relationship covers several campuses.
- **Colleges and coaching institutions**, similar timing, adult passengers.
- **Corporate staff transport**, which fills vacation months and different peaks.
- **Camps, tours and excursions**, concentrated in exactly the weeks schools are closed.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: school-owned in-house fleets, local contractors with a handful of vehicles, regional staff-transport companies, and individual van operators contracted directly by parents. **The rate floor is set by operators who do not fund the full specification, and by parent-contracted vans that sit outside the regulatory frame almost entirely.**

The business's edge

- **Logged post-trip sweeps on 100% of trips**, verifiable rather than asserted.
- **Parent-visible live tracking**, which routes information past the school to the risk-bearer.
- **Full specification verified quarterly**, not certified once at fitment.
- **POCSO-aware induction and annual re-verification** for every adult on board.
- **Journey times managed as a welfare metric**, not only a routing output.

> **The most under-considered competitor in this market is the private van an individual parent contracts directly, and it deserves attention because it is cheap, popular and almost entirely outside the frame this plan operates**

in. A van hired by a group of parents typically has **no school-bus specification, no attendant, no verified driver record, no speed governor, no tracking, seating filled well beyond design capacity, and no contractual accountability to anybody except the parents who pay it.** It is also convenient, flexible about timing, and materially cheaper than a compliant bus seat. **An operator cannot compete with it on price and should not try to compete with it on convenience.** What can be done is more useful and rarely attempted: **give the school the arithmetic it needs to explain to parents what the difference actually consists of — the attendant, the sweep, the governor, the verified driver, the tracking — because parents choosing a private van are almost never choosing to accept those risks; they are choosing a price without knowing what has been removed from it. That is a school-communication problem more than a sales problem, and the operator who helps solve it converts a competitor into a contract.**

6. Services, Pricing & the Cost of the Specification

Line	Model	Basis
School transport contracts	Per vehicle per academic term / year	**~59–64% of revenue**
Corporate & institutional staff transport	Per vehicle per month	Fills different hours and months
Vacation-period charters, tours & camps	Per day / per trip	**₹26L → ₹82L — the ten-month fix**
Excursion, sports & event movement	Per trip, school-linked	Relationship-extending
Ad-hoc & weekend hire	Per trip	Marginal fill
Routes priced below compliant cost	**Declined — with the number stated in writing**	**Loses tenders; documented**
Trips run without an attendant	**NIL from Year 2**	**Not an assistant — a safeguarding control**

The attendant is systematically misunderstood in this industry, treated as a helper who manages boarding and is therefore the first cost cut when a route is priced tightly. That reading misses what the role actually does. **The attendant is the person who counts children at each stop, who performs the post-trip sweep, who notices that a child is unwell or distressed, who supervises the aisle while the vehicle is moving so the driver does not have to — and, structurally, who ensures that no adult is ever alone with children on the vehicle. That last function is a safeguarding control of the same kind the sports-academy plan in this library described, and it works precisely because it is boring and constant rather than because anyone is suspected of anything.** Two adults present is the control; the identity of the second adult is secondary. This plan therefore treats the attendant as non-negotiable — **trips run without one fall to nil from Year 2** — and prices routes accordingly, accepting that **a competitor quoting without a full-time attendant will always be cheaper and that this is precisely the difference the parent cannot see and is paying for anyway.**

7. Go-to-Market — Selling What Cannot Be Observed

Acquisition

- **School tenders**, entered with a documented compliance specification and its cost.
- **School groups and chains**, where one relationship covers several campuses.
- **Parent-communication support**, which helps schools defend the rate they pay.

- **Corporate contracts** built deliberately to cover the vacation months.

Retention

- **Incident-free operation with documentation to prove it**, not merely to claim it.
- **Parent satisfaction**, which reaches the school and decides renewals.
- **Punctuality**, the one thing parents measure daily and precisely.
- **Substitution reliability**, since a bus that fails to arrive strands children.

Sales approach

Quote the compliant specification with its cost shown → provide parent-visible tracking → operate with logged controls → report proactively → fill the vacations. **The commercial difficulty specific to this business is that its entire value is invisible when it is working.** A term in which every sweep was logged, every attendant present, every governor functioning and every journey under an hour **looks exactly like a term in which none of that happened, because in both cases nothing went wrong.** The operator therefore has to make the invisible visible before it is tested: **a monthly compliance report to the school covering sweeps completed, attendant coverage, speed exceedances, driver verification currency and journey times — a document nobody asks for and which is the only thing that distinguishes this operator from a cheaper one on the day a school's management committee asks what they are paying for.**

8. Operations Plan (verify, route, board, sweep, report)

- **Vehicle compliance: full state specification verified quarterly — governor function, grilles, doors, first aid, extinguisher, GPS, CCTV — not certified once at fitment.**
- **Personnel: driver experience and record standard, police verification, POCSO-aware induction, annual re-verification for drivers and attendants alike.**
- **Route design: journey time capped as a welfare constraint, not optimised only for vehicle efficiency.**
- **Boarding: headcount at every stop, recorded; named handover to a listed adult at drop where required.**
- **Post-trip sweep: attendant walks the vehicle front to back after the last child alights, logged, every trip, no exceptions.**
- **Parent visibility:** live tracking and arrival notification, provided directly rather than through the school.
- **Speed discipline:** governor maintained and exceedances monitored — **a schedule that cannot be met at the legal limit is a schedule that must change.**
- **Vacation deployment:** camps, tours and corporate work booked before the term ends.

Safety control points

Area	Activity	Control point
Post-trip sweep	**Attendant walks vehicle, logged, every trip**	**41% → 78% → 100%**
Children left on a vehicle	**Absolute standard**	**NIL — not a trend**
Headcount	Independent, non-driver verification	34% → 72% → 96% of routes
Safeguarding	**POCSO induction & annual re-verification**	**28% → 100% of drivers & attendants**
Specification	Verified quarterly, not at fitment	62% → 100%; speed exceedances 3.8 → 0.4
Welfare	**Journey time treated as a constraint**	**Over-60-minute journeys 24% → 7%**

> **Journey time is treated in this plan as a welfare metric rather than a routing output, and the reasoning is worth setting out because it costs money and almost no operator does it.** A child with a seventy-five-minute journey each way spends **two and a half hours a day on a bus** — leaving home before six, arriving back exhausted, with homework and sleep both compressed. **Route optimisation software will happily produce that journey, because from the vehicle's point of view a long route with high occupancy is efficient: more children per bus, fewer buses, a lower cost per seat. The efficiency is real and it is being purchased with the child's time, which appears in nobody's cost model.** This plan caps one-way journeys and accepts the consequence — **shorter routes mean lower occupancy per vehicle and more vehicles for the same catchment, which raises cost per seat** — taking children on journeys over sixty minutes from 24% to 7%. It is defensible commercially for a reason that took the author by surprise: **journey time is one of the very few things about a transport contract that a parent experiences directly, measures daily and complains about specifically** — **which makes it the rare case in this plan where the humane choice and the renewable one are the same choice.**

9. Child Safety, Permits & Compliance (India)

- **School-bus specification** — yellow livery and marking, 40 km/h governed speed, window grilles, lockable doors, first aid, fire extinguisher, GPS and CCTV where mandated, child-basis seating.
- **Driver standard** — **five or more years of heavy-vehicle experience with no dangerous-driving record**, badge, and current police verification.
- **Attendant mandatory on every school trip** — **a safeguarding control, not an assistant to the driver.**
- **POCSO obligations** apply to every adult alone with children, including drivers and attendants: **induction, awareness and annual re-verification.**
- **Speed-governor function verified quarterly** — **a schedule that cannot be met at the legal limit is a schedule that must change, not a governor that must be disconnected.**
- **Permits, fitness, road tax and PUC** per vehicle, on schedule.
- **Third-party liability, uncapped** — and in this model attaching to passengers who are minors.
- GST on transport services; term-cycle revenue recognition on academic-year contracts.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / operations head	1	1	2
Drivers (including relievers)	**20**	**25**	**32**
Attendants / route escorts	**19**	**24**	**31**
Route planning & dispatch	3	4	6
Maintenance & workshop	3	5	7
Accounts, compliance & admin	3	4	6
Safety, verification & training	**2**	**3**	**4**
School liaison & contracts	2	3	4
Total	**53**	**69**	**92**

Attendants almost equal drivers in number — which is the specification written into headcount, and the direct reason wages exceed diesel in this plan when they do so in no other business in this vertical.

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Setup	Month 0–3	16 vehicles to full specification, driver and attendant verification, first school contracts
Launch	Month 3–12	₹2.68cr revenue, ₹2L loss; sweeps logged on 41%, specification 62%, vacation utilisation 12%
Build	Year 2	20 vehicles; sweeps 78%, POCSO coverage 74%, parent tracking 56%; ₹3.54cr, ₹14L profit
Scale	Year 3	26 vehicles; ₹4.82cr, ₹32L profit; **sweeps 100%, specification 100%, vacation utilisation 58%**

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. ***Vacation utilisation and contract rate adequacy are the levers; the safety specification is a fixed cost and is not one.***

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Vehicle down-payment & registration (16 vehicles)	**70,00,000**
Working capital (diesel, wages vs term-cycle receipts)	**26,00,000**
School-bus specification compliance (marking, grilles, governor, GPS, CCTV, first aid)	**14,00,000**
Parking yard, workshop & deposits	8,00,000
Technology (tracking, parent app, attendance)	6,00,000
Driver & attendant recruitment, verification & training	6,00,000
Legal, permits & registrations	2,00,000
Total project cost	**1,32,00,000**
Promoter contribution	50,00,000
Vehicle term loan	56,00,000
Working-capital finance	26,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
School transport contracts (term-cycle)	**1,72,00,000**	**2,16,00,000**	**2,82,00,000**
Corporate & institutional staff transport	46,00,000	62,00,000	84,00,000
Vacation-period charters, tours & camps	**26,00,000**	**46,00,000**	**82,00,000**
Excursion, sports & event movement	18,00,000	22,00,000	26,00,000

Ad-hoc & weekend hire	6,00,000	8,00,000	8,00,000
Total revenue	**2,68,00,000**	**3,54,00,000**	**4,82,00,000**
Driver, attendant & cleaner wages	**78,00,000**	**1,00,00,000**	**1,34,00,000**
Diesel	**76,00,000**	**96,00,000**	**1,28,00,000**
Depreciation on fleet	32,00,000	40,00,000	52,00,000
Maintenance, tyres & body	28,00,000	34,00,000	46,00,000
Insurance, permits, road tax & fitness	18,00,000	23,00,000	30,00,000
Vehicle finance cost (interest)	18,00,000	22,00,000	27,00,000
Yard, technology & admin	14,00,000	18,00,000	24,00,000
Safety compliance, verification & training	**6,00,000**	**7,00,000**	**9,00,000**
Total expenses	**2,70,00,000**	**3,40,00,000**	**4,50,00,000**
Net profit / (loss) before tax	**(2,00,000)**	**14,00,000**	**32,00,000**
Net margin	(0.7%)	4.0%	6.6%
Fleet size (vehicles)	16	20	26
CHILDREN LEFT ON A VEHICLE	**NIL**	**NIL**	**NIL**
TRIPS WITH A LOGGED POST-TRIP VEHICLE SWEEP	**41%**	**78%**	**100%**
Routes with independent (non-driver) headcount verification	**34%**	**72%**	**96%**
Contracts where parents have direct live tracking access	**22%**	**56%**	**84%**
Vehicles meeting the full state specification, verified quarterly	**62%**	**88%**	**100%**
Drivers meeting the 5-year experience & clean-record standard	**71%**	**94%**	**100%**
Drivers & attendants with POCSO induction & annual re-verification	**28%**	**74%**	**100%**
Attendant present on every school trip	**88%**	**100%**	**100%**
Children with a one-way journey exceeding 60 minutes	**24%**	**14%**	**7%**
VACATION-PERIOD FLEET UTILISATION	**12%**	**34%**	**58%**
Speed-limit exceedances recorded per 1,000 km	**3.8**	**1.4**	**0.4**
Accident claims per 100,000 km / Contract renewal rate	0.9 / 74%	0.5 / 82%	0.3 / 88%
Receivable days	82	72	64

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **Wages exceed diesel — the only plan in this vertical where that is true — because every school vehicle carries two staff rather than one, and the mandatory attendant is a fixed cost per route, not a variable one.**
- **The vehicle is financed for twelve months and earns for ten**, on top of the twin-peak idleness inherited from contracted passenger transport: **a short day and a short year, which is why vacation utilisation from 12% to 58% is necessity rather than opportunism.**

- **Journey-time capping raises cost per seat** — shorter routes carry fewer children per vehicle — and is funded deliberately from the vacation and corporate lines.
- **Safety compliance runs at 2.2% of revenue** and is treated as a fixed input rather than a variable: **it is the one cost line in this plan that must not respond to a difficult year.**
- **Break-even:** Year 2, at 6.6% by Year 3 — **the thinnest margins in the transport vertical, and honestly so: two staff per vehicle, ten earning months and a non-negotiable compliance cost cannot produce fleet-level returns.**

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	24,00,000	14,00,000	9,00,000	5,00,000
Collections	58,00,000	62,00,000	64,00,000	68,00,000
Wages, diesel, EMI, maintenance, insurance & overheads	68,00,000	67,00,000	68,00,000	67,00,000
Closing balance	**14,00,000**	**9,00,000**	**5,00,000**	**6,00,000**

> **The cash problem here is the sharpest in the vertical because the revenue is seasonal and the costs are not.** Schools collect transport fees from parents in term cycles and pay the operator when that collection completes — **so receivables run at 82 days and are determined by parents' payment behaviour at an institution the operator has no relationship with.** Worse, **the vacation months bring school revenue close to zero while wages, instalments, insurance and yard costs continue unchanged** — and drivers and attendants cannot simply be released for eight weeks and re-hired, **because the verified, trained, POCSO-inducted staff this model depends on are exactly the people who will not be waiting when the term restarts.** Three controls: **vacation work booked before the term ends rather than sought after it closes**; **an advance or security deposit written into every school contract, which is customary and simply has to be asked for**; and **corporate staff-transport contracts deliberately weighted into the mix because they pay through the months schools do not** — the plan's clearest example of using one revenue line to solve another's timing rather than its margin.

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Child safety (absolute): children left on a vehicle (must be nil); logged post-trip sweeps; headcount verification; attendant coverage.**
- **Personnel integrity: POCSO induction and re-verification currency; driver experience and record standard; police verification currency.**
- **Vehicle & driving: full-specification verification; speed exceedances per 1,000 km; accident claims; maintenance adherence.**
- **Welfare & commercials: journey times over 60 minutes; vacation utilisation**; renewal rate; receivable days; parent tracking coverage.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹56 lakh vehicle term loan plus ₹26 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹50 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, the security is conventional and the contracts are unusually sticky** — school transport relationships run for years because switching mid-year is disruptive to parents, giving this model the highest renewal rate in the vertical. **Second, the working-capital facility must be sized for a ten-month earning year against twelve months of cost**, and specifically for the vacation trough: **this is not a receivables gap, it is a revenue gap, and a**

lender who sizes it as the former will under-fund it. Third, and specific to this model, the concentrated risk is not financial. A single child-safety failure ends the contract, the reputation and very probably the business — and unlike a payment default it cannot be recovered from, refinanced or renegotiated. That makes compliance spend a credit consideration: **an operator whose rate is materially below the market is not more efficient; he has removed something from the specification, and the only question is which thing. Fourth, ask for the sweep log. An operator who cannot produce a per-trip record of post-trip vehicle checks is not performing them, and that single document distinguishes a managed safety system from a stated intention more reliably than any certificate on the wall.**

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Vehicle down-payment & registration (16 vehicles)	70,00,000	53.0%
Working capital (diesel, wages vs term-cycle receipts)	26,00,000	19.7%
School-bus specification compliance	14,00,000	10.6%
Parking yard, workshop & deposits	8,00,000	6.1%
Technology (tracking, parent app, attendance)	6,00,000	4.6%
Driver & attendant recruitment, verification & training	6,00,000	4.5%
Legal, permits & registrations	2,00,000	1.5%
Total	**1,32,00,000**	**100%**

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
The passenger cannot report what happened	The preceding plan established that a contracted passenger has no exit; this goes further — **A CHILD CANNOT ASSESS WHETHER A DRIVER IS COMPETENT, CANNOT JUDGE WHETHER A ROUTE IS SAFE, AND FREQUENTLY CANNOT DESCRIBE AN INCIDENT ACCURATELY EVEN WHEN ONE OCCURS. THIS IS THE ONLY TRANSPORT BUSINESS IN THE LIBRARY WHERE THE ABSENCE OF COMPLAINTS PROVES NOTHING AT ALL, AND AN OPERATOR WHO READS A QUIET TERM AS EVIDENCE OF A SAFE ONE HAS MISUNDERSTOOD WHAT HE IS RUNNING — SAFETY HERE MUST BE VERIFIED BY SYSTEMS RATHER THAN INFERRED FROM SILENCE** (independent non-driver headcount verification 34%→72%→96%)
A child left on the vehicle	**THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT OPERATIONAL CONTROL IN THE ENTIRE TRANSPORT VERTICAL: A CHILD ASLEEP ON A REAR SEAT, OR HIDING, OR SIMPLY NOT NOTICED, WHO REMAINS ON A LOCKED BUS IN AN INDIAN SUMMER, IS THE FAILURE MODE THIS BUSINESS EXISTS TO PREVENT — AND IT IS A FAILURE THAT HAS KILLED CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY AND EVERY OTHER.** The control is embarrassingly simple: **A PHYSICAL WALK-THROUGH OF THE VEHICLE BY THE ATTENDANT AFTER THE LAST CHILD ALIGHTS, FRONT TO BACK, LOGGED, EVERY SINGLE TRIP — IT COSTS NINETY SECONDS** (41%→78%→100%), with **CHILDREN LEFT ON A VEHICLE: NIL, STATED AS AN ABSOLUTE RATHER THAN AS A TREND, BECAUSE IT IS THE ONE NUMBER IN THIS LIBRARY THAT MUST BE ZERO RATHER THAN IMPROVING**

The payer is not the risk-bearer	**THE SCHOOL NEGOTIATES THE RATE AND SIGNS THE CONTRACT; THE PARENT BEARS THE CONSEQUENCE AND HAS NO CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OPERATOR AT ALL — CANNOT INSPECT THE VEHICLE, CANNOT CHECK THE DRIVER'S LICENCE OR RECORD, CANNOT SEE THE SPEED DATA, AND CANNOT CHANGE OPERATOR; THEY CAN ONLY CHANGE SCHOOL** → route information past the school to the people who carry the risk (parent live tracking 22%→56%→84%)
Prescriptive rules, uneven compliance	**A VEHICLE MEETING THE FULL SPECIFICATION — GOVERNOR FUNCTIONING, GRILLES, CCTV, LIVE GPS, A TRAINED ATTENDANT ON EVERY TRIP, A DRIVER WITH FIVE YEARS' EXPERIENCE AND A CLEAN RECORD COMMANDING A HIGHER WAGE — COSTS MATERIALLY MORE PER ROUTE-MONTH THAN ONE THAT HAS THE YELLOW PAINT AND LITTLE ELSE; SCHOOLS TENDER ON RATE, SO THE LOWEST BID FREQUENTLY CANNOT FUND THE SPECIFICATION IT HAS UNDERTAKEN TO MEET, AND EVERYBODY INVOLVED UNDERSTANDS THIS AT THE MOMENT OF SIGNING. THE WINNER THEN ECONOMISES WHERE IT CANNOT BE SEEN: THE ATTENDANT BECOMES OCCASIONAL, THE GOVERNOR IS DISCONNECTED BECAUSE THE ROUTE CANNOT BE RUN IN TIME AT 40 KM/H, THE DRIVER'S RECORD IS NOT RE-CHECKED — NONE OF IT VISIBLE TO A PARENT, AND NONE OF IT PRODUCING A COMPLAINT UNTIL THE DAY IT PRODUCES SOMETHING FAR WORSE.** Response: decline routes priced below compliant cost **AND TELL THE SCHOOL IN WRITING WHAT THE SPECIFICATION ACTUALLY COSTS, BECAUSE A SCHOOL THAT UNDERSTANDS THE NUMBER WILL EITHER PAY IT OR WILL AT LEAST HAVE BEEN TOLD — AND THE LETTER THAT TOLD THEM IS THE OPERATOR'S ONLY PROTECTION WHEN THE QUESTION IS ASKED AFTERWARDS** (specification verified quarterly 62%→100%; drivers to standard 71%→100%)
The attendant treated as a helper	**THE FIRST COST CUT WHEN A ROUTE IS PRICED TIGHTLY, AND THE READING MISSES WHAT THE ROLE DOES: THE ATTENDANT COUNTS CHILDREN AT EACH STOP, PERFORMS THE POST-TRIP SWEEP, NOTICES THAT A CHILD IS UNWELL OR DISTRESSED, SUPERVISES THE AISLE SO THE DRIVER DOES NOT HAVE TO — AND, STRUCTURALLY, ENSURES THAT NO ADULT IS EVER ALONE WITH CHILDREN ON THE VEHICLE. THAT LAST FUNCTION IS A SAFEGUARDING CONTROL OF THE SAME KIND THE SPORTS-ACADEMY PLAN DESCRIBED, AND IT WORKS PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS BORING AND CONSTANT RATHER THAN BECAUSE ANYONE IS SUSPECTED OF ANYTHING** — two adults present is the control; the identity of the second is secondary. Trips without an attendant: NIL from Year 2, accepting that **A COMPETITOR QUOTING WITHOUT A FULL-TIME ATTENDANT WILL ALWAYS BE CHEAPER, AND THAT THIS IS PRECISELY THE DIFFERENCE THE PARENT CANNOT SEE AND IS PAYING FOR ANYWAY**. POCSO induction and annual re-verification 28%→100%
Journey time as an unpriced cost	**A CHILD WITH A SEVENTY-FIVE-MINUTE JOURNEY EACH WAY SPENDS TWO AND A HALF HOURS A DAY ON A BUS — LEAVING HOME BEFORE SIX, ARRIVING BACK EXHAUSTED, WITH HOMEWORK AND SLEEP BOTH COMPRESSED. ROUTE OPTIMISATION SOFTWARE WILL HAPPILY PRODUCE THAT JOURNEY, BECAUSE FROM THE VEHICLE'S POINT OF VIEW A LONG ROUTE WITH HIGH OCCUPANCY IS EFFICIENT: MORE CHILDREN PER BUS, FEWER BUSES, LOWER COST PER SEAT — THE EFFICIENCY IS REAL AND IT IS BEING PURCHASED WITH THE CHILD'S TIME, WHICH APPEARS IN NOBODY'S COST MODEL.** Capped at cost (shorter routes mean lower occupancy and more vehicles), 24%→14%→7% over sixty minutes — defensible because **JOURNEY TIME IS ONE OF THE VERY FEW THINGS ABOUT A TRANSPORT CONTRACT THAT A PARENT EXPERIENCES DIRECTLY, MEASURES DAILY AND COMPLAINS ABOUT SPECIFICALLY, WHICH MAKES IT THE RARE CASE WHERE THE HUMANE CHOICE AND THE RENEWABLE ONE ARE THE SAME CHOICE**
A short day and a short year	**EVERY SCHOOL VEHICLE CARRIES TWO STAFF RATHER THAN ONE, SO WAGES EXCEED DIESEL — TRUE OF NO OTHER PLAN IN THIS VERTICAL — AND SCHOOL CONTRACTS RUN ROUGHLY TEN MONTHS, SO THE VEHICLE IS FINANCED FOR TWELVE AND EARNS FOR TEN, ON TOP OF THE TWIN-PEAK IDLENESS IT ALREADY INHERITS** → vacation utilisation 12%→34%→58% as necessity rather than opportunism; corporate staff transport weighted in deliberately because it pays through the months schools do not

The parent-contracted private van	**THE MOST UNDER-CONSIDERED COMPETITOR: NO SPECIFICATION, NO ATTENDANT, NO VERIFIED DRIVER RECORD, NO GOVERNOR, NO TRACKING, SEATING FILLED WELL BEYOND DESIGN CAPACITY AND NO ACCOUNTABILITY TO ANYBODY EXCEPT THE PARENTS WHO PAY IT — ALSO CONVENIENT, FLEXIBLE AND MATERIALLY CHEAPER.** Cannot be beaten on price or convenience → **GIVE THE SCHOOL THE ARITHMETIC IT NEEDS TO EXPLAIN WHAT THE DIFFERENCE CONSISTS OF, BECAUSE PARENTS CHOOSING A PRIVATE VAN ARE ALMOST NEVER CHOOSING TO ACCEPT THOSE RISKS; THEY ARE CHOOSING A PRICE WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM IT — A SCHOOL-COMMUNICATION PROBLEM MORE THAN A SALES PROBLEM, AND THE OPERATOR WHO HELPS SOLVE IT CONVERTS A COMPETITOR INTO A CONTRACT**
Invisible value & cash	**THE ENTIRE VALUE OF THIS BUSINESS IS INVISIBLE WHEN IT IS WORKING: A TERM IN WHICH EVERY SWEEP WAS LOGGED, EVERY ATTENDANT PRESENT, EVERY GOVERNOR FUNCTIONING AND EVERY JOURNEY UNDER AN HOUR LOOKS EXACTLY LIKE A TERM IN WHICH NONE OF THAT HAPPENED, BECAUSE IN BOTH CASES NOTHING WENT WRONG** → a monthly compliance report to the school, **A DOCUMENT NOBODY ASKS FOR AND THE ONLY THING THAT DISTINGUISHES THIS OPERATOR FROM A CHEAPER ONE ON THE DAY A MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ASKS WHAT THEY ARE PAYING FOR.** Cash: **82-DAY RECEIVABLES DETERMINED BY PARENTS' PAYMENT BEHAVIOUR AT AN INSTITUTION THE OPERATOR HAS NO RELATIONSHIP WITH, AND VACATION MONTHS WHERE SCHOOL REVENUE FALLS TO NEAR ZERO WHILE WAGES, INSTALMENTS AND INSURANCE CONTINUE — AND STAFF CANNOT SIMPLY BE RELEASED FOR EIGHT WEEKS AND RE-HIRED, BECAUSE THE VERIFIED, TRAINED, POCSO-INDUCTED PEOPLE THIS MODEL DEPENDS ON ARE EXACTLY THE ONES WHO WILL NOT BE WAITING WHEN THE TERM RESTARTS** → vacation work booked before term ends, advance/security deposit in every school contract, corporate contracts as timing cover

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths **Logged sweeps and verifiable safeguarding controls rather than asserted ones**; parent-visible tracking routing information past the school; full specification verified quarterly; **highest contract renewal rate in the vertical**; journey time managed as welfare.	**Weaknesses** **Thinnest margins in the transport vertical — two staff per vehicle, ten earning months, non-negotiable compliance cost**; wages exceed diesel; 82-day term-cycle receivables; **compliant pricing loses tenders to operators who fund less.**
Opportunities Schools outsourcing to move liability and capital off their books; **tightening enforcement favouring documented operators** ; school groups covering several campuses; **camps, tours and corporate work concentrated in exactly the weeks schools are closed**; parent-communication support as a differentiator.	**Threats** **Parent-contracted vans outside the regulatory frame**; tender rates that cannot fund the specification; **a single child-safety failure ending the business outright**; school payment cycles slipping; driver and attendant supply at verified standard.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This school & employee transport contractor would use AiSevak's Transport vertical tools in operations:

- **Child safety: per-trip post-sweep log with attendant sign-off, stop-level headcount capture, independent arrival verification, exception alerting.**
- **Personnel integrity: POCSO induction and annual re-verification register**, driver experience and record standard tracker, police-verification currency.

- **Vehicle compliance: quarterly full-specification checklist (governor function, grilles, first aid, extinguisher, GPS, CCTV)**, speed-exceedance monitoring per 1,000 km.
- **Parent visibility:** live tracking and arrival notification, **monthly compliance report to the school.**
- **Commercials: compliant-cost route pricing model, journey-time cap monitoring, vacation-utilisation planner**, term-cycle receivable tracking and security-deposit register.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- School & employee transport contractor: school transport on term-cycle contracts, corporate and institutional staff transport, vacation-period charters and camps, school-linked excursion movement, and ad-hoc hire.
- **⚠ THE PRECEDING PLAN ESTABLISHED THAT A CONTRACTED PASSENGER HAS NO EXIT; THIS ONE GOES FURTHER, AND THE DIFFERENCE IS THE WHOLE BUSINESS: A CHILD CANNOT ASSESS WHETHER A DRIVER IS COMPETENT, CANNOT JUDGE WHETHER A ROUTE IS SAFE, AND FREQUENTLY CANNOT DESCRIBE AN INCIDENT ACCURATELY EVEN WHEN ONE OCCURS — THIS IS THEREFORE THE ONLY TRANSPORT BUSINESS IN THE LIBRARY WHERE THE ABSENCE OF COMPLAINTS PROVES NOTHING AT ALL, AND AN OPERATOR WHO READS A QUIET TERM AS EVIDENCE OF A SAFE ONE HAS MISUNDERSTOOD WHAT HE IS RUNNING: SAFETY HERE MUST BE VERIFIED BY SYSTEMS RATHER THAN INFERRED FROM SILENCE** (the deepest version of the library's recurring motif that the customer cannot evaluate — the pet clinic's animal that cannot speak, the certification body that is believed or not). **THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT OPERATIONAL CONTROL IN THE ENTIRE TRANSPORT VERTICAL IS THE POST-TRIP SWEEP: A CHILD ASLEEP ON A REAR SEAT, OR HIDING, OR SIMPLY NOT NOTICED, WHO REMAINS ON A LOCKED BUS IN AN INDIAN SUMMER, IS THE FAILURE MODE THIS BUSINESS EXISTS TO PREVENT — AND IT IS A FAILURE THAT HAS KILLED CHILDREN IN THIS COUNTRY AND EVERY OTHER. THE CONTROL IS EMBARRASSINGLY SIMPLE: A PHYSICAL WALK-THROUGH OF THE VEHICLE BY THE ATTENDANT AFTER THE LAST CHILD ALIGHTS, FRONT TO BACK, LOGGED, EVERY SINGLE TRIP. IT COSTS NINETY SECONDS** (41%→78%→100%), and **CHILDREN LEFT ON A VEHICLE IS CARRIED AT NIL, STATED AS AN ABSOLUTE RATHER THAN A TREND, BECAUSE IT IS THE ONE NUMBER IN THIS LIBRARY THAT MUST BE ZERO RATHER THAN IMPROVING.**
- **THE STRUCTURAL ASYMMETRY THAT EXPLAINS MOST NON-COMPLIANCE IN THIS SECTOR IS THAT THE PARTY WHO PAYS IS NOT THE PARTY WHO BEARS THE RISK: THE SCHOOL NEGOTIATES THE RATE AND SIGNS THE CONTRACT; THE PARENT BEARS THE CONSEQUENCE AND HAS NO CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE OPERATOR AT ALL — CANNOT INSPECT THE VEHICLE, CANNOT CHECK THE DRIVER'S LICENCE OR RECORD, CANNOT SEE THE SPEED DATA, AND CANNOT CHANGE OPERATOR; THEY CAN ONLY CHANGE SCHOOL. THAT IS WHY REGULATION HERE IS UNUSUALLY PRESCRIPTIVE AND COMPLIANCE IS NEVERTHELESS UNEVEN: A COMPLIANT VEHICLE COSTS MORE TO RUN THAN A NON-COMPLIANT ONE, SO IN PRACTICE THE TENDER RATE SETS THE SAFETY STANDARD** — and the mechanism is specific: **THE LOWEST BID FREQUENTLY CANNOT FUND THE SPECIFICATION IT HAS UNDERTAKEN TO MEET, AND EVERYBODY INVOLVED UNDERSTANDS THIS AT THE MOMENT OF SIGNING; THE WINNER THEN ECONOMISES WHERE IT CANNOT BE SEEN — THE ATTENDANT BECOMES OCCASIONAL, THE GOVERNOR IS DISCONNECTED BECAUSE THE ROUTE CANNOT BE RUN IN TIME AT 40 KM/H, THE DRIVER'S RECORD IS NOT RE-CHECKED — NONE OF IT VISIBLE TO A PARENT, AND NONE OF IT PRODUCING A COMPLAINT UNTIL THE DAY IT PRODUCES SOMETHING FAR WORSE** → decline routes priced below compliant cost and **TELL THE SCHOOL IN WRITING WHAT THE SPECIFICATION ACTUALLY COSTS, BECAUSE A SCHOOL THAT UNDERSTANDS THE NUMBER WILL EITHER PAY IT OR WILL AT LEAST HAVE BEEN TOLD — AND THE LETTER THAT TOLD THEM IS THE OPERATOR'S ONLY PROTECTION WHEN THE QUESTION IS ASKED AFTERWARDS**; plus parent live tracking (22%→56%→84%) to route information past the school to the risk-bearer.

- **THE ATTENDANT IS SYSTEMATICALLY MISUNDERSTOOD AND IS THE FIRST COST CUT WHEN A ROUTE IS PRICED TIGHTLY: THE ROLE COUNTS CHILDREN AT EACH STOP, PERFORMS THE POST-TRIP SWEEP, NOTICES THAT A CHILD IS UNWELL OR DISTRESSED, SUPERVISES THE AISLE SO THE DRIVER DOES NOT HAVE TO — AND, STRUCTURALLY, ENSURES THAT NO ADULT IS EVER ALONE WITH CHILDREN ON THE VEHICLE; THAT LAST FUNCTION IS A SAFEGUARDING CONTROL OF THE SAME KIND THE SPORTS-ACADEMY PLAN DESCRIBED, AND IT WORKS PRECISELY BECAUSE IT IS BORING AND CONSTANT RATHER THAN BECAUSE ANYONE IS SUSPECTED OF ANYTHING — TWO ADULTS PRESENT IS THE CONTROL; THE IDENTITY OF THE SECOND ADULT IS SECONDARY** (trips without an attendant NIL from Y2; POCSO induction and annual re-verification 28%→74%→100%), accepting that **A COMPETITOR QUOTING WITHOUT A FULL-TIME ATTENDANT WILL ALWAYS BE CHEAPER AND THAT THIS IS PRECISELY THE DIFFERENCE THE PARENT CANNOT SEE AND IS PAYING FOR ANYWAY.** On journey time: **A CHILD WITH A SEVENTY-FIVE-MINUTE JOURNEY EACH WAY SPENDS TWO AND A HALF HOURS A DAY ON A BUS, LEAVING HOME BEFORE SIX AND ARRIVING BACK EXHAUSTED, WITH HOMEWORK AND SLEEP BOTH COMPRESSED — AND ROUTE OPTIMISATION SOFTWARE WILL HAPPILY PRODUCE THAT JOURNEY, BECAUSE FROM THE VEHICLE'S POINT OF VIEW A LONG ROUTE WITH HIGH OCCUPANCY IS EFFICIENT: MORE CHILDREN PER BUS, FEWER BUSES, A LOWER COST PER SEAT. THE EFFICIENCY IS REAL AND IT IS BEING PURCHASED WITH THE CHILD'S TIME, WHICH APPEARS IN NOBODY'S COST MODEL** → capped at real cost (24%→14%→7% over sixty minutes), defensible because **JOURNEY TIME IS ONE OF THE VERY FEW THINGS ABOUT A TRANSPORT CONTRACT THAT A PARENT EXPERIENCES DIRECTLY, MEASURES DAILY AND COMPLAINS ABOUT SPECIFICALLY — THE RARE CASE IN THIS PLAN WHERE THE HUMANE CHOICE AND THE RENEWABLE ONE ARE THE SAME CHOICE.**
- Economics — **WAGES EXCEED DIESEL, THE ONLY PLAN IN THIS VERTICAL WHERE THAT IS TRUE, BECAUSE EVERY SCHOOL VEHICLE CARRIES TWO STAFF RATHER THAN ONE AND THE MANDATORY ATTENDANT IS A FIXED COST PER ROUTE RATHER THAN A VARIABLE ONE** (attendants almost equal drivers in headcount); **THE VEHICLE IS FINANCED FOR TWELVE MONTHS AND EARNS FOR TEN, ON TOP OF THE TWIN-PEAK IDLENESS INHERITED FROM CONTRACTED PASSENGER TRANSPORT — A SHORT DAY AND A SHORT YEAR** → vacation utilisation 12%→34%→58% as necessity; safety compliance held at 2.2% of revenue and treated as **THE ONE COST LINE IN THIS PLAN THAT MUST NOT RESPOND TO A DIFFICULT YEAR**; break-even Y2 at **6.6% Y3 — THE THINNEST MARGINS IN THE TRANSPORT VERTICAL, AND HONESTLY SO: TWO STAFF PER VEHICLE, TEN EARNING MONTHS AND A NON-NEGOTIABLE COMPLIANCE COST CANNOT PRODUCE FLEET-LEVEL RETURNS.** Cash is **THE SHARPEST IN THE VERTICAL BECAUSE THE REVENUE IS SEASONAL AND THE COSTS ARE NOT: 82-DAY RECEIVABLES DETERMINED BY PARENTS' PAYMENT BEHAVIOUR AT AN INSTITUTION THE OPERATOR HAS NO RELATIONSHIP WITH, AND VACATION MONTHS WHERE SCHOOL REVENUE FALLS CLOSE TO ZERO WHILE WAGES, INSTALMENTS, INSURANCE AND YARD COSTS CONTINUE UNCHANGED — AND DRIVERS AND ATTENDANTS CANNOT SIMPLY BE RELEASED FOR EIGHT WEEKS AND RE-HIRED, BECAUSE THE VERIFIED, TRAINED, POCSO-INDUCTED STAFF THIS MODEL DEPENDS ON ARE EXACTLY THE PEOPLE WHO WILL NOT BE WAITING WHEN THE TERM RESTARTS** → vacation work booked BEFORE the term ends, **AN ADVANCE OR SECURITY DEPOSIT WRITTEN INTO EVERY SCHOOL CONTRACT, CUSTOMARY AND SIMPLY HAS TO BE ASKED FOR**, and corporate staff-transport weighted in deliberately because it pays through the months schools do not — **THE PLAN'S CLEAREST EXAMPLE OF USING ONE REVENUE LINE TO SOLVE ANOTHER'S TIMING RATHER THAN ITS MARGIN.** Sales note: **THE ENTIRE VALUE OF THIS BUSINESS IS INVISIBLE WHEN IT IS WORKING — A TERM IN WHICH EVERY SWEEP WAS LOGGED, EVERY ATTENDANT PRESENT, EVERY GOVERNOR FUNCTIONING AND EVERY JOURNEY UNDER AN HOUR LOOKS EXACTLY LIKE A TERM IN WHICH NONE OF THAT HAPPENED, BECAUSE IN BOTH CASES NOTHING WENT WRONG** → a monthly compliance report to the school, **A DOCUMENT NOBODY ASKS FOR AND THE ONLY THING THAT DISTINGUISHES THIS OPERATOR FROM A CHEAPER ONE ON THE DAY A SCHOOL'S MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ASKS WHAT THEY ARE PAYING FOR.** Lender note: conventional security and the vertical's highest renewal rate; **THE WC FACILITY MUST BE SIZED FOR A TEN-MONTH**

EARNING YEAR AGAINST TWELVE MONTHS OF COST — THIS IS NOT A RECEIVABLES GAP, IT IS A REVENUE GAP, AND A LENDER WHO SIZES IT AS THE FORMER WILL UNDER-FUND IT; **THE CONCENTRATED RISK IS NOT FINANCIAL — A SINGLE CHILD-SAFETY FAILURE ENDS THE CONTRACT, THE REPUTATION AND VERY PROBABLY THE BUSINESS, AND UNLIKE A PAYMENT DEFAULT IT CANNOT BE RECOVERED FROM, REFINANCED OR RENEGOTIATED, WHICH MAKES COMPLIANCE SPEND A CREDIT CONSIDERATION: AN OPERATOR WHOSE RATE IS MATERIALLY BELOW THE MARKET IS NOT MORE EFFICIENT; HE HAS REMOVED SOMETHING FROM THE SPECIFICATION, AND THE ONLY QUESTION IS WHICH THING**; and **ASK FOR THE SWEEP LOG — AN OPERATOR WHO CANNOT PRODUCE A PER-TRIP RECORD OF POST-TRIP VEHICLE CHECKS IS NOT PERFORMING THEM, AND THAT SINGLE DOCUMENT DISTINGUISHES A MANAGED SAFETY SYSTEM FROM A STATED INTENTION MORE RELIABLY THAN ANY CERTIFICATE ON THE WALL.** ₹1.32cr, 16→20→26 vehicles, 53→92 staff, rev 2.68→4.82cr, Y1 −₹2L → Y3 ₹32L. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

▶ Use these tools now — free on AiSevak

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