



BUSINESS PLAN · INDIA

Web Design & Development Agency

A website is machinery, not a picture

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 a **Web Design & Development Agency** in India — website design and build, platform and e-commerce integration, maintenance and security retainers, conversion optimisation and performance engineering, and accessibility audit and remediation.

Six plans in this vertical have now argued about outcomes that cannot be measured, can be gamed, or can simply be purchased. This one inverts the convention entirely, because its deliverable is a working system rather than a message. A website loads or it does not. It converts or it does not. It is accessible or it is not. It is secure or it is not. **This is the first business in the marketing vertical that CAN be held to an objective standard — and the industry's central failure is that it mostly is not, because clients evaluate websites the way they evaluate logos rather than the way they evaluate machinery. The client's aesthetic opinion is the least important measurable fact about a website, and it is the one that dominates every review meeting.**

The correction is straightforward and almost nobody does it: put the testable things in the contract. Performance thresholds, accessibility conformance, conversion baselines and security standards written as acceptance criteria — **rising from 26% to 84% of projects** — which converts a subjective sign-off into an objective one and, incidentally, protects the agency far more than the client. **An agency with contractual performance criteria has an answer to "I don't like it"; an agency without them has only an opinion, and the client's opinion outranks it.**

The second structural problem is that this industry sells websites as projects when they are in fact assets requiring continuous maintenance. A site delivered and walked away from is **insecure within a year and obsolete within three** — and the security point deserves stating bluntly, because clients genuinely do not understand it: **an unmaintained content-managed website is not a static object sitting harmlessly on a server. It is an unpatched application with a login page, publicly addressable, running third-party plugins whose vulnerabilities are catalogued in public.** This plan moves **projects converting to a maintenance and security retainer from 22% to 68%**, and treats the recurring line as the more valuable half of the relationship rather than an afterthought.

Two further realities shape what this agency should sell. AI site builders and template platforms have eliminated the bottom of this market outright — a competent brochure site is now effectively free, so an agency competing on "we build beautiful websites" is competing with something that costs nothing. What survives is what a template cannot know: **your inventory system, your payment flow, your CRM, your regulatory constraints, your actual customers' behaviour.** A template knows what a website looks like; it does not know what your business does. Brochure builds fall from 42% to 30% of revenue accordingly. **And fixed-price web projects overwhelmingly fail on content rather than on code — the agency finishes the build in eight weeks and then waits four months for the client to write the copy, with a team allocated and idle.** Average project overrun falls from **11 weeks to 4**, and unbilled overrun from **11.0% to 4.7% of revenue.**

This plan models an agency requiring **₹40 lakh** (₹22 lakh promoter + ₹8 lakh investor + ₹10 lakh working-capital finance), moving from **₹1.46 crore revenue and a ₹5 lakh loss** in Year 1 to **₹3.58 crore revenue and ₹29 lakh profit** by Year 3. *(Project-plus-retainer technical services business — figures illustrative.)*

2. Business Description, Vision & Legal Structure

Concept: A web agency that contracts on measurable outcomes, builds on platforms the client owns, ships accessible and fast by default, and stays for the maintenance because that is where the value and the risk both live.

Vision: To be the agency whose work can be tested rather than admired.

Mission: Write performance, accessibility and security into the contract; put content on the critical path where it belongs; never build on a platform only we can maintain; hand over every credential; and tell a client when a staged improvement beats the redesign they asked for.

Legal structure options

- **Private Limited** — recommended: IP assignment, security and uptime obligations, enterprise contracting.
- **LLP** — workable for a small partner-led studio.
- **Proprietorship** — common at entry scale; weak for maintenance liability and enterprise work.

Regulatory anchor: lighter than the regulated verticals but with two obligations this industry routinely ships past. **Accessibility is a legal question, not a design preference** — the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 obliges service providers to make information and services accessible, and government-facing work sits under GIGW standards; **an agency that ships an inaccessible site has built a barrier for a client who is legally required not to build one, and the client generally does not know, because the agency did not mention it.** Second, **the DPDP Act makes a website a data-collection system rather than a brochure:** forms, analytics, cookies, session tools and embedded pixels all collect personal data, **the agency builds the collection mechanism, the client carries the obligation, and Indian consent banners are largely decorative — they announce rather than obtain consent.** Alongside these: IP assignment on code and design; open-source licence compliance in dependencies; PCI-DSS scope where payments are handled; platform and hosting terms; and CERT-In incident-reporting obligations on security events.

3. Promoter & Ownership

Led by a promoter with engineering, product or technical-design background. Three competences decide outcomes: *technical judgment*, since platform choices made in week two determine maintenance cost for five years; *project discipline*, because overrun is the only meaningful margin variable; and *the willingness to make the client accountable for content*, which is the single most avoided conversation in this business. Ownership, equity & investor terms are editable inputs.

4. Market Analysis — India

Demand is universal at the low end and increasingly technical at the high end. The market has hollowed out in the middle: templates and AI builders have absorbed simple work, while integration, commerce and performance work has grown more demanding.

Demand drivers

- **D2C and e-commerce**, where the website is the business rather than a description of it.
- **Platform migrations and replatforming**, high-value and urgent.
- **Integration work** — ERP, CRM, payments, logistics, inventory — which templates cannot touch.
- **Performance and conversion engineering**, as paid traffic costs make wasted clicks expensive.
- **Accessibility and data-protection remediation**, an emerging and currently under-served demand.

Market sizing (illustrative framing)

Layer	Definition	Indicative scale
TAM	Indian web design, development & maintenance	Very large; hollowing at the bottom

SAM	Projects and retainers at ticket sizes served	Complexity- and value-bounded
SOM (Yr 1-3)	Projects × value + retained maintenance base	42 → 96 projects a year

Performance is the one place in this entire vertical where a defensible causal chain exists between what an agency does and what a client earns, and it is remarkable how rarely it is sold that way. Page load time affects conversion; the relationship is measurable on the client's own site, on the client's own traffic, with a before-and-after that does not require trusting the agency's attribution model. **Every preceding plan in this vertical has struggled with the question "did the work cause the result"; here you can turn the improvement off and watch the number move.** The commercial implication is that performance engineering should be positioned as a revenue intervention rather than a technical hygiene task — **a two-second improvement on a site doing ₹40 lakh a month is a business case, not a bug fix** — and it is the strongest argument this agency has for charging properly. **Core Web Vitals passing on delivery rises from 38% to 89%**, and the reason it is not already universal in this industry is that **speed is invisible in a design review: the client sees the site on office wi-fi on a new laptop, and the customer sees it on a four-year-old phone on mobile data in a lift.**

Target segments

- **D2C and e-commerce brands** needing commerce platforms that actually integrate.
- **Funded startups** requiring product-adjacent marketing sites at pace.
- **Mid-market businesses** with legacy sites carrying real security exposure.
- **Regulated and institutional clients** where accessibility and data obligations are enforceable.
- **Existing sites** — conversion, performance and accessibility work with no rebuild required.

5. Competition & Competitive Advantage

Landscape: freelancers and small shops, large digital agencies, offshore development firms, product studios moving into services, and **template platforms and AI site builders that have removed the entire bottom tier of demand.** The floor is no longer low — **it is zero.**

The business's edge

- **Contractual acceptance criteria** on performance, accessibility, security and conversion.
- **Integration depth**, which is the only thing templates structurally cannot deliver.
- **Accessibility as standard**, not as a paid extra nobody buys.
- **Maintenance retainers** that treat the site as an operating asset.
- **No proprietary lock-in** — every credential handed over, every platform portable.

Building a client's site on a content system only the agency can maintain is this industry's quiet form of hostage-taking, and it is usually presented as a benefit. The pitch is familiar — our own platform, purpose-built, no plugin bloat, fully supported. **The consequence is that the client cannot change agency without rebuilding from scratch, cannot get a second quote that means anything, and cannot value the asset they believe they own.** An agency that builds on a CMS only it can maintain has not sold a website; it has sold a subscription with a website attached — and it has done so to a client who thinks they made a purchase. This plan holds **proprietary agency-only CMS builds at NIL** and hands over **hosting, domain, repository and CMS administrator credentials on 100% of projects at handover, whether or not the client asks.** The commercial argument for doing so is stronger than the ethical one and is worth stating to clients directly: **an agency that keeps clients by holding their credentials has stopped competing on quality, and it will find out what that did to its work only when a client finally leaves**

anyway.

6. Services, Pricing & the Content Problem

Line	Model	Basis
Website design & build projects	Fixed fee by scope	42% → 30% of revenue
Integration, platform & e-commerce development	Fixed fee / time & materials	What templates cannot do
Maintenance, security & hosting management	Monthly retainer	13.7% → 21.2%
Conversion & performance engineering	Retained / per programme	The measurable line
Accessibility audit & remediation	Per engagement	Legal obligation, under-served
Proprietary agency-only CMS builds	NIL — by policy	No lock-in, ever
Credentials withheld at handover	NIL — by policy	100% handed over

Fixed-price web projects do not fail on code. They fail on content, and the failure is so consistent that treating it as a surprise is a planning error rather than bad luck. The agency designs, builds, tests and reaches the point where the site needs the client's actual words, product descriptions, photographs, legal pages and pricing. **Then everything stops — for six weeks, three months, sometimes longer — because writing forty pages of copy is a substantial job that the client's marketing manager was never given time for and never budgeted for.** The agency is now in the worst possible position: **the team is allocated and idle, the project cannot be invoiced because it is not complete, and none of it is the agency's fault in a way that can be usefully argued.** The controls are three and all of them belong in the proposal rather than the recovery conversation. **Content is placed on the critical path with named owners and dates, exactly like any other dependency. A deemed-approval and placeholder-launch clause allows the site to go live with agreed placeholder content if the client's material is late — which sounds harsh and is in fact the kindest available outcome, since a live site with three imperfect pages earns more than a perfect site that has not launched.** And **content production is offered as a priced service, because the honest reading of a four-month content delay is that the client needed help and had no way to ask for it.**

7. Go-to-Market — Selling Machinery, Not Pictures

Acquisition

- **Paid technical audits** — performance, accessibility, security and data — which produce findings clients cannot dispute.
- **Migration and replatforming work**, urgent and high-value.
- **Integration specialisation** in specific platforms and commerce stacks.
- **Referral** — 69% of new work by Year 3, because verifiable work travels.

Retention

- **Maintenance retainers**, which convert a project into an ongoing relationship.
- **Continuous improvement** rather than periodic rebuilds.
- **Security responsibility**, the thing clients least want to own themselves.
- **Measurable performance gains**, which renew themselves.

Sales approach

Audit → acceptance criteria in the contract → content on the critical path → build on portable platforms → accessible and fast by default → maintenance retainer at handover. **The most valuable and least expected recommendation this agency makes is that a client should not have the redesign they came in asking for.** A full rebuild discards accumulated search authority, established user habits and years of incremental conversion tuning, **and the traffic drop that follows a badly executed replatform is real, common and frequently permanent.** A redesign is a rebrand with a traffic loss attached — the same argument the branding plan made about unnecessary rebrands, arriving in a domain where the damage is actually measurable. This plan tracks **staged improvement recommended instead of the requested full redesign, rising from 4 to 14 engagements**, and accepts the obvious cost: **a staged programme bills less in year one than a rebuild does, and it is the reason the client is still there in year three.**

8. Operations Plan (audit, contract, build, test, maintain)

- **Discovery & audit:** current performance, accessibility, security posture, analytics and data collection.
- **Contracting:** performance, accessibility, security and conversion acceptance criteria written in, with content dates and owners named.
- **Platform selection:** portable, standard, maintainable by anyone competent — never agency-proprietary.
- **Build:** component-based, version-controlled, with the client's repository access from day one.
- **Testing:** performance budgets, WCAG conformance checks, cross-device and real-network testing — not office wi-fi on a new laptop.
- **Data:** documented data inventory, consent mechanism that actually obtains consent, and third-party script register.
- **Handover:** all credentials, documentation and training — 100%, unprompted.
- **Maintenance:** patching, dependency updates, backups, monitoring, uptime and incident response.

Project control points

Stage	Activity	Control point
Contract	Testable acceptance criteria written in	26% → 84% of projects
Plan	Content on the critical path, named owners	Content on time 19% → 58%
Build	Portable platform, client repo access	Proprietary CMS NIL
Test	Performance budgets & WCAG conformance	CWV 38% → 89%; WCAG AA 12% → 76%
Hand over	All credentials and documentation	100%, unprompted
Maintain	Patching, backups, monitoring, response	Retainer conversion 22% → 68%

Accessibility is the clearest example in this vertical of a legal obligation that the market has silently agreed to treat as optional, and the economics of fixing it are the opposite of what most agencies assume. Built in from the start — semantic markup, keyboard navigation, sufficient contrast, labelled form fields, alternative text, sensible heading structure — **accessibility costs very little, because it is mostly a matter of doing standard things correctly rather than doing additional things.** Retrofitted onto a finished site, it is expensive and partial. **So the agency that ships inaccessible sites is not saving its clients money; it is deferring a cost and increasing it.** Two further points make this commercially rather than morally persuasive, which matters because moral arguments do not survive procurement. **An accessible site is measurably better for everyone — cleaner semantics improve search performance, keyboard**

and contrast work improves mobile and outdoor usability, and clear structure helps every user in a hurry. And India has a very large population of users with disabilities whom an inaccessible site simply excludes from transacting, which is a revenue question before it is a compliance one. WCAG AA on delivery moves from 12% to 76% — deliberately not 100%, because some legacy integrations and third-party embeds cannot be brought into conformance by the agency that did not write them, and claiming otherwise would be the kind of unfalsifiable promise this vertical is full of.

9. Accessibility, Data & Security Compliance (India)

- **RPwD Act 2016 accessibility obligations** on services and information, with GIGW standards for government-facing work — **an agency shipping an inaccessible site has built a barrier for a client legally required not to.**
- **DPDP Act obligations** — **a website is a data-collection system: forms, analytics, cookies, session tools and pixels; the agency builds the mechanism and the client carries the duty.**
- **Consent that actually obtains consent** — **most Indian cookie banners announce rather than ask, which is not the same thing.**
- **Third-party script register**, since embedded tags collect data the client never authorised and cannot see.
- **CERT-In incident reporting** obligations on security events, with defined responsibility in the maintenance contract.
- **PCI-DSS scope** where payment data is handled, and scope reduction where it can be avoided entirely.
- **IP assignment and open-source licence compliance** across all dependencies shipped to the client.
- GST on services; project milestone versus retainer revenue recognition.

10. Organisation & Manpower Plan

Role	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3
Promoter / technical director	1	1	2
Front-end & full-stack engineers	11	17	26
Designers (UI / UX)	7	10	15
Backend & integration engineers	4	7	11
QA, performance & accessibility testing	3	5	8
Project management	3	5	8
Maintenance & support	2	4	7
Business development	1	2	3
Operations & admin	2	3	4
Total	34	54	84

Engineers outnumber designers roughly two to one, which is the honest description of a business whose remaining value is integration and performance rather than appearance — **the appearance layer is the part that got automated.**

11. Implementation Timeline & Milestones

Phase	Timeline	Milestone
Setup	Month 0-3	Team, tooling, testing stack, contract templates with acceptance criteria
Launch	Month 3-12	42 projects; ₹1.46cr revenue, ₹5L loss; overrun baselined at 11 weeks
Build	Year 2	Criteria in 58% of contracts, overrun 6 weeks, retainer conversion 44%; ₹2.34cr, ₹9L profit
Scale	Year 3	96 projects; ₹3.58cr, ₹29L profit; overrun 4 weeks, maintenance 21% of revenue

12. Financial Plan (Illustrative)

All figures are illustrative model assumptions for an Indian context, shown so the promoter can replace them with live rates. **Project overrun and retainer conversion are the two levers; everything else is secondary to them.**

12.1 Project cost & means of finance

Capital requirement	₹
Working capital (salaries against project milestones)	15,00,000
Team recruitment & senior engineering hires	10,00,000
Workstations, devices & real-device testing hardware	5,00,000
Software, tooling, testing & monitoring stack	4,00,000
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000
Business development	2,00,000
Legal, compliance & registrations	1,00,000
Total project cost	40,00,000
Promoter contribution	22,00,000
Investor funding	8,00,000
Working-capital finance	10,00,000

12.2 Projected Profit & Loss (3 years)

Particulars	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Website design & build projects	62,00,000	84,00,000	1,08,00,000
Integration, platform & e-commerce development	38,00,000	66,00,000	1,04,00,000
Maintenance, security & hosting management	20,00,000	40,00,000	76,00,000
Conversion & performance engineering	16,00,000	28,00,000	44,00,000
Accessibility audit & remediation	10,00,000	16,00,000	26,00,000
Proprietary agency-only CMS builds	NIL	NIL	NIL

Total revenue	1,46,00,000	2,34,00,000	3,58,00,000
Salaries (design, engineering, QA, project management, admin)	92,00,000	1,44,00,000	2,14,00,000
Unbilled scope creep & project overrun	16,00,000	17,00,000	17,00,000
Business development & marketing	11,00,000	16,00,000	24,00,000
Software, tooling, hosting & monitoring	10,00,000	14,00,000	21,00,000
Office, overheads & admin	9,00,000	14,00,000	21,00,000
Freelance & specialist contracting	6,00,000	11,00,000	17,00,000
Training & development	3,00,000	4,00,000	7,00,000
Depreciation, interest & other	4,00,000	5,00,000	8,00,000
Total expenses	1,51,00,000	2,25,00,000	3,29,00,000
Net profit / (loss) before tax	(5,00,000)	9,00,000	29,00,000
Net margin	(3.4%)	3.8%	8.1%
Projects with performance, accessibility & conversion criteria in the contract	26%	58%	84%
CORE WEB VITALS PASSING ON DELIVERY	38%	67%	89%
SITES MEETING WCAG AA ON DELIVERY	12%	48%	76%
Sites delivered with a documented data inventory & working consent mechanism	24%	56%	82%
Sites built on a proprietary agency-only CMS	NIL	NIL	NIL
Clients holding all hosting, domain, repository & CMS credentials at handover	100%	100%	100%
PROJECTS CONVERTING TO A MAINTENANCE & SECURITY RETAINER	22%	44%	68%
Maintenance as share of revenue / Brochure builds as share of revenue	13.7% / 42%	17.1% / 36%	21.2% / 30%
Projects where client content was delivered on the contracted date	19%	38%	58%
AVERAGE PROJECT OVERRUN (WEEKS)	11	6	4
Unbilled scope & overrun as % of revenue	11.0%	7.3%	4.7%
Staged improvement recommended instead of the full redesign requested	4	9	14
Billable utilisation / Repeat & referral share	58% / 41%	67% / 56%	75% / 69%
Projects delivered / Client concentration	42 / 22%	66 / 15%	96 / 11%

12.3 Unit economics & break-even

- **Overrun is the margin, exactly as revisions were for the branding studio:** unbilled overrun holds at ₹16-17 lakh while revenue grows 2.45x, **falling from 11.0% to 4.7% of revenue. That 6.3-point swing is not a contributor to the Year-3 margin — it is smaller than the margin only because the margin exists at all because of it.**

- **Retainer conversion is the second lever and the more durable one:** maintenance revenue is predictable, high-margin and **does not have to be sold again every quarter, which is the structural weakness of every project business.**
- **Brochure builds fall from 42% to 30% of revenue deliberately — that line is under permanent price attack from things that cost nothing, and defending it is defending the wrong ground.**
- **Performance and accessibility work carry the best margin per hour,** because they are specified against objective standards and therefore do not generate aesthetic revision cycles.
- **Break-even:** Year 2, at 8.1% by Year 3 — **lower than the branding studio because engineering salaries are higher and the delivery risk is real rather than subjective.**

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

Particulars (₹)	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Opening balance	16,00,000	9,00,000	5,00,000	3,00,000
Collections	31,00,000	34,00,000	36,00,000	37,00,000
Salaries, freelance, tooling, business development & overheads	38,00,000	38,00,000	38,00,000	37,00,000
Closing balance	9,00,000	5,00,000	3,00,000	3,00,000

The cash trap in a web agency is milestone billing tied to launch, and it converts the content problem directly into an overdraft. A typical structure bills 40% on commencement, 30% at design approval and 30% on launch — **which means nearly a third of the project value is held hostage by a go-live date the client controls and routinely delays.** The team has done the work; the invoice cannot be raised; the credit period has not started; **and an agency with five projects awaiting content has, in cash terms, five completed jobs it is not allowed to bill for.** Three fixes, all contractual rather than collectible: **the final milestone is tied to DELIVERY FOR LAUNCH rather than to launch itself**, so the agency bills when it has finished; **a deemed-complete clause after a stated waiting period;** and **maintenance retainers billed monthly in advance**, which are the only genuinely predictable cash in this business and the strongest reason to build the recurring base early rather than treat it as a bonus at the end of a project.

12.5 Key Performance Indicators to Monitor

- **Delivery quality:** Core Web Vitals and WCAG conformance on delivery; acceptance criteria coverage; defect escape rate; security incidents.
- **Project health:** average overrun in weeks; content-on-time rate; unbilled overrun as % of revenue; utilisation.
- **Recurring base:** retainer conversion rate; maintenance share of revenue; retainer churn; uptime and response-time compliance.
- **Integrity:** proprietary-CMS builds (nil); credential handover (100%); staged-improvement recommendations ; data inventory and consent coverage.

13. Funding Requirement & Bankability

Total ask: **₹8 lakh investor funding plus ₹10 lakh working-capital finance** against ₹22 lakh promoter contribution. Four points. **First, this is the most objectively assessable business in the vertical and a lender should exploit that — unlike a brand studio or a PR firm, this agency's output can be tested directly: load a client site, run the performance and accessibility checks, and the quality of the work is visible in ninety seconds without asking anybody's opinion.** **Second, underwrite project overrun rather than revenue. An agency running eleven**

weeks late on average is delivering roughly a quarter less capacity than it is paying for, and the loss sits in salaries where no cost line names it. Third, the maintenance base is the quality-of-earnings signal — a pure project agency starts every year at zero and must resell its entire revenue, while a retained base of ₹76 lakh is the difference between a business and a sequence of jobs. Fourth, ask what happens if the agency is fired: if the client cannot take the site elsewhere, the revenue is being held in place by lock-in rather than by satisfaction, and that is a quality-of-revenue problem disguised as customer loyalty.

13.1 Funding utilisation

Use of funds	₹	% of total
Working capital (salaries against project milestones)	15,00,000	37.5%
Team recruitment & senior engineering hires	10,00,000	25.0%
Workstations, devices & real-device testing hardware	5,00,000	12.5%
Software, tooling, testing & monitoring stack	4,00,000	10.0%
Office setup & deposits	3,00,000	7.5%
Business development	2,00,000	5.0%
Legal, compliance & registrations	1,00,000	2.5%
Total	40,00,000	100%

14. Risk Analysis & Mitigation

Risk	Mitigation
A testable deliverable evaluated as if it were a picture	Six plans in this vertical argued about outcomes that cannot be measured, can be gamed, or can be purchased. THIS ONE INVERTS THE CONVENTION: THE DELIVERABLE IS A WORKING SYSTEM — IT LOADS OR IT DOES NOT, CONVERTS OR DOES NOT, IS ACCESSIBLE OR IS NOT, IS SECURE OR IS NOT — THE FIRST MARKETING BUSINESS HERE THAT CAN BE HELD TO AN OBJECTIVE STANDARD. AND THE INDUSTRY'S CENTRAL FAILURE IS THAT IT MOSTLY IS NOT, BECAUSE CLIENTS EVALUATE WEBSITES THE WAY THEY EVALUATE LOGOS RATHER THAN THE WAY THEY EVALUATE MACHINERY: THE CLIENT'S AESTHETIC OPINION IS THE LEAST IMPORTANT MEASURABLE FACT ABOUT A WEBSITE AND THE ONE THAT DOMINATES EVERY REVIEW MEETING. Fix: put the testable things in the contract (26%→84%) — AN AGENCY WITH CONTRACTUAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA HAS AN ANSWER TO "I DON'T LIKE IT"; ONE WITHOUT THEM HAS ONLY AN OPINION, AND THE CLIENT'S OPINION OUTRANKS IT
Sold as a project, actually an asset	A site delivered and walked away from is INSECURE WITHIN A YEAR AND OBSOLETE WITHIN THREE , and clients genuinely do not understand the security point: AN UNMAINTAINED CONTENT-MANAGED WEBSITE IS NOT A STATIC OBJECT SITTING HARMLESSLY ON A SERVER — IT IS AN UNPATCHED APPLICATION WITH A LOGIN PAGE, PUBLICLY ADDRESSABLE, RUNNING THIRD-PARTY PLUGINS WHOSE VULNERABILITIES ARE CATALOGUED IN PUBLIC. Retainer conversion 22%→44%→68%; maintenance 13.7%→21.2% of revenue, the more valuable half of the relationship rather than an afterthought

Fixed-price projects fail on CONTENT, not code	SO CONSISTENTLY THAT TREATING IT AS A SURPRISE IS A PLANNING ERROR RATHER THAN BAD LUCK: the build reaches the point where it needs the client's actual words, product descriptions, photographs, legal pages and pricing — AND EVERYTHING STOPS FOR SIX WEEKS, THREE MONTHS, SOMETIMES LONGER, BECAUSE WRITING FORTY PAGES OF COPY IS A SUBSTANTIAL JOB THE CLIENT'S MARKETING MANAGER WAS NEVER GIVEN TIME FOR AND NEVER BUDGETED FOR; THE TEAM IS ALLOCATED AND IDLE, THE PROJECT CANNOT BE INVOICED BECAUSE IT IS NOT COMPLETE, AND NONE OF IT IS THE AGENCY'S FAULT IN A WAY THAT CAN BE USEFULLY ARGUED. Content on the critical path with named owners and dates; a DEEMED-APPROVAL AND PLACEHOLDER-LAUNCH CLAUSE — which sounds harsh and is the KINDEST available outcome, since A LIVE SITE WITH THREE IMPERFECT PAGES EARNS MORE THAN A PERFECT SITE THAT HAS NOT LAUNCHED; and content offered as a priced service, because THE HONEST READING OF A FOUR-MONTH CONTENT DELAY IS THAT THE CLIENT NEEDED HELP AND HAD NO WAY TO ASK FOR IT (overrun 11→6→4 weeks; unbilled overrun 11.0%→4.7% of revenue)
Proprietary CMS lock-in	Presented as a benefit — our own platform, no plugin bloat, fully supported — WITH THE CONSEQUENCE THAT THE CLIENT CANNOT CHANGE AGENCY WITHOUT REBUILDING FROM SCRATCH, CANNOT GET A SECOND QUOTE THAT MEANS ANYTHING, AND CANNOT VALUE THE ASSET THEY BELIEVE THEY OWN. AN AGENCY THAT BUILDS ON A CMS ONLY IT CAN MAINTAIN HAS NOT SOLD A WEBSITE; IT HAS SOLD A SUBSCRIPTION WITH A WEBSITE ATTACHED — TO A CLIENT WHO THINKS THEY MADE A PURCHASE. NIL, with 100% credential handover unprompted; commercial argument stronger than the ethical one: AN AGENCY THAT KEEPS CLIENTS BY HOLDING THEIR CREDENTIALS HAS STOPPED COMPETING ON QUALITY, AND WILL FIND OUT WHAT THAT DID TO ITS WORK ONLY WHEN A CLIENT FINALLY LEAVES ANYWAY
Accessibility treated as optional	THE CLEAREST EXAMPLE IN THIS VERTICAL OF A LEGAL OBLIGATION THE MARKET HAS SILENTLY AGREED TO IGNORE (RPwD Act 2016; GIGW for government work) — AN AGENCY THAT SHIPS AN INACCESSIBLE SITE HAS BUILT A BARRIER FOR A CLIENT LEGALLY REQUIRED NOT TO, AND THE CLIENT DOES NOT KNOW BECAUSE THE AGENCY DID NOT MENTION IT. Economics are the opposite of the assumption: BUILT IN FROM THE START IT COSTS VERY LITTLE, BECAUSE IT IS MOSTLY DOING STANDARD THINGS CORRECTLY RATHER THAN ADDITIONAL THINGS; RETROFITTED IT IS EXPENSIVE AND PARTIAL — SO THE AGENCY SHIPPING INACCESSIBLE SITES IS NOT SAVING ITS CLIENTS MONEY, IT IS DEFERRING A COST AND INCREASING IT. Commercially: cleaner semantics improve search, keyboard/contrast work improves mobile and outdoor use, and India has a very large population of users an inaccessible site simply excludes from transacting — a REVENUE question before a compliance one (WCAG AA 12%→48%→76%, deliberately NOT 100% because third-party embeds the agency did not write cannot always be brought into conformance, and claiming otherwise would be the kind of unfalsifiable promise this vertical is full of)
The bottom of the market is now free	AI SITE BUILDERS AND TEMPLATE PLATFORMS HAVE ELIMINATED IT OUTRIGHT — THE FLOOR IS NO LONGER LOW, IT IS ZERO — SO AN AGENCY COMPETING ON "WE BUILD BEAUTIFUL WEBSITES" IS COMPETING WITH SOMETHING THAT COSTS NOTHING. What survives is WHAT A TEMPLATE CANNOT KNOW: YOUR INVENTORY SYSTEM, YOUR PAYMENT FLOW, YOUR CRM, YOUR REGULATORY CONSTRAINTS, YOUR ACTUAL CUSTOMERS' BEHAVIOUR — A TEMPLATE KNOWS WHAT A WEBSITE LOOKS LIKE; IT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT YOUR BUSINESS DOES. Brochure builds cut from 42% to 30% of revenue deliberately; engineers outnumber designers two to one, since THE APPEARANCE LAYER IS THE PART THAT GOT AUTOMATED

Performance is a business metric	THE ONE PLACE IN THIS ENTIRE VERTICAL WHERE A DEFENSIBLE CAUSAL CHAIN EXISTS BETWEEN WHAT AN AGENCY DOES AND WHAT A CLIENT EARNS — measurable on the client's own site, own traffic, with a before-and-after requiring no trust in anyone's attribution model: EVERY PRECEDING PLAN STRUGGLED WITH "DID THE WORK CAUSE THE RESULT"; HERE YOU CAN TURN THE IMPROVEMENT OFF AND WATCH THE NUMBER MOVE. Position it as a revenue intervention — a two-second improvement on a site doing ₹40 lakh a month is a business case, not a bug fix — and note why it is not already universal: SPEED IS INVISIBLE IN A DESIGN REVIEW, BECAUSE THE CLIENT SEES THE SITE ON OFFICE WI-FI ON A NEW LAPTOP AND THE CUSTOMER SEES IT ON A FOUR-YEAR-OLD PHONE ON MOBILE DATA IN A LIFT (CWV passing 38%→89%)
The redesign trap	A full rebuild discards accumulated search authority, established user habits and years of incremental conversion tuning, and the traffic drop after a badly executed replatform is REAL, COMMON AND FREQUENTLY PERMANENT: A REDESIGN IS A REBRAND WITH A TRAFFIC LOSS ATTACHED — the branding plan's argument arriving in a domain where the damage is actually measurable. Staged improvement recommended instead of the requested rebuild 4→9→14, at an accepted cost: A STAGED PROGRAMME BILLS LESS IN YEAR ONE THAN A REBUILD DOES, AND IT IS THE REASON THE CLIENT IS STILL THERE IN YEAR THREE
Data obligations built by one party, carried by another	DPDP MAKES A WEBSITE A DATA-COLLECTION SYSTEM RATHER THAN A BROCHURE — forms, analytics, cookies, session tools and embedded pixels — THE AGENCY BUILDS THE COLLECTION MECHANISM, THE CLIENT CARRIES THE OBLIGATION, AND INDIAN CONSENT BANNERS ARE LARGELY DECORATIVE: THEY ANNOUNCE RATHER THAN OBTAIN CONSENT. Documented data inventory, working consent, third-party script register (24%→82%); CERT-In incident responsibility defined in the maintenance contract; PCI-DSS scope reduced where possible
Cash & delivery risk	MILESTONE BILLING TIED TO LAUNCH CONVERTS THE CONTENT PROBLEM DIRECTLY INTO AN OVERDRAFT: a 40/30/30 structure means NEARLY A THIRD OF PROJECT VALUE IS HELD HOSTAGE BY A GO-LIVE DATE THE CLIENT CONTROLS AND ROUTINELY DELAYS — AN AGENCY WITH FIVE PROJECTS AWAITING CONTENT HAS, IN CASH TERMS, FIVE COMPLETED JOBS IT IS NOT ALLOWED TO BILL FOR. Final milestone tied to DELIVERY FOR LAUNCH rather than launch itself; deemed-complete clause; maintenance retainers billed monthly IN ADVANCE — the only genuinely predictable cash in this business and the strongest reason to build the recurring base EARLY rather than treat it as a bonus at the end of a project

15. SWOT Analysis

Strengths The only deliverable in the vertical that can be objectively verified — and contracted accordingly; integration depth templates cannot reach; performance work with a genuine causal chain to revenue; accessibility as standard; growing retained maintenance base; no lock-in, which wins enterprise trust.	Weaknesses Project overrun driven by a dependency the agency does not control; higher salary base than design-only competitors; launch-tied billing creating structural cash strain; brochure revenue under permanent attack; delivery risk is technical and real.
Opportunities Replatforming and migration work; accessibility remediation as a legal-obligation-driven market barely served today; DPDP-driven data and consent remediation; conversion and performance programmes on sites that need no rebuild; security-led maintenance retainers.	Threats AI builders and templates at zero cost; offshore development on price; in-housing by product-led clients; a security incident on a maintained site becoming an agency liability; platform and framework churn devaluing specialised skills.

16. Recommended AiSevak Tools for This Business

This web design agency would use AiSevak's Marketing vertical tools in operations:

- **Contract & delivery: acceptance-criteria template (performance, accessibility, security, conversion)**, content-dependency schedule with named owners, **deemed-approval and placeholder-launch triggers**.
- **Quality gates: Core Web Vitals and WCAG conformance checks at delivery**, real-device and real-network test matrix, defect-escape log.
- **Compliance: data inventory and consent-mechanism register**, third-party script tracker, CERT-In responsibility record, open-source licence register.
- **Handover & integrity: credential-handover checklist (hosting, domain, repository, CMS)**, portability confirmation, staged-improvement recommendation log.
- **Commercials: project overrun tracking in weeks**, unbilled overrun capture, retainer conversion pipeline, utilisation and repeat-share reporting.

17. Key Assumptions & Notes

- Web design & development agency: design and build, platform and e-commerce integration, maintenance and security retainers, conversion and performance engineering, accessibility audit and remediation.
- **⚠ SIX PLANS IN THIS VERTICAL HAVE ARGUED ABOUT OUTCOMES THAT CANNOT BE MEASURED, CAN BE GAMED, OR CAN SIMPLY BE PURCHASED. THIS ONE INVERTS THE CONVENTION ENTIRELY, BECAUSE ITS DELIVERABLE IS A WORKING SYSTEM RATHER THAN A MESSAGE: A WEBSITE LOADS OR IT DOES NOT, CONVERTS OR DOES NOT, IS ACCESSIBLE OR IS NOT, IS SECURE OR IS NOT — THE FIRST BUSINESS IN THE MARKETING VERTICAL THAT CAN BE HELD TO AN OBJECTIVE STANDARD. AND THE INDUSTRY'S CENTRAL FAILURE IS THAT IT MOSTLY IS NOT, BECAUSE CLIENTS EVALUATE WEBSITES THE WAY THEY EVALUATE LOGOS RATHER THAN THE WAY THEY EVALUATE MACHINERY: THE CLIENT'S AESTHETIC OPINION IS THE LEAST IMPORTANT MEASURABLE FACT ABOUT A WEBSITE, AND IT IS THE ONE THAT DOMINATES EVERY REVIEW MEETING.** Correction is straightforward and almost nobody does it — **PUT THE TESTABLE THINGS IN THE CONTRACT (performance thresholds, accessibility conformance, conversion baselines, security standards as ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA, 26%→58%→84%), WHICH CONVERTS A SUBJECTIVE SIGN-OFF INTO AN OBJECTIVE ONE AND PROTECTS THE AGENCY FAR MORE THAN THE CLIENT: AN AGENCY WITH CONTRACTUAL PERFORMANCE CRITERIA HAS AN ANSWER TO "I DON'T LIKE IT"; AN AGENCY WITHOUT THEM HAS ONLY AN OPINION, AND THE CLIENT'S OPINION OUTRANKS IT.**
- **THE INDUSTRY SELLS WEBSITES AS PROJECTS WHEN THEY ARE ASSETS REQUIRING CONTINUOUS MAINTENANCE: A SITE DELIVERED AND WALKED AWAY FROM IS INSECURE WITHIN A YEAR AND OBSOLETE WITHIN THREE — AND THE SECURITY POINT DESERVES STATING BLUNTLY BECAUSE CLIENTS GENUINELY DO NOT UNDERSTAND IT: AN UNMAINTAINED CONTENT-MANAGED WEBSITE IS NOT A STATIC OBJECT SITTING HARMLESSLY ON A SERVER; IT IS AN UNPATCHED APPLICATION WITH A LOGIN PAGE, PUBLICLY ADDRESSABLE, RUNNING THIRD-PARTY PLUGINS WHOSE VULNERABILITIES ARE CATALOGUED IN PUBLIC →** retainer conversion 22%→44%→68%, maintenance 13.7%→17.1%→21.2% of revenue, treated as **THE MORE VALUABLE HALF OF THE RELATIONSHIP RATHER THAN AN AFTERTHOUGHT**, and as **THE ONLY GENUINELY PREDICTABLE CASH IN THIS BUSINESS**. Related refusal: **PROPRIETARY AGENCY-ONLY CMS BUILDS: NIL** — the pitch is familiar (our own platform, purpose-built, no plugin bloat, fully supported) but **THE CONSEQUENCE IS THAT THE CLIENT CANNOT CHANGE AGENCY WITHOUT REBUILDING FROM SCRATCH, CANNOT GET A SECOND QUOTE THAT MEANS ANYTHING, AND CANNOT VALUE THE ASSET THEY BELIEVE THEY OWN; AN AGENCY THAT BUILDS ON A CMS ONLY IT CAN MAINTAIN HAS NOT SOLD A WEBSITE, IT HAS SOLD A SUBSCRIPTION**

WITH A WEBSITE ATTACHED — TO A CLIENT WHO THINKS THEY MADE A PURCHASE (100% credential handover, unprompted; **AN AGENCY THAT KEEPS CLIENTS BY HOLDING THEIR CREDENTIALS HAS STOPPED COMPETING ON QUALITY, AND WILL FIND OUT WHAT THAT DID TO ITS WORK ONLY WHEN A CLIENT FINALLY LEAVES ANYWAY**).

- **FIXED-PRICE WEB PROJECTS DO NOT FAIL ON CODE — THEY FAIL ON CONTENT, SO CONSISTENTLY THAT TREATING IT AS A SURPRISE IS A PLANNING ERROR RATHER THAN BAD LUCK: THE AGENCY DESIGNS, BUILDS, TESTS AND REACHES THE POINT WHERE THE SITE NEEDS THE CLIENT'S ACTUAL WORDS, PRODUCT DESCRIPTIONS, PHOTOGRAPHS, LEGAL PAGES AND PRICING — THEN EVERYTHING STOPS FOR SIX WEEKS, THREE MONTHS, SOMETIMES LONGER, BECAUSE WRITING FORTY PAGES OF COPY IS A SUBSTANTIAL JOB THE CLIENT'S MARKETING MANAGER WAS NEVER GIVEN TIME FOR AND NEVER BUDGETED FOR. THE AGENCY IS THEN IN THE WORST POSSIBLE POSITION: THE TEAM IS ALLOCATED AND IDLE, THE PROJECT CANNOT BE INVOICED BECAUSE IT IS NOT COMPLETE, AND NONE OF IT IS THE AGENCY'S FAULT IN A WAY THAT CAN BE USEFULLY ARGUED** → three controls, all belonging in the PROPOSAL rather than the recovery conversation: **content on the critical path with named owners and dates like any other dependency; A DEEMED-APPROVAL AND PLACEHOLDER-LAUNCH CLAUSE, WHICH SOUNDS HARSH AND IS THE KINDEST AVAILABLE OUTCOME SINCE A LIVE SITE WITH THREE IMPERFECT PAGES EARNS MORE THAN A PERFECT SITE THAT HAS NOT LAUNCHED; and content offered as a PRICED SERVICE, BECAUSE THE HONEST READING OF A FOUR-MONTH CONTENT DELAY IS THAT THE CLIENT NEEDED HELP AND HAD NO WAY TO ASK FOR IT** (content on time 19%→38%→58%; **OVERRUN 11→6→4 WEEKS; UNBILLED OVERRUN 11.0%→7.3%→4.7% OF REVENUE — OVERRUN IS THE MARGIN, EXACTLY AS REVISION ROUNDS WERE FOR THE BRANDING STUDIO**). Cash version of the same problem: **MILESTONE BILLING TIED TO LAUNCH MEANS NEARLY A THIRD OF PROJECT VALUE IS HELD HOSTAGE BY A GO-LIVE DATE THE CLIENT CONTROLS AND ROUTINELY DELAYS — AN AGENCY WITH FIVE PROJECTS AWAITING CONTENT HAS, IN CASH TERMS, FIVE COMPLETED JOBS IT IS NOT ALLOWED TO BILL FOR** → final milestone tied to **DELIVERY FOR LAUNCH** rather than **LAUNCH**, deemed-complete clause, retainers billed monthly in advance.
- **AI SITE BUILDERS AND TEMPLATE PLATFORMS HAVE ELIMINATED THE BOTTOM OF THIS MARKET OUTRIGHT — THE FLOOR IS NO LONGER LOW, IT IS ZERO — SO AN AGENCY COMPETING ON "WE BUILD BEAUTIFUL WEBSITES" IS COMPETING WITH SOMETHING THAT COSTS NOTHING. WHAT SURVIVES IS WHAT A TEMPLATE CANNOT KNOW: YOUR INVENTORY SYSTEM, YOUR PAYMENT FLOW, YOUR CRM, YOUR REGULATORY CONSTRAINTS, YOUR ACTUAL CUSTOMERS' BEHAVIOUR — A TEMPLATE KNOWS WHAT A WEBSITE LOOKS LIKE; IT DOES NOT KNOW WHAT YOUR BUSINESS DOES** (brochure builds cut 42%→36%→30% of revenue deliberately, since **THAT LINE IS UNDER PERMANENT PRICE ATTACK FROM THINGS THAT COST NOTHING AND DEFENDING IT IS DEFENDING THE WRONG GROUND**; engineers outnumber designers two to one because **THE APPEARANCE LAYER IS THE PART THAT GOT AUTOMATED**). **AND PERFORMANCE IS THE ONE PLACE IN THIS ENTIRE VERTICAL WHERE A DEFENSIBLE CAUSAL CHAIN EXISTS BETWEEN WHAT AN AGENCY DOES AND WHAT A CLIENT EARNS — MEASURABLE ON THE CLIENT'S OWN SITE, OWN TRAFFIC, WITH A BEFORE-AND-AFTER REQUIRING NO TRUST IN ANYONE'S ATTRIBUTION MODEL: EVERY PRECEDING PLAN STRUGGLED WITH "DID THE WORK CAUSE THE RESULT"; HERE YOU CAN TURN THE IMPROVEMENT OFF AND WATCH THE NUMBER MOVE** → sell it as a revenue intervention (**A TWO-SECOND IMPROVEMENT ON A SITE DOING ₹40 LAKH A MONTH IS A BUSINESS CASE, NOT A BUG FIX**), and note why it is not already universal: **SPEED IS INVISIBLE IN A DESIGN REVIEW — THE CLIENT SEES THE SITE ON OFFICE WI-FI ON A NEW LAPTOP, AND THE CUSTOMER SEES IT ON A FOUR-YEAR-OLD PHONE ON MOBILE DATA IN A LIFT** (CWV 38%→67%→89%).
- **ACCESSIBILITY IS THE CLEAREST EXAMPLE IN THIS VERTICAL OF A LEGAL OBLIGATION THE MARKET HAS SILENTLY AGREED TO TREAT AS OPTIONAL** (RPwD Act 2016 on services and information; GIGW for government work) — **AN AGENCY THAT SHIPS AN INACCESSIBLE SITE HAS BUILT A BARRIER FOR A CLIENT WHO IS LEGALLY REQUIRED NOT TO BUILD ONE, AND THE CLIENT GENERALLY DOES NOT KNOW BECAUSE THE**

AGENCY DID NOT MENTION IT — and **THE ECONOMICS ARE THE OPPOSITE OF WHAT MOST AGENCIES ASSUME: BUILT IN FROM THE START** (semantic markup, keyboard navigation, contrast, labelled form fields, alt text, sensible heading structure) **IT COSTS VERY LITTLE BECAUSE IT IS MOSTLY A MATTER OF DOING STANDARD THINGS CORRECTLY RATHER THAN DOING ADDITIONAL THINGS; RETROFITTED ONTO A FINISHED SITE IT IS EXPENSIVE AND PARTIAL** — **SO THE AGENCY THAT SHIPS INACCESSIBLE SITES IS NOT SAVING ITS CLIENTS MONEY, IT IS DEFERRING A COST AND INCREASING IT**; commercially rather than morally persuasive (which matters, **BECAUSE MORAL ARGUMENTS DO NOT SURVIVE PROCUREMENT**): cleaner semantics improve search, keyboard/contrast work improves mobile and outdoor usability, **AND INDIA HAS A VERY LARGE POPULATION OF USERS WITH DISABILITIES WHOM AN INACCESSIBLE SITE SIMPLY EXCLUDES FROM TRANSACTING — A REVENUE QUESTION BEFORE IT IS A COMPLIANCE ONE** (WCAG AA 12%→48%→76%, **DELIBERATELY NOT 100% BECAUSE SOME LEGACY INTEGRATIONS AND THIRD-PARTY EMBEDS CANNOT BE BROUGHT INTO CONFORMANCE BY THE AGENCY THAT DID NOT WRITE THEM, AND CLAIMING OTHERWISE WOULD BE THE KIND OF UNFALSIFIABLE PROMISE THIS VERTICAL IS FULL OF**). Second obligation: **DPDP MAKES A WEBSITE A DATA-COLLECTION SYSTEM RATHER THAN A BROCHURE — FORMS, ANALYTICS, COOKIES, SESSION TOOLS AND EMBEDDED PIXELS ALL COLLECT PERSONAL DATA; THE AGENCY BUILDS THE COLLECTION MECHANISM, THE CLIENT CARRIES THE OBLIGATION, AND INDIAN CONSENT BANNERS ARE LARGELY DECORATIVE: THEY ANNOUNCE RATHER THAN OBTAIN CONSENT** (data inventory + working consent 24%→56%→82%; third-party script register; CERT-In responsibility defined in the maintenance contract; PCI-DSS scope reduced where avoidable; IP assignment and open-source licence compliance).

- The redesign trap — **A FULL REBUILD DISCARDS ACCUMULATED SEARCH AUTHORITY, ESTABLISHED USER HABITS AND YEARS OF INCREMENTAL CONVERSION TUNING, AND THE TRAFFIC DROP FOLLOWING A BADLY EXECUTED REPLATFORM IS REAL, COMMON AND FREQUENTLY PERMANENT: A REDESIGN IS A REBRAND WITH A TRAFFIC LOSS ATTACHED** (the branding plan's refresh-versus-rebrand argument arriving in a domain where the damage is **actually measurable**) → staged improvement recommended instead of the requested redesign 4→9→14, at an accepted cost: **A STAGED PROGRAMME BILLS LESS IN YEAR ONE THAN A REBUILD DOES, AND IT IS THE REASON THE CLIENT IS STILL THERE IN YEAR THREE**. Break-even Y2, 8.1% Y3 — **lower than the branding studio because engineering salaries are higher and the delivery risk is REAL rather than SUBJECTIVE**; performance and accessibility work carry the best margin per hour **BECAUSE THEY ARE SPECIFIED AGAINST OBJECTIVE STANDARDS AND THEREFORE DO NOT GENERATE AESTHETIC REVISION CYCLES**. Lender note: **THE MOST OBJECTIVELY ASSESSABLE BUSINESS IN THE VERTICAL AND A LENDER SHOULD EXPLOIT THAT — UNLIKE A BRAND STUDIO OR A PR FIRM, THIS AGENCY'S OUTPUT CAN BE TESTED DIRECTLY: LOAD A CLIENT SITE, RUN THE PERFORMANCE AND ACCESSIBILITY CHECKS, AND THE QUALITY OF THE WORK IS VISIBLE IN NINETY SECONDS WITHOUT ASKING ANYBODY'S OPINION; UNDERWRITE PROJECT OVERRUN RATHER THAN REVENUE, BECAUSE AN AGENCY RUNNING ELEVEN WEEKS LATE ON AVERAGE IS DELIVERING ROUGHLY A QUARTER LESS CAPACITY THAN IT IS PAYING FOR, AND THE LOSS SITS IN SALARIES WHERE NO COST LINE NAMES IT; THE MAINTENANCE BASE IS THE QUALITY-OF-EARNINGS SIGNAL — A PURE PROJECT AGENCY STARTS EVERY YEAR AT ZERO AND MUST RESELL ITS ENTIRE REVENUE, WHILE A RETAINED BASE OF ₹76 LAKH IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A BUSINESS AND A SEQUENCE OF JOBS; and ASK WHAT HAPPENS IF THE AGENCY IS FIRED — IF THE CLIENT CANNOT TAKE THE SITE ELSEWHERE, THE REVENUE IS BEING HELD IN PLACE BY LOCK-IN RATHER THAN BY SATISFACTION, WHICH IS A QUALITY-OF-REVENUE PROBLEM DISGUISED AS CUSTOMER LOYALTY**. ₹40L, 42→96 projects, 34→84 staff, rev 1.46→3.58cr, Y1 — ₹5L → Y3 ₹29L. 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.