ENABLERS
SECTOR INTELLIGENCE REPORT MAY 2026

Manufacturing as a Service (MaaS) in India

India's ₹930M bet — who is winning, why it matters, and where the real opportunity lies.

₹11,834 Cr
TOP PERFORMER REVENUE
Zetwerk FY24

600,000×
REVENUE SPREAD
Highest vs. lowest in cohort

13
COMPANIES TRACKED
FY24 cohort | this report

This report is for informational purposes only and does not constitute investment advice.

SECTION 01

Reading the Data — What the Numbers Show

Across the 13 Indian MaaS companies we tracked, FY24 revenue ranges from **₹0.02 Cr to ₹11,834 Cr** — a 600,000× spread. This is not sector luck. It is structural. The companies at the top are not simply bigger versions of the companies at the bottom. They control different layers of the supply chain — and those layers carry fundamentally different economic properties.

India's MaaS ecosystem is bifurcating into two categories: **coordination platforms** that help buyers find suppliers, and **control platforms** that own quality, compliance, logistics, and workflow integration. Only the second type is building durable value. This report maps the 13 companies, explains the bifurcation, and states ValPro's investment view on where the opportunity lies in 2026.

SECTION 02 – COMPANY DATA

13-Company Cohort — FY24

All figures from public disclosures, company announcements, and industry sources. Revenue models differ — figures are not directly comparable. Sources: Company disclosures, Tracxn, Crunchbase, MCA filings. Losses shown in parentheses.

Company	Founded	HQ	Funding	Stage	FY24 Revenue	FY24 EBITDA	Model
Zetwerk	2018	Bengaluru	$768M	Series F	₹11,834 Cr	₹186 Cr	Full-stack
MetalBook	2020	Delhi	$24.3M	Series A	₹799 Cr	₹(9.8) Cr	Marketplace
Elchemy	2021	Mumbai	$7.6M	Series A	₹31 Cr	₹(3.0) Cr	Full-stack
Covvalent	2022	Gurugram	$4.3M	Seed	₹39 Cr	₹0.7 Cr	Hybrid
Scimplify	2023	Bengaluru	$54.2M	Series B	₹18 Cr	₹(1.7) Cr	Full-stack
Capgrid	2020	Gurugram	$17.3M	Series A	₹101 Cr	₹(26) Cr	Asset-light
Karkhana.io	2018	Mumbai	$9.9M	Series A	₹71 Cr	₹(8.0) Cr	Hybrid
Mstack	2022	Cochin	$40M	Series A	N/A	—	Full-stack
Atomgrid	2023	Bengaluru	$1.5M	Seed	₹0.6 Cr	₹(0.4) Cr	Hybrid
Frigate Eng.	2011	Trichy	$1.7M	Seed	₹9 Cr	₹(2.0) Cr	Asset-light
Distil	2023	Mumbai	$3.1M	Seed	₹0.02 Cr	₹(0.1) Cr	SaaS+Exec
Venttup	2021	Chennai	$0.2M	Seed	₹0.6 Cr	₹(0.03) Cr	Asset-light
Vendosmart	2019	Bengaluru	$0.1M	Seed	₹0.9 Cr	₹(0.4) Cr	SaaS+Exec

SECTION 03 – SECTOR CONTEXT

Why is MaaS Emerging Now?

India's manufacturing sector is structurally fragmented — a large MSME base with limited digital integration, weak quality standardisation, and reliance on opaque intermediaries. Three converging forces are accelerating the platform transition:

Force	Context
Supply chain diversification	Global buyers are reducing China dependency. India is the primary beneficiary — but only for suppliers who can guarantee quality, compliance, and delivery at scale.
Government manufacturing push	PLI schemes across electronics, automotive, defence, and chemicals are creating demand for organised, documented supply chains that MSMEs alone cannot deliver.
Export market expectations	Specialty chemicals, APIs, and precision components exported to regulated markets (EU, US, Japan) require GMP, REACH, and ISO certifications — a compliance layer that MaaS platforms provide.

SECTION 04 - THE FRAMEWORK

The MaaS Value Stack

Not all parts of the supply chain carry equal economic value. The table below maps five layers from lowest to highest value concentration. Companies at the top two layers exhibit structurally higher margins, repeat usage, and disintermediation resistance.

Layer (Low → High)	Companies	Characteristic
Workflow integration	*Zetwerk, Scimplify*	API connections, RFQ systems, procurement lock-in — the pinnacle of defensibility.
Financing & capital flow	*MetalBook, Elchemy*	Working capital, credit extension, payment velocity — emerging high-value layer.

Logistics & fulfilment control	*Elchemy, Capgrid*	Warehousing, cross-border shipping, port access.
Quality & compliance infrastructure	*Covvalent, Atomgrid, Scimplify*	GMP / REACH certifications, in-process inspection.
Supplier discovery (base)	*Frigate, Vendosmart*	Search, broker networks — lowest switching cost, most competitive layer.

SECTION 5 – BUSINESS MODEL ARCHETYPES

Four Models — Very Different Economics

Four distinct archetypes are emerging across the cohort, each with different implications for margin, capital intensity, scalability, and defensibility.

Model	Gross Margin	EBITDA Potential	Capital Intensity	Defensibility	Take Rate
Asset-light orchestration	10–18%	5–10%	Medium	Low–Medium	10–18%
Full-stack platform	20–35%	10–20%	Medium–High	High	15–30%
Hybrid (platform + assets)	25–40%	15–25%	Very high	High	15–30%
SaaS + execution	60–80% (SaaS)	10–20% (exec)	Low–Medium	Medium	SaaS ARR

Take rates are industry estimates. Margins vary by segment: chemicals 15–30%, industrial 10–18%, metals 5–15%.

SECTION 06 – SUB SECTOR ANALYSIS

Four Segments — Four Investment Theses

The MaaS label spans four structurally distinct sub-sectors. Each carries different margin profiles, capital requirements, regulatory barriers, and competitive dynamics. Treating them as a single category is the most common analytical error in this space.

Sub-sector	India TAM (est.)	Key Moat	Gross Margin	Regulatory Barrier	Capital Intensity	Conviction
Specialty chemicals	$35–40B	R&D + GMP/REACH compliance	15–30%	High (GMP, REACH, CDSCO)	Medium–High	**High ↑↑**
Industrial / precision mfg.	$60–70B	Supplier density + workflow	10–18%	Medium (ISO, BIS)	Medium	Medium →
Metals procurement	$80–90B	Embedded finance + data moat	5–15%	Low	Very High (WC)	Selective →
Electronics mfg. (EMS)	$25–30B	Physical infra + OEM contracts	8–14%	Medium (BIS, export)	High	Selective →

TAM estimates based on IBEF, FICCI, and industry sources. Margins are indicative ranges.

Specialty Chemicals — The Highest-Conviction Sub-Sector

India is the world's sixth-largest producer of chemicals, accounting for approximately 4% of global output. The specialty chemicals segment — fine chemicals, agrochemicals, dyes, pigments, APIs, and performance materials — is where the MaaS model is most structurally justified. Four compounding factors drive this view:

Complexity creates natural moats Custom molecule synthesis requires R&D capability, specialised equipment, and process IP. A platform that can design a molecule, match it to the right reactor, manage GMP documentation, and coordinate cross-border export is providing a service that buyers genuinely cannot replicate internally.

China+1 is driving a structural demand shift Global pharma, agrochemical, and performance material buyers are actively reducing China dependency. India is the primary beneficiary — but only for suppliers who can demonstrate regulatory compliance (US FDA, EU GMP, and REACH). MaaS platforms that bundle compliance management with production coordination are the key commercial enabler of this shift.

Regulatory barriers create durable competitive advantage GMP certification, REACH registration, and CDSCO approvals take 18–36 months and cost ₹2–8 Cr per molecule or facility. Once a platform has built this infrastructure, it creates a meaningful barrier that pure-coordination competitors cannot easily replicate. The compliance layer is the moat — not the supplier network.

Production-level AI has genuine impact here AI applied to retro synthesis, process parameter optimisation, and batch reproducibility directly compresses the R&D-to-production cycle by 60–90%. This is categorically different from AI applied to supplier matching — it creates IP and defensible production advantage, not merely coordination efficiency.

Industrial & Precision Manufacturing — The Volume Play

Industrial manufacturing — fabricated metal parts, precision components, castings, forgings — is the largest sub-sector by TAM and the most crowded by platform count. Zetwerk's trajectory from Series A to ₹11,834 Cr revenue defines the ceiling. But it also reveals the structural tension inherent in asset-light orchestration at scale.

The Scalability Advantage	The Margin Ceiling
Asset-light orchestration scales faster than any other model. Adding a new supplier is near-zero Incremental cost. Customer acquisition leverages the existing network. Platform revenue grows with transaction volume, not capex. Zetwerk's ₹11,834 Cr revenue on $768M of cumulative funding is the proof case.	At scale, asset-light platforms face structural margin compression. Gross margins of 10–18% leave limited room for technology investment, quality infrastructure build-out, and customer support. Zetwerk's ₹186 Cr EBITDA on ₹11,834 Cr revenue implies a 1.6% EBITDA margin — impressive in absolute terms, but thin as a structural ceiling.

The implication for investors: revenue scale is achievable, but margin expansion requires moving up the value stack into quality infrastructure, workflow integration, and customer-embedded tooling. Platforms that remain pure-coordination at ₹200–500 Cr revenue will see gross margin erode as buyers gain pricing leverage and consider direct supplier engagement.

Metals Procurement — The Working Capital Trap

Metals is the sub-sector with the highest absolute revenue potential and the most capital-intensive path. The fundamental economics: metals are commodity-priced, volume-driven, and structurally margin thin. Embedded financing changes the equation entirely — and is the only credible path to a defensible moat.

Without Embedded Finance	With Embedded Finance
Gross margin: 3–8% on transaction value	Gross margin: 5–12% + financing yield of 2–6% on working capital deployed
Revenue constrained by physical transaction volume	Revenue includes interest income on buyer credit and supplier payment terms
No data moat — buyers can switch platforms easily	Payment behaviour data creates buyer creditworthiness profiles — a proprietary underwriting asset
Working capital sourced externally by buyer	Platform controls transaction velocity by controlling payment release timing
EBITDA loss deepens with revenue growth	Financing yield partially offsets WC cost; path to profitability becomes visible

Electronics Manufacturing Services (EMS) — Infrastructure-First

Electronics manufacturing services in India is at an inflection point driven by PLI-scheme incentives and global OEM supply chain localisation (Apple, Samsung, and others). The MaaS model in EMS requires physical infrastructure ownership — there is no credible asset-light path because quality consistency, IP protection, and OEM certification requirements demand direct facility control. This makes EMS the most capital-intensive sub-sector but also the one with the most durable customer relationships once OEM contracts are signed. Single OEM contracts can represent ₹200–500 Cr in annual revenue — a step change that other sub-sectors rarely see.

SECTION 07 – COMPETITIVE DYNAMICS

How the Competitive Landscape Is Evolving

The MaaS ecosystem is not static. Four structural forces are reshaping competitive positioning across all sub-sectors simultaneously. Understanding these forces determines which platforms will capture value over the next 3–5 years and which will be disintermediated.

1. Model convergence is accelerating

Asset-light platforms are adding quality infrastructure. Full-stack platforms are investing in software layers. Hybrid models are pursuing compliance certifications. In 18–24 months, the surface-level differences between platform types will narrow significantly. Differentiation will shift to depth of customer integration and proprietary data assets — not the range of services offered on paper.

2. Funding concentration is creating a two-tier market

Approximately 94% of cohort funding ($875M of $930M total) is concentrated in three companies: Zetwork ($768M), Scimplify ($54.2M), and Ms tack ($40M). This creates a structural disadvantage for the remaining ten — competing for growth capital in a tightening market while the top tier uses its balance sheet to expand supplier networks, build compliance infrastructure, and attract enterprise customers at scale.

3. Disintermediation risk is real for discovery-only platforms

As buyer-supplier relationships mature through platform interactions, buyers accumulate direct knowledge of and trust in specific suppliers. Without embedded switching costs — workflow integration, compliance SLAs, embedded financing, quality documentation ownership — platforms risk becoming a discovery layer that buyers graduate beyond. This risk is long-dated (3–5 years) but structurally material for asset-light models.

4. Global MaaS platforms are entering the India sourcing layer

Platforms such as Xometry (USA, IPO at $1.5B), Fictiv (USA), and Mfg.com are actively expanding their India supplier networks. While their direct India commercial presence is limited, they represent a meaningful competitive threat in the cross-border precision components, castings, and electronics subassembly layer where global buyers use these platforms as their front-end procurement interface.

SECTION 08 – INDIAN GLOBAL CONTEXT

India vs. Global MaaS Benchmarks

India's MaaS ecosystem is structurally similar to earlier-stage equivalents in the US, China, and Europe — but with important differences in regulatory environment, capital availability, and market maturity. Understanding where India stands globally is critical for calibrating growth expectations, exit multiples, and the competitive threat from global entrants.

Dimension	India (current)	China (c. 2018)	USA / Xometry benchmark	Implication for India
Ecosystem maturity	Early growth — 2–3 at scale, broad sub-₹50 Cr base	Similar 2016–18 before rapid consolidation and state-backed scale	Mature — Xometry IPO at $1.5B; Fictiv, Jabil at scale	India is 4–6 years behind US maturity; the next Xometry is being built now
Regulatory complexity	High — GMP, BIS, CDSCO, REACH vary by sub-sector	Lower barriers but inconsistent state level enforcement	Moderate — FDA, EPA oversight, cleaner documentation	Regulatory moat is deeper in India — higher barrier creates higher protection once cleared
Capital availability	$930M cohort; heavily concentrated; mid-market starved	State-backed capital widely available; less reliance on VC	Deep VC and PE ecosystem; Xometry raised $280M pre-IPO	India mid-market (₹50–500 Cr) is most underfunded segment
Labour cost advantage	Significant — 70–80% lower engineering cost vs. US/EU	Eroding — wages risen 8–12% p.a.; platforms moving upstream	None — cost is the reason US buyers source from Asia	India's cost advantage is structural for the next decade
Export compliance infra	Developing — few platforms have full GMP + REACH capabilities	Well-developed with govt-backed export compliance support	Mature — standard requirement in all global on boarding	First-mover advantage for Indian platforms that build early
Valuation multiples	0.06–3× revenue depending on stage and model	1–4× at comparable stages in 2018 vintage	2–6× revenue; Xometry at ~3× at current scale	Indian platforms at ₹1,000 Cr+ will converge toward 2–4× as margins improve

SECTION 09 – RISK FRAMEWORK

Risks That Investors Consistently Under-priced

The MaaS sector is well-covered from a growth narrative perspective. It is less well-analysed from a risk perspective. These are the four risks that ValPro believes are most consistently under-priced by investors evaluating platforms in this space.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Description	Diligence Screen
Working capital intensity at growth stage	**High**	**High**	Most MaaS platforms in industrial and metals carry significant working capital — paying suppliers before collecting from buyers. At ₹50 Cr revenue, WC requirements can be ₹15–25 Cr. At ₹200 Cr, this becomes ₹60–100 Cr. Companies without committed credit facilities before scaling face a growth-limiting liquidity crunch at precisely the worst moment.	Screen for working capital cycle (DSO minus DPO). Healthy MaaS platforms should have DPO ≥ DSO or a committed revolving facility covering the gap.
Customer concentration in early cohorts	**Medium**	**High**	Many early-stage MaaS platforms have 60–80% of revenue in 3–5 customers. Inevitable at Seed but becomes a structural risk at Series A when a single customer exit can trigger a revenue cliff that undermines the entire growth narrative. Concentration is almost never disclosed proactively in fundraise materials.	Request a revenue cohort breakdown: % from top 5, top 10, and new customers. New customer revenue should represent at least 30% of total by Series A.
Compliance infrastructure lag	**High**	**Medium**	Platforms that have grown revenue rapidly without building parallel compliance infrastructure — GMP documentation, supplier audits, quality certifications — face a reckoning when a global buyer triggers a supplier audit. Compliance failures at this stage can trigger regulatory action affecting the entire platform's operating licence.	Conduct compliance due diligence as seriously as financial DD. Absence of a Head of Quality or Compliance at Series A+ is a direct red flag.
Disintermediation by maturing	**Medium**	Low	As buyer-supplier relationships mature through platform interactions, buyers	Track monthly active buyer and supplier cohort retention by vintage. Declining

buyer-supplier relationships			Accumulate direct knowledge of and trust in specific suppliers. Without embedded switching costs — workflow integration, compliance SLAs, embedded financing — the platform risks becoming a discovery layer that buyers graduate beyond.	Engagement in cohorts older than 18 months is the earliest disintermediation signal.

SECTION 10 – SCALING ECONOMICS

Revenue-to-EBITDA Trajectory by Model

The cohort data allows construction of indicative scaling trajectories for each archetype. These are pattern-derived benchmarks, not projections. They illustrate why model choice at the early stage has lasting consequences on the margin profile at scale.

Revenue Milestone	Asset-light EBITDA%	Full-stack EBITDA%	Hybrid EBITDA%	Key Inflection Point
₹0–20 Cr (early stage)	(40–80%)	(30–60%)	(50–90%)	All models loss-making; burn rate and revenue quality are primary metrics
₹20–100 Cr (growth)	(15–30%)	(20–40%)	(25–45%)	Full-stack burns more due to R&D and compliance capex; justified if moat is building
₹100–500 Cr (scale entry)	(8–18%)	(10–20%)	(5–15%)	Asset-light reaches first EBITDA positive earlier; full-stack still investing in infrastructure
₹500 Cr–1,000 Cr (category scale)	(3–8%)	(8–15%)	(10–18%)	Full-stack and hybrid begin to show structural margin advantage over asset-light
₹1,000 Cr+ (platform scale)	**1–5%**	**10–20%**	**12–22%**	**Full-stack and hybrid margin superiority is decisive; asset light margin ceiling confirmed**

> ***Asset-light platforms reach EBITDA breakeven earlier but face a structural margin ceiling above ₹500 Cr revenue. Full-stack and hybrid models carry higher early-stage losses but converge to meaningfully higher long-run margins.***

SECTION 11 – TECHNOLOGY & AI

Not All AI Is Equal in Manufacturing

AI is being deployed across the MaaS ecosystem, but its impact varies fundamentally depending on what layer it operates at. This distinction matters for valuation. Production AI creates IP and defensible production advantage; coordination AI improves efficiency but is replicable.

Production AI — High Impact	Coordination AI — Incremental Impact
Applied to molecule design, synthesis optimisation, and process efficiency (Mstack Chemstack, Scimplify R&D). AI directly influences production outcomes — reducing synthesis time by ~90%, cutting iterations by ~60%. Creates IP, not just efficiency. ***Companies: Mstack, Scimplify***	Applied to supplier matching, RFQ optimisation, demand forecasting. Improves operational efficiency but is more replicable — any platform with sufficient data can implement similar tools. Does not create production-level barriers to entry. ***Companies: Zetwerk, Capgrid, Karkhana.io***

SECTION 12 – INVESTMENT OUTLOOK

Where ValPro Sees the Opportunity in 2026

Based on our analysis of the 13-company cohort and sector dynamics, these are ValPro's directional investment views. These are not generic observations — they are specific, falsifiable claims.

1

Highest conviction — specialty chemicals, full-stack, ₹30–200 Cr revenue band

Companies like Scimplify and Covvalent are building quality and compliance moats that become exponentially harder to replicate as customer relationships deepen. This is the best risk-adjusted entry point in the ecosystem in 2026. Funding is still accessible; the window is narrowing.

2

Asset-light platforms below ₹100 Cr face a structural funding cliff

The VC community has absorbed the lesson that coordination-only models in B2B manufacturing struggle to reach EBITDA break-even before needing another round. Companies in this band need to either move up the value stack (quality, compliance) or demonstrate path to profitability within 18 months to raise Series A capital.

3

MetalBook's embedded finance model is the template for metals

Embedding working capital financing into the transaction flow is the most defensible move in commodity-like procurement. It creates data moats, improves velocity, and generates a yield that pure marketplace models cannot access. Expect 1–2 more players to adopt this structure in metals and industrial.

4

3–4 consolidation events likely within 24 months

Sub-scale asset-light platforms (below ₹20 Cr revenue) will either be acqui-hired by larger full-stack players seeking supplier networks, or will face attrition. Full-stack platforms are the natural acquirers — they gain supplier density without the capex of organic expansion.

DISCLAIMER

- ValPro has taken due care in the preparation of this document. All information/views provided herein have been prepared from publicly available information and proprietary database of ValPro and is believed to be reliable at the time of publication. ValPro reserves its rights to withdraw or amend information contained in this document at any time based on developments and/or new information becoming available to it.
- ValPro, and ValPro's shareholders, employees, directors, agents and representatives ('Affiliates') do not warrant the completeness or accuracy of the information contained herein and shall in no circumstance whatsoever be liable or responsible for any inaccuracies, omissions, mistakes or errors in this paper and for any economic or any other loss or damage (direct or indirect), incurred or suffered by the reader/ user or any other person, arising out of or in connection with such information/views. Any person relying on information contained herein is advised to undertake their own independent diligence, analysis and verification.
- Information contained herein is meant to be for the recipient only. By accepting the information the recipient is implicitly undertaking to keep the contents thereof as confidential. Dissemination of such information to any third party without express written consent of ValPro is prohibited. If so requested by ValPro in writing, the recipient shall be obligated to return and/or destroy this document/information retained by it in its records whether in physical or digital form.
- This document does not constitute an offer, invitation or recommendation to buy, sell, subscribe for or issue any securities or invest in any business or asset or a solicitation of any such offer or invitation. ValPro shall not be liable for any decision made by the recipient or any third party on the basis of this information.
- ValPro and its Affiliates, may have a position or vested interest in the company or businesses covered by this document or may be representing such companies or businesses in relation to their business in transactions. By receiving this information, the recipient acknowledges the fact of the aforesaid possible interest of ValPro and/or its Affiliates in the circulation of this note and waives any claims in this regard.
- By receiving this information the recipient acknowledges that any dispute arising here from shall be subject to the laws of India and shall be resolved by a sole arbitration appointed in accordance with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act 1996. The venue of arbitration shall be New Delhi and language of arbitration shall be English.