



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

SEO & Content Agency

Built to still be there when the results arrive

AGENCIES & MARKETING-SERVICES FIRMS

AISEVAK.IN · BY ABL DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES

August 2026

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

1. Executive Summary

This plan sets out an **SEO & Content Agency** in India — search strategy and ongoing SEO retainers, editorial content production, technical SEO audits and migrations, digital PR and earned links, and search-visibility analytics.

Every business in this vertical has an attribution problem. This one adds a time dimension that changes its character entirely: SEO results take six to twelve months to appear, which means the client pays for three quarters before they can judge anything at all. An industry in which the verdict arrives long after the money has been spent is an industry that structurally attracts people who do not intend to be there when it arrives — and that, rather than any technical dispute, is why SEO carries the reputation it does. The honest response is not to ask for trust. It is to publish, at onboarding, a written framework of what must move at thirty, sixty and ninety days for the nine-month outcome to remain possible — crawl coverage, indexation, technical debt cleared, publishing cadence, early non-brand impression growth. None of those are results; all of them are falsifiable, and a client holding them can fire the agency at month four on evidence rather than on suspicion. This plan takes that framework from 30% to 88% of clients.

The metric the industry reports is close to meaningless, and for a reason peculiar to search: results are personalised, localised, device-specific and fragmented across an enormous number of query variants — so a rank-tracking report shows the keywords the agency chose to track, and there is always a set on which the agency is winning. It is the vertical's convention in yet another costume. Two corrections apply. **Non-brand organic sessions and organic-attributed revenue replace rankings as the reported outcome** (26% → 82% of clients), and **brand search is separated out, because a client's own brand queries will rank first regardless of what any agency does — reporting them as SEO performance is claiming credit for the client's existing reputation**, the identical error the performance-marketing plan identified in paid channels.

Something genuinely new has also happened, and a plan written today that omits it is describing a business that is quietly disappearing: AI overviews and answer engines resolve a growing share of queries on the results page itself. The consequence is unprecedented in this industry — **an agency can rank first and deliver nothing. Ranking success and business outcome, which have been proxies for one another for twenty years, have come apart.** The strategic response is a shift in what content is produced for: away from informational top-of-funnel questions that an AI answer now satisfies completely, toward queries requiring a decision, a product, a price, a location or a booking. **Share of content targeting queries that survive an AI answer rises from 38% to 79%, and click-through rate at unchanged rank position becomes the diagnostic that tells a client the search results page changed rather than their site.**

AI has simultaneously repriced the content half of the business from both directions, and the two effects point opposite ways. Drafting cost has collapsed — **cost per published article falls from ₹4,200 to ₹2,800.** But every competitor's cost fell identically and the index is now flooded, **so the marginal generic article is worth approximately nothing.** What remains defensible is precisely what a language model cannot generate: **original data, first-hand testing, named expert authorship, primary research.** Which is why the second number moves the other way — **cost per article that actually earns rankings rises from ₹18,000 to ₹26,000.** **The honest summary of AI's effect on this business is not that content got cheaper. It is that worthless content got cheaper and valuable content got more expensive, and the gap between them is now the entire business.**

This plan models an agency requiring **₹45 lakh** (₹26 lakh promoter + ₹9 lakh investor + ₹10 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹1.68 crore revenue and an ₹11 lakh loss** in Year 1 to **₹4.02 crore revenue and ₹35 lakh profit** by

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A search agency built for a delivery cycle longer than most client patience — leading indicators published in advance, non-brand outcomes reported, content produced for queries that still generate clicks, and links earned rather than bought.

Vision: To be the SEO agency still holding the account when the results arrive.

Mission: Publish what must move before it can be claimed; report non-brand outcomes and separate them from the client's own name; never buy a link; and tell a client when the query they want to rank for no longer sends anybody anywhere.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — recommended: enterprise contracting, longer engagements, team scale.
- **LLP** — workable for a consultant-led practice.
- **Proprietorship** — common for solo consultants; unsuited to content-production scale.

Regulatory anchor: lighter than elsewhere in the vertical, with three real exposures. **Search-engine guidelines are not law but function as commercial regulation** — link schemes, scaled content abuse and site-reputation abuse can trigger manual actions or algorithmic suppression, and **the penalty lands on the client's domain, not the agency's. Content liability is genuine and frequently ignored:** agency-produced articles in health, financial and legal categories carry ASCI and sector-specific claim obligations, **and AI-drafted content raises the risk of confidently stated falsehoods being published under the client's name and expertise.** Third, **plagiarism and copyright** across text and images at production scale. Alongside these: DPDP duties where analytics and CRM data are handled; disclosure obligations on sponsored placements in digital PR; and client ownership of content, analytics properties, search console access and the link profile itself.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with SEO, editorial or digital-PR background. Three competences decide outcomes: *editorial judgment*, now the scarce input rather than production capacity; *technical diagnosis*, which is the highest-value and least commoditised service; and *expectation management across a nine-month cycle*, since the commonest failure in this business is not a bad strategy but a client who left before it could work. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand comes from e-commerce, SaaS, marketplaces, publishers, education, healthcare and local services. The market is large and, for the first time in two decades, structurally uncertain — clients are asking whether the channel still works. It is **long-cycle, technically deep and undergoing a genuine platform-level disruption.**

Demand drivers

- **Rising paid-media costs**, which make organic acquisition economically attractive again.
- **Content-led categories** — SaaS, fintech, health, education — where search is the primary discovery path.
- **Regional-language and vernacular search**, growing fast and thinly served.
- **Site migrations, replatforming and technical debt**, which generate high-value project work.

- **Uncertainty itself** — clients now need help deciding whether and how to keep investing.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian SEO & content-marketing services	Large; fragmented, consultant-heavy
SAM	Brands at retainer levels served	Category- and ticket-bounded
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Retained clients × tenure × revenue per client	20 → 42 active clients

The zero-click shift deserves to be described precisely rather than treated as a slogan, because its effects are uneven and the unevenness is the strategy. AI-generated answers absorb **informational queries almost completely** — definitions, how-to explanations, comparisons of concepts, symptom descriptions. These were the backbone of a decade of content marketing and **they are now the least valuable content an agency can produce, because the answer appears above the result and the user's question is resolved before a click exists.** What survives is everything requiring something the answer cannot supply: **a transaction, a specific product, a live price, a local business, an appointment, a login, a comparison of actual vendors, or an opinion attached to a named person the reader wants to hear from.** The operational consequence is a content mix that looks quite different from the industry's habit — **fewer explainers, more commercial-investigation and transactional pages, more genuinely expert commentary, more content that is the destination rather than a summary of one.** And it produces a diagnostic every client should be shown: **when rankings hold steady while clicks fall, nothing has gone wrong with the site — the results page changed underneath it,** which is a fact the client will otherwise interpret as agency failure.

Target segments

- **E-commerce and marketplaces**, where transactional queries retain their clicks.
- **SaaS and B2B**, where content still converts and the sales cycle rewards depth.
- **Local and multi-location businesses** — local intent is among the most AI-resistant.
- **Regulated categories** (health, finance, legal) where expertise and authorship carry real weight.
- **Migration and replatforming projects**, high-value and urgent.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: full-service agencies, specialist SEO shops, independent consultants, offshore content mills, and **an enormous new supply of AI-assisted content operations selling volume at prices no editorial team can match.** The floor is set by operators promising rankings on a fixed keyword list for a small monthly fee.

The business's edge

- **Leading-indicator frameworks published before the money is spent.**
- **Non-brand outcome reporting**, with brand search separated.
- **Content built for queries that survive an AI answer.**
- **Original expertise and primary data** — the input AI cannot manufacture.
- **Earned links only**, with the liability argument made explicitly to clients.

The link question is where this agency loses the most business, and the reason to hold the line is not ethical but actuarial. Bought links, private blog networks and paid guest-post placements work — for a while, at a known price,

with a delivery timeline a competitor can put in a proposal. **What the proposal does not say is where the risk sits when it stops working: the manual action or algorithmic suppression lands on the CLIENT'S domain. The agency that built the profile moves on to its next account; the client is left with a website carrying a liability it did not know it had bought, and a recovery project costing multiples of what the links cost. Paid links: NIL** in this plan, and the commercial cost is real — earned coverage is slower, more expensive per placement and impossible to guarantee. The compensating argument to a client is the one they can verify later: **an earned link cannot be disavowed away from you, cannot be sold to your competitor next quarter, and does not have to be disclosed to an acquirer during diligence.**

6. Services, Pricing & the Long-Cycle Problem

Line	Model	Basis
SEO retainers (strategy, technical, ongoing)	Monthly by scope	~39-40% of revenue
Content production & editorial	Retained / per volume	~28% — repriced by AI
Technical SEO audits & migrations	Per project	Highest value per hour
Digital PR & earned links	Retained / per campaign	Slowest, least guaranteeable
Analytics & search-visibility programmes	Retained	Where reporting honesty lives
Bought links, PBNs or paid guest-post networks	NIL — by policy	Liability sits on the client's domain
Guaranteed-ranking packages	NIL — by policy	Only deliverable by choosing easy keywords

Guaranteed rankings are the SEO equivalent of the ROAS guarantee the performance plan refused, and they fail in exactly the same way: the promise is deliverable, and delivering it destroys the value. Any agency can guarantee first position by selecting queries with almost no competition and almost no search volume. **The client receives a report full of first-place rankings and no additional customers, which is a technically honest outcome to a fundamentally dishonest promise.** The refusal costs pitches to competitors who will make it. The counter-offer is **a commitment to non-brand organic revenue or qualified organic enquiries within a stated horizon, with the leading-indicator framework as the interim accountability** — harder to promise, impossible to fake, and the only version that survives the client eventually looking at their own sales data.

7. Go-to-Market — Selling a Nine-Month Outcome

Acquisition

- **Paid technical audits** — immediate, concrete, and the fastest demonstration of competence in this field.
- **Migration work**, urgent and high-value, which converts to retainer.
- **Category depth**, since expertise-led content cannot be produced generically.
- **The agency's own search visibility**, which in this category is the proof.

Retention

- **The 90-day framework**, which gives the client something to judge at month three instead of month nine.
- **Honest reporting of algorithm events**, before the client discovers them elsewhere.
- **Compounding results**, which make year two cheaper to deliver than year one.
- **Technical partnership** with the client's engineering team.

Sales approach

Audit → publish the leading-indicator framework → contract on non-brand outcomes → produce for surviving queries → earn links → report brand and non-brand separately. **The single largest cause of failure in this business is not strategy but sequence: clients who leave before month nine never learn whether the work was any good, and the agency never gets to find out either.** This plan tracks it directly — **clients lost before month nine falls from 7 to 3** — and treats it as the primary retention metric, because **an SEO agency losing a third of its clients before the delivery cycle completes is not running an agency; it is running a subscription to hope, and every account it loses early takes the evidence of its own competence with it.**

8. Operations Plan (audit, fix, publish, earn, report)

- **Onboarding:** technical audit, baseline documentation, and **the written 30/60/90-day leading-indicator framework.**
- **Technical:** crawl, index, performance, structured data, and migration risk — **the highest-value work in the business.**
- **Content:** query selection filtered for AI-answer survival; AI-assisted drafting with **mandatory expert input, original data or first-hand testing on priority pieces.**
- **Editorial control:** fact-checking, source verification and named authorship — **the control that AI drafting makes non-optional.**
- **Digital PR:** earned coverage only; **no paid placements, no networks.**
- **Measurement:** non-brand organic revenue; brand separated; **CTR at constant rank position tracked as the SERP-change diagnostic.**
- **Algorithm events:** logged, dated and reported **at portfolio level as well as account level.**
- **Implementation follow-through:** technical recommendations tracked to completion in the client's own systems.

Engagement rhythm

Stage	Activity	Control point
Frame	Written 30/60/90-day leading indicators	Published at onboarding: 30% → 88%
Diagnose	Technical audit, baseline, migration risk	Highest value per hour
Implement	Tracked into the client's own release cycle	Implemented in 90 days 41% → 78%
Produce	AI-assisted drafting, expert-led priority content	Original-input share 22% → 71%
Earn	Digital PR; bought links NIL	Slower, and it stays yours
Report	Non-brand organic revenue; brand separated	Non-brand-led reporting 26% → 82%

The most under-discussed operational failure in this business is that the agency's most valuable recommendations are the ones it cannot implement. Technical SEO fixes — rendering, crawl budget, site architecture, page performance, canonical logic — **require the client's own engineering team, competing for sprint capacity against product roadmaps that will always outrank a recommendation from a marketing supplier.** The result is an agency that diagnosed the problem correctly in month one, delivered a document, and is judged in month nine on results that were blocked in a backlog it never had access to. **The metric that exposes this is technical recommendations implemented within 90 days, which starts at 41% — meaning the majority of the highest-value work this agency produced was never executed at all.** Moving it to 78% is done through unglamorous means:

recommendations written as engineering tickets rather than as reports, sized and prioritised by effort against impact, taken into the client's own sprint planning, and — critically — a monthly report that names what was **NOT implemented**, because **an agency that quietly absorbs the blame for unshipped work is protecting the relationship at the cost of the outcome, and it will lose both at month nine.**

9. Search, Content & Data Compliance (India)

- **Search-engine guidelines function as commercial regulation** — link schemes, scaled content abuse and site-reputation abuse trigger manual actions, **and the penalty lands on the client's domain rather than the agency's.**
- **Content liability** — agency-produced articles in health, finance and legal carry ASCI and sector claim obligations, **and AI-drafted content risks confidently stated falsehoods published under the client's name and expertise.**
- **Editorial verification** as a formal control: fact-checking, source citation and named authorship on expert content.
- **Plagiarism and copyright** across text and imagery at production scale.
- **Disclosure** on sponsored or paid placements arising from digital PR.
- **DPDP obligations** where analytics, CRM and enquiry data are processed.
- **Client ownership** of content, analytics properties, search console access and the link profile, with documented handover.
- GST on services; project versus retainer revenue recognition.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / managing partner	1	1	2
Content writers & editors	12	17	25
SEO strategists & consultants	8	12	18
Technical SEO specialists	4	6	9
Digital PR & outreach	4	6	9
Analytics & reporting	3	4	6
Account management	3	5	8
Business development	2	3	4
Operations & admin	2	3	4
Total	39	57	85

Editors matter more than writers now, which is the organisational consequence of AI drafting: **the scarce input has moved from producing text to deciding whether the text is true, original and worth publishing under someone's name.**

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
-------	----------	-----------

Setup	Month 0-3	Team, tooling, editorial standards, expert contributor network
Launch	Month 3-12	20 clients; ₹1.68cr revenue, ₹11L loss (long ramp); frameworks published
Build	Year 2	Non-brand reporting 58%, early churn down to 5, tenure 17 months; ₹2.62cr, ₹14L profit
Scale	Year 3	42 clients; ₹4.02cr, ₹35L profit; tenure 23 months — the longest in the vertical

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. **Tenure and early-churn control are the dominant levers, because a client lost at month six consumed the entire cost of delivery and produced none of the value.**

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Working capital (salaries against a long delivery ramp)	16,00,000
Team recruitment & training	10,00,000
Content capability & expert contributor network	7,00,000
SEO tooling, crawlers, data & rank infrastructure	6,00,000
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000
Business development	2,00,000
Legal, compliance & registrations	1,00,000
Total project cost	45,00,000
Promoter contribution	26,00,000
Investor funding	9,00,000
Working-capital finance	10,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
SEO retainers (strategy, technical, ongoing)	68,00,000	1,04,00,000	1,58,00,000
Content production & editorial	46,00,000	74,00,000	1,16,00,000
Technical SEO audits & migrations	24,00,000	34,00,000	48,00,000
Digital PR & earned links	18,00,000	30,00,000	48,00,000
Analytics & search-visibility programmes	12,00,000	20,00,000	32,00,000
Bought links, PBNs or guaranteed-ranking packages	NIL	NIL	NIL
Total revenue	1,68,00,000	2,62,00,000	4,02,00,000
Salaries (SEO, content, editorial, technical, analytics, admin)	1,04,00,000	1,48,00,000	2,24,00,000

Content production & expert contributor costs	20,00,000	29,00,000	44,00,000
Unbilled scope creep & absorbed revisions	13,00,000	15,00,000	18,00,000
Technology, crawlers, data & tooling	12,00,000	16,00,000	23,00,000
Business development & marketing	11,00,000	15,00,000	22,00,000
Office, overheads & admin	10,00,000	14,00,000	20,00,000
Training & development	4,00,000	5,00,000	8,00,000
Depreciation, interest & other	5,00,000	6,00,000	8,00,000
Total expenses	1,79,00,000	2,48,00,000	3,67,00,000
Net profit / (loss) before tax	(11,00,000)	14,00,000	35,00,000
Net margin	(6.5%)	5.3%	8.7%
BOUGHT LINKS, PBNs OR PAID GUEST-POST NETWORKS	NIL	NIL	NIL
Clients given a written 90-day leading-indicator framework at onboarding	30%	64%	88%
Clients reported on non-brand organic revenue rather than rankings	26%	58%	82%
Brand-search traffic reported separately from non-brand	100%	100%	100%
Share of content targeting queries that survive an AI answer	38%	61%	79%
Articles containing original data, first-hand testing or named expert input	22%	48%	71%
COST PER PUBLISHED ARTICLE (₹)	4,200	3,300	2,800
COST PER ARTICLE THAT EARNS RANKINGS (₹)	18,000	22,000	26,000
Technical recommendations implemented by the client within 90 days	41%	62%	78%
CLIENTS LOST BEFORE MONTH NINE (before results could appear)	7	5	3
Average client tenure (months)	11	17	23
Billable utilisation / Scope creep absorbed	60% / 19%	68% / 12%	75% / 7%
Client concentration / Revenue per billable head (₹ lakh)	19% / 4.9	13% / 5.2	9% / 5.4
Active clients / Revenue per client per month (₹)	20 / 70,000	30 / 72,800	42 / 79,800

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **Early churn is the dominant economic variable, and it is worse here than anywhere else in the vertical:** a client lost at month six **consumed the full cost of the audit, the technical work and the content build, and produced none of the compounding value those inputs were purchased to create.** Cutting it from 7 to 3 clients a year is worth more than any pricing change.
- **Tenure of 23 months is the longest in the vertical** — against a performance agency's 16 and a social agency's 19 — **because SEO's output accumulates rather than resets, so year two costs less to deliver than year one for the same client.**
- **The two content cost lines move in opposite directions and must be read together** — falling cost per published piece is not a margin gain, because **the pieces that got cheaper are the pieces that stopped working.**

- **Technical work carries the highest value per hour** and the lowest delivery risk; content carries the volume; digital PR carries the least predictability.
- **Break-even: Year 2. The Year-1 loss of 6.5% is the deepest in the vertical and is structural, not a modelling pessimism: revenue ramps on a nine-month delivery cycle while the team is hired on day one.**

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	18,00,000	10,00,000	5,00,000	3,00,000
Collections	37,00,000	40,00,000	43,00,000	42,00,000
Salaries, content, technology, business development & overheads	45,00,000	45,00,000	45,00,000	44,00,000
Closing balance	10,00,000	5,00,000	3,00,000	1,00,000

The cash profile here is the tightest in the vertical and the reason is the plan's own thesis turned into a balance-sheet problem: the delivery cycle is nine months and the team is hired in month one. An SEO agency cannot phase its hiring to match revenue, because **the technical, editorial and strategy capability must exist before the first client can be onboarded at all** — and the retainer that funds it is small in the early months precisely because the client is not yet willing to commit fully to an outcome they cannot see. The mitigations are three. **Project work — audits and migrations — is deliberately weighted into the early revenue mix because it bills fast and proves competence in weeks rather than quarters. Retainers are billed in advance, standard in this category. And the working-capital facility is sized for the ramp rather than for receivables**, which is an unusual ask and needs to be explained to a lender in exactly those terms: **this is not a business waiting to be paid, it is a business waiting to be believed.**

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Delivery honesty: leading-indicator frameworks published;** non-brand reporting share; brand separation; **bought links (must be nil);** algorithm events logged.
- **Content quality: original-input share;** AI-answer-surviving query share; **cost per published piece against cost per ranking piece;** editorial rejection rate.
- **Execution: technical recommendations implemented within 90 days;** unimplemented items named in reporting; migration incident rate.
- **Retention: clients lost before month nine;** tenure; renewal; concentration; utilisation and scope absorbed.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹9 lakh investor funding plus ₹10 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹26 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, the working-capital need is unusual and must be understood correctly — it funds a delivery ramp, not a receivables gap,** and a lender assessing it as ordinary invoice-cycle finance will size it wrong. **Second, underwrite clients-lost-before-month-nine ahead of revenue,** because **an SEO agency with high early churn is charging clients for the expensive first half of a cycle and never delivering the second — a model that looks like a business and functions like a treadmill.** Third, ask what the link profile is built from. **An agency using paid links has placed a contingent liability on every client site it touches, and the liability is not on its own balance sheet — which is precisely why it does not appear in diligence unless someone asks.** Fourth, **this channel is under genuine structural pressure from AI answers,** and the correct question is not whether the agency has a view on it but **whether its content mix has actually changed — an agency still producing informational**

explainers at scale is billing for output whose audience has been intercepted upstream.

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Working capital (salaries against a long delivery ramp)	16,00,000	35.6%
Team recruitment & training	10,00,000	22.2%
Content capability & expert contributor network	7,00,000	15.6%
SEO tooling, crawlers, data & rank infrastructure	6,00,000	13.3%
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000	6.7%
Business development	2,00,000	4.4%
Legal, compliance & registrations	1,00,000	2.2%
Total	45,00,000	100%

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
The verdict arrives after the money	SEO results take six to twelve months, so the client pays for three quarters before they can judge anything — AND AN INDUSTRY IN WHICH THE VERDICT ARRIVES LONG AFTER THE MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT STRUCTURALLY ATTRACTS PEOPLE WHO DO NOT INTEND TO BE THERE WHEN IT ARRIVES , which is why the category carries its reputation. Answer is not trust but a written 30/60/90-day framework of what MUST move for the nine-month outcome to remain possible — none of them results, all of them falsifiable, AND A CLIENT HOLDING THEM CAN FIRE THE AGENCY AT MONTH FOUR ON EVIDENCE RATHER THAN SUSPICION (30% → 88%)
Rankings are near-meaningless as a reported metric	Results are personalised, localised, device-specific and fragmented across enormous query variation, so a rank report shows THE KEYWORDS THE AGENCY CHOSE TO TRACK — and there is always a set on which the agency is winning . Replaced by non-brand organic revenue (26%→82%), with brand search separated 100%, because a client's own brand queries rank first regardless of what any agency does and reporting them as SEO performance is CLAIMING CREDIT FOR THE CLIENT'S EXISTING REPUTATION — the identical error performance-ads-agency identified in paid
Zero-click and AI answers	AI overviews resolve a growing share of queries on the results page, so AN AGENCY CAN RANK FIRST AND DELIVER NOTHING — RANKING SUCCESS AND BUSINESS OUTCOME, PROXIES FOR ONE ANOTHER FOR TWENTY YEARS, HAVE COME APART . Effects are uneven and the unevenness IS the strategy: informational queries are absorbed almost completely (definitions, how-to, concept comparisons — the backbone of a decade of content marketing, now the LEAST valuable content an agency can produce) , while what survives requires a transaction, a product, a live price, a local business, an appointment, a vendor comparison or a named opinion (surviving-query share 38%→79%); diagnostic: rankings holding while clicks fall means the RESULTS PAGE changed, not the site — a fact the client will otherwise read as agency failure

AI repriced content from both directions	Drafting cost collapsed (₹4,200→₹2,800 per published piece) BUT every competitor's fell identically and the index is flooded, so THE MARGINAL GENERIC ARTICLE IS WORTH APPROXIMATELY NOTHING → the only defensible input is what a model cannot generate: original data, first-hand testing, named expert authorship, primary research — which is why COST PER ARTICLE THAT ACTUALLY EARNS RANKINGS ROSE ₹18,000→₹26,000. THE HONEST SUMMARY OF AI'S EFFECT IS NOT THAT CONTENT GOT CHEAPER: WORTHLESS CONTENT GOT CHEAPER AND VALUABLE CONTENT GOT MORE EXPENSIVE, AND THE GAP BETWEEN THEM IS NOW THE ENTIRE BUSINESS (original-input share 22%→71%; editors now matter more than writers)
Bought links	They work, at a known price, on a timeline a competitor can put in a proposal — what the proposal omits is WHERE THE RISK SITS: the manual action lands on the CLIENT'S domain; the agency that built the profile moves on, and the client is left with a website carrying a liability it did not know it had bought and a recovery project costing multiples of the links. NIL. Compensating argument the client can verify later: an earned link cannot be disavowed away from you, cannot be sold to your competitor next quarter, and does not have to be disclosed to an acquirer during diligence
Guaranteed rankings	The SEO equivalent of the ROAS guarantee and it fails identically — deliverable by selecting queries with almost no competition and almost no volume, so the client receives a report full of first-place rankings and no additional customers: A TECHNICALLY HONEST OUTCOME TO A FUNDAMENTALLY DISHONEST PROMISE. NIL; counter-offer is non-brand organic revenue within a stated horizon with the leading-indicator framework as interim accountability
The best work is the work it cannot implement	Technical fixes require the CLIENT'S engineering team, competing for sprint capacity against product roadmaps that will always outrank a marketing supplier's recommendation — so the agency diagnoses correctly in month one, delivers a document, and is judged in month nine on work blocked in a backlog it never had access to. AT 41% IMPLEMENTATION, THE MAJORITY OF THE HIGHEST-VALUE WORK PRODUCED WAS NEVER EXECUTED AT ALL. Fixed by writing recommendations as engineering tickets sized by effort against impact, taken into the client's own sprint planning, and a monthly report that NAMES WHAT WAS NOT IMPLEMENTED — because an agency quietly absorbing blame for unshipped work is protecting the relationship at the cost of the outcome, and will lose both at month nine (41%→78%)
Algorithm updates	A core update can halve traffic overnight through no fault of the agency, and the client cannot distinguish "an update happened" from "the agency failed" — the same epistemic problem social media faces with platform reach. Baselines documented, updates logged and dated, and PORTFOLIO-LEVEL REPORTING: WHEN FORTY CLIENTS MOVE TOGETHER IT WAS THE ALGORITHM; WHEN ONE MOVES IT WAS THE SITE — an inference no single-client team and no in-house SEO can make
Early churn & the cash ramp	A client lost at month six consumed the full cost of audit, technical work and content build and produced NONE of the compounding value those inputs were bought to create (7→3 lost before month nine). Cash is the tightest in the vertical because the delivery cycle is nine months and the team is hired in month one — technical, editorial and strategy capability must EXIST before the first client can be onboarded, while the early retainer is small precisely because the client will not yet commit to an outcome they cannot see → audits and migrations weighted early (bill fast, prove competence in weeks), retainers billed in advance, and a facility sized for the RAMP not the receivables: THIS IS NOT A BUSINESS WAITING TO BE PAID, IT IS A BUSINESS WAITING TO BE BELIEVED
Content liability & commoditisation	AI-drafted content risks confidently stated falsehoods published under the CLIENT'S name and expertise , with ASCI and sector claim obligations in health, finance and legal → fact-checking, source verification and named authorship as formal controls. Competition from AI content operations selling volume at prices no editorial team can match, and from consultants at a fraction of the overhead

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths Longest client tenure in the vertical (23 months) because output accumulates rather than resets; leading-indicator frameworks that make the long cycle accountable; non-brand outcome reporting; portfolio-level algorithm inference no in-house team can replicate; technical work with the highest value per hour.	Weaknesses Deepest Year-1 loss in the vertical, structurally — nine-month delivery against day-one hiring; the highest-value work depends on the client's engineers; digital PR is unpredictable; refusals on links and guarantees lose pitches; heavy editorial cost on content that works.
Opportunities Rising paid-media costs making organic attractive again; migrations and replatforming as urgent high-value project work; regional-language search; regulated categories where expertise and authorship carry weight; clients needing help deciding whether the channel still works at all.	Threats AI answers structurally reducing the clicks the whole channel exists to produce; core algorithm updates; AI content operations competing on volume and price; clients leaving before the delivery cycle completes; in-housing of technical SEO.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This SEO & content agency would use AiSevak's Marketing vertical tools in operations:

- **Accountability: 30/60/90-day leading-indicator framework builder,** baseline documentation, **algorithm-event log with portfolio-level comparison.**
- **Reporting: non-brand organic revenue reporting with brand separated,** CTR-at-constant-rank diagnostic, query-survival classification.
- **Editorial:** AI-assisted drafting with **mandatory expert-input flagging,** fact-check and source register, named-authorship tracking, **cost per published piece against cost per ranking piece.**
- **Execution: technical recommendations as ticketed items with 90-day implementation tracking and an unimplemented-items report.**
- **Retention: clients-lost-before-month-nine cohort tracking,** tenure, renewal, concentration, scope-creep capture.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- SEO & content agency: search strategy and retainers, editorial content production, technical audits and migrations, digital PR and earned links, and search-visibility analytics.
- **△ EVERY BUSINESS IN THIS VERTICAL HAS AN ATTRIBUTION PROBLEM; THIS ONE ADDS A TIME DIMENSION THAT CHANGES ITS CHARACTER ENTIRELY: SEO RESULTS TAKE SIX TO TWELVE MONTHS, SO THE CLIENT PAYS FOR THREE QUARTERS BEFORE THEY CAN JUDGE ANYTHING — AND AN INDUSTRY IN WHICH THE VERDICT ARRIVES LONG AFTER THE MONEY HAS BEEN SPENT IS AN INDUSTRY THAT STRUCTURALLY ATTRACTS PEOPLE WHO DO NOT INTEND TO BE THERE WHEN IT ARRIVES — that, rather than any technical dispute, is why SEO carries the reputation it does.** Honest response is not to ask for trust but to publish at onboarding **A WRITTEN 30/60/90-DAY FRAMEWORK OF WHAT MUST MOVE FOR THE NINE-MONTH OUTCOME TO REMAIN POSSIBLE** (crawl coverage, indexation, technical debt cleared, publishing cadence, early non-brand impression growth) — **NONE OF THEM RESULTS, ALL OF THEM FALSIFIABLE, AND A CLIENT HOLDING THEM CAN FIRE THE AGENCY AT MONTH FOUR ON EVIDENCE RATHER THAN ON SUSPICION** (30%→64%→88%). **THE METRIC THE INDUSTRY REPORTS IS CLOSE TO MEANINGLESS FOR A REASON PECULIAR TO SEARCH:**

RESULTS ARE PERSONALISED, LOCALISED, DEVICE-SPECIFIC AND FRAGMENTED ACROSS ENORMOUS QUERY VARIATION, SO A RANK-TRACKING REPORT SHOWS THE KEYWORDS THE AGENCY CHOSE TO TRACK — AND THERE IS ALWAYS A SET ON WHICH THE AGENCY IS WINNING → non-brand organic revenue replaces rankings (26%→82%), and **BRAND SEARCH IS SEPARATED 100%, BECAUSE A CLIENT'S OWN BRAND QUERIES WILL RANK FIRST REGARDLESS OF WHAT ANY AGENCY DOES AND REPORTING THEM AS SEO PERFORMANCE IS CLAIMING CREDIT FOR THE CLIENT'S EXISTING REPUTATION** — the identical error performance-ads-agency identified in paid channels.

- **SOMETHING GENUINELY NEW HAS HAPPENED AND A PLAN OMITTING IT DESCRIBES A BUSINESS THAT IS QUIETLY DISAPPEARING: AI OVERVIEWS AND ANSWER ENGINES RESOLVE A GROWING SHARE OF QUERIES ON THE RESULTS PAGE ITSELF, SO AN AGENCY CAN RANK FIRST AND DELIVER NOTHING — RANKING SUCCESS AND BUSINESS OUTCOME, WHICH HAVE BEEN PROXIES FOR ONE ANOTHER FOR TWENTY YEARS, HAVE COME APART.** The effects are uneven and **THE UNEVENNESS IS THE STRATEGY: INFORMATIONAL QUERIES ARE ABSORBED ALMOST COMPLETELY** (definitions, how-to explanations, concept comparisons, symptom descriptions — **THE BACKBONE OF A DECADE OF CONTENT MARKETING AND NOW THE LEAST VALUABLE CONTENT AN AGENCY CAN PRODUCE, BECAUSE THE ANSWER APPEARS ABOVE THE RESULT AND THE USER'S QUESTION IS RESOLVED BEFORE A CLICK EXISTS**), **WHILE WHAT SURVIVES IS EVERYTHING REQUIRING SOMETHING THE ANSWER CANNOT SUPPLY: A TRANSACTION, A SPECIFIC PRODUCT, A LIVE PRICE, A LOCAL BUSINESS, AN APPOINTMENT, A LOGIN, A COMPARISON OF ACTUAL VENDORS, OR AN OPINION ATTACHED TO A NAMED PERSON THE READER WANTS TO HEAR FROM** → content mix shifts (surviving-query share 38%→61%→79%: fewer explainers, more commercial-investigation and transactional pages, **more content that IS the destination rather than a summary of one**), plus the diagnostic every client should see — **WHEN RANKINGS HOLD STEADY WHILE CLICKS FALL, NOTHING HAS GONE WRONG WITH THE SITE: THE RESULTS PAGE CHANGED UNDERNEATH IT, A FACT THE CLIENT WILL OTHERWISE INTERPRET AS AGENCY FAILURE.**
- **AI HAS SIMULTANEOUSLY REPRICED THE CONTENT HALF OF THE BUSINESS FROM BOTH DIRECTIONS AND THE TWO EFFECTS POINT OPPOSITE WAYS: DRAFTING COST HAS COLLAPSED (COST PER PUBLISHED ARTICLE ₹4,200→₹3,300→₹2,800), BUT EVERY COMPETITOR'S COST FELL IDENTICALLY AND THE INDEX IS NOW FLOODED, SO THE MARGINAL GENERIC ARTICLE IS WORTH APPROXIMATELY NOTHING — WHAT REMAINS DEFENSIBLE IS PRECISELY WHAT A LANGUAGE MODEL CANNOT GENERATE: ORIGINAL DATA, FIRST-HAND TESTING, NAMED EXPERT AUTHORSHIP, PRIMARY RESEARCH, WHICH IS WHY COST PER ARTICLE THAT ACTUALLY EARNS RANKINGS RISES ₹18,000→₹22,000→₹26,000. THE HONEST SUMMARY OF AI'S EFFECT ON THIS BUSINESS IS NOT THAT CONTENT GOT CHEAPER: WORTHLESS CONTENT GOT CHEAPER AND VALUABLE CONTENT GOT MORE EXPENSIVE, AND THE GAP BETWEEN THEM IS NOW THE ENTIRE BUSINESS** (original-input share 22%→48%→71%). Organisational consequence: **EDITORS MATTER MORE THAN WRITERS NOW — THE SCARCE INPUT HAS MOVED FROM PRODUCING TEXT TO DECIDING WHETHER THE TEXT IS TRUE, ORIGINAL AND WORTH PUBLISHING UNDER SOMEONE'S NAME.**
- **THE LINK REFUSAL IS ACTUARIAL, NOT ETHICAL: BOUGHT LINKS, PBNs AND PAID GUEST-POST PLACEMENTS WORK — FOR A WHILE, AT A KNOWN PRICE, WITH A TIMELINE A COMPETITOR CAN PUT IN A PROPOSAL — AND WHAT THE PROPOSAL DOES NOT SAY IS WHERE THE RISK SITS WHEN IT STOPS WORKING: THE MANUAL ACTION OR ALGORITHMIC SUPPRESSION LANDS ON THE CLIENT'S DOMAIN. THE AGENCY THAT BUILT THE PROFILE MOVES ON TO ITS NEXT ACCOUNT; THE CLIENT IS LEFT WITH A WEBSITE CARRYING A LIABILITY IT DID NOT KNOW IT HAD BOUGHT, AND A RECOVERY PROJECT COSTING MULTIPLES OF WHAT THE LINKS COST → PAID LINKS: NIL, at real commercial cost (earned coverage is slower, more expensive per placement, impossible to guarantee), with the argument a client can verify later: AN EARNED LINK CANNOT BE DISAVOWED AWAY FROM YOU, CANNOT BE SOLD TO YOUR COMPETITOR NEXT QUARTER, AND DOES NOT HAVE TO BE DISCLOSED TO AN ACQUIRER DURING DILIGENCE.** Second refusal: **GUARANTEED RANKINGS — THE SEO EQUIVALENT OF THE ROAS GUARANTEE, FAILING IDENTICALLY BECAUSE ANY AGENCY CAN**

GUARANTEE FIRST POSITION BY SELECTING QUERIES WITH ALMOST NO COMPETITION AND ALMOST NO SEARCH VOLUME, SO THE CLIENT RECEIVES A REPORT FULL OF FIRST-PLACE RANKINGS AND NO ADDITIONAL CUSTOMERS: A TECHNICALLY HONEST OUTCOME TO A FUNDAMENTALLY DISHONEST PROMISE
→ NIL.

- **THE MOST UNDER-DISCUSSED OPERATIONAL FAILURE IS THAT THE AGENCY'S MOST VALUABLE RECOMMENDATIONS ARE THE ONES IT CANNOT IMPLEMENT: TECHNICAL FIXES (rendering, crawl budget, architecture, page performance, canonical logic) REQUIRE THE CLIENT'S OWN ENGINEERING TEAM, COMPETING FOR SPRINT CAPACITY AGAINST PRODUCT ROADMAPS THAT WILL ALWAYS OUTRANK A RECOMMENDATION FROM A MARKETING SUPPLIER — SO THE AGENCY DIAGNOSED CORRECTLY IN MONTH ONE, DELIVERED A DOCUMENT, AND IS JUDGED IN MONTH NINE ON RESULTS BLOCKED IN A BACKLOG IT NEVER HAD ACCESS TO; AT 41% IMPLEMENTATION THE MAJORITY OF THE HIGHEST-VALUE WORK THIS AGENCY PRODUCED WAS NEVER EXECUTED AT ALL** → fixed by unglamorous means (**recommendations written as ENGINEERING TICKETS** rather than reports, sized and prioritised by effort against impact, taken into the client's OWN sprint planning, and — critically — **A MONTHLY REPORT THAT NAMES WHAT WAS NOT IMPLEMENTED, BECAUSE AN AGENCY THAT QUIETLY ABSORBS THE BLAME FOR UNSHIPPED WORK IS PROTECTING THE RELATIONSHIP AT THE COST OF THE OUTCOME, AND IT WILL LOSE BOTH AT MONTH NINE** 41%→62%→78%). On algorithm updates: a core update can halve traffic overnight through no fault of the agency and **THE CLIENT CANNOT DISTINGUISH "AN UPDATE HAPPENED" FROM "THE AGENCY FAILED"** (social's platform-reach epistemics again) → baselines, dated update logs, and **PORTFOLIO-LEVEL REPORTING: WHEN FORTY CLIENTS MOVE TOGETHER IT WAS THE ALGORITHM; WHEN ONE MOVES IT WAS THE SITE — AN INFERENCE NO SINGLE-CLIENT TEAM AND NO IN-HOUSE SEO CAN MAKE.**
- **Economics — EARLY CHURN IS THE DOMINANT VARIABLE AND WORSE HERE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE VERTICAL: A CLIENT LOST AT MONTH SIX CONSUMED THE FULL COST OF THE AUDIT, THE TECHNICAL WORK AND THE CONTENT BUILD, AND PRODUCED NONE OF THE COMPOUNDING VALUE THOSE INPUTS WERE PURCHASED TO CREATE** (lost before month nine 7→5→3; **AN SEO AGENCY LOSING A THIRD OF ITS CLIENTS BEFORE THE DELIVERY CYCLE COMPLETES IS NOT RUNNING AN AGENCY, IT IS RUNNING A SUBSCRIPTION TO HOPE, AND EVERY ACCOUNT IT LOSES EARLY TAKES THE EVIDENCE OF ITS OWN COMPETENCE WITH IT; TENURE OF 23 MONTHS IS THE LONGEST IN THE VERTICAL (vs performance-ads 16, social 19) BECAUSE SEO'S OUTPUT ACCUMULATES RATHER THAN RESETS, SO YEAR TWO COSTS LESS TO DELIVER THAN YEAR ONE FOR THE SAME CLIENT — AND IT IS THE ONLY MARKETING SERVICE IN THIS VERTICAL WHOSE OUTPUT KEEPS WORKING AFTER THE INVOICE STOPS, THE EXACT INVERSE OF PAID MEDIA WHERE SPEND STOPS AND TRAFFIC STOPS THE SAME DAY; THE TWO CONTENT COST LINES MUST BE READ TOGETHER — FALLING COST PER PUBLISHED PIECE IS NOT A MARGIN GAIN, BECAUSE THE PIECES THAT GOT CHEAPER ARE THE PIECES THAT STOPPED WORKING.** Cash is the tightest in the vertical, the plan's own thesis turned into a balance-sheet problem: **THE DELIVERY CYCLE IS NINE MONTHS AND THE TEAM IS HIRED IN MONTH ONE — technical, editorial and strategy capability MUST EXIST BEFORE THE FIRST CLIENT CAN BE ONBOARDED AT ALL, while the early retainer is small PRECISELY BECAUSE THE CLIENT IS NOT YET WILLING TO COMMIT TO AN OUTCOME THEY CANNOT SEE** → audits/migrations weighted early (bill fast, prove competence in weeks not quarters), retainers billed in advance, and a **facility SIZED FOR THE RAMP RATHER THAN FOR RECEIVABLES — an unusual ask that must be explained to a lender in exactly those terms: THIS IS NOT A BUSINESS WAITING TO BE PAID, IT IS A BUSINESS WAITING TO BE BELIEVED; Y1 loss of 6.5% is the deepest in the vertical and is STRUCTURAL, not modelling pessimism.** Regulatory: **search-engine guidelines are not law but function as COMMERCIAL REGULATION, and the penalty lands on the CLIENT'S domain;** content liability in health/finance/legal where **AI-DRAFTED CONTENT RISKS CONFIDENTLY STATED FALSEHOODS PUBLISHED UNDER THE CLIENT'S NAME AND EXPERTISE** → fact-checking, source verification and named authorship as formal controls; plagiarism/copyright at production scale; disclosure on sponsored digital-PR placements; DPDP on

analytics/CRM data; client ownership of content, analytics, search console and **the link profile itself**. Lender note: **THE WORKING-CAPITAL NEED FUNDS A DELIVERY RAMP, NOT A RECEIVABLES GAP — A LENDER ASSESSING IT AS ORDINARY INVOICE-CYCLE FINANCE WILL SIZE IT WRONG; UNDERWRITE CLIENTS-LOST-BEFORE-MONTH-NINE AHEAD OF REVENUE, BECAUSE AN SEO AGENCY WITH HIGH EARLY CHURN IS CHARGING CLIENTS FOR THE EXPENSIVE FIRST HALF OF A CYCLE AND NEVER DELIVERING THE SECOND — A MODEL THAT LOOKS LIKE A BUSINESS AND FUNCTIONS LIKE A TREADMILL; ASK WHAT THE LINK PROFILE IS BUILT FROM, BECAUSE AN AGENCY USING PAID LINKS HAS PLACED A CONTINGENT LIABILITY ON EVERY CLIENT SITE IT TOUCHES AND THE LIABILITY IS NOT ON ITS OWN BALANCE SHEET — WHICH IS PRECISELY WHY IT DOES NOT APPEAR IN DILIGENCE UNLESS SOMEONE ASKS**; and on AI pressure, **THE CORRECT QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER THE AGENCY HAS A VIEW BUT WHETHER ITS CONTENT MIX HAS ACTUALLY CHANGED — AN AGENCY STILL PRODUCING INFORMATIONAL EXPLAINERS AT SCALE IS BILLING FOR OUTPUT WHOSE AUDIENCE HAS BEEN INTERCEPTED UPSTREAM**. ₹45L, 20→42 clients, 39→85 staff, rev 1.68→4.02cr, Y1 →₹11L → Y3 ₹35L. Figures illustrative, exclude GST.

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

Every tool referenced in this plan is available on aisevak.in. Open the [Agencies & Marketing-Services Firms toolkit](#) to browse and use them all at <https://aisevak.in/verticals/marketing> — or go straight to any specific tool at <https://aisevak.in/service/<tool-name>>. No signup needed to explore; each tool guides you step by step.

Prepared by AiSevak.in — a product of ABL Digital Technologies. AI-powered business services for India. This is AI-assisted guidance; figures are illustrative and not a guarantee of results. Verify all numbers, licences and regulatory requirements with a qualified professional before relying on this plan for binding decisions. © 2026 ABL Digital Technologies Private Limited.