SDM Institute for Management Development (SDMIMD)

International Case Conference (ICC) 2026

Theme: Contemporary Context in Innovation, Inclusion, and Impact.

ICC26112

Meesho and the Empty-Truck Engine: Can Value Commerce Stay Profitable at ₹250 per Order?26101

*Dr. Hemanth Kumar, Professor and Head of Marketing Area,Faculty of Management Studies, CMS BUSINESS SCHOOL,JAIN (deemed-to-be University) and **Prof. Suparna Ghosal,** Adjunct Faculty, Marketing Area, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS BUSINESS SCHOOL,JAIN (deemed-to-be University) Suparna.ghosal@cms.ac.in prepared this case solely as a basis for classroom discussion. This case is not intended to serve as an endorsement, source of primary data, or illustration of either effective or ineffective managerial decision-making. Certain names and other identifying details have been disguised to protect confidentiality*

Opening Scene: A Miracle on Thin Margins

Bengaluru, early 2025. The evening traffic on Outer Ring Road had finally thinned when Meesho's senior leadership team filed into a glass-walled conference room at the company's headquarters. The lights were dimmed and a single slide glowed on the screen.

Three numbers dominated the display:

- An average order value (AOV) of roughly ₹274,

- A fulfilment cost per order a little above ₹40, and

- Annual placed orders exceeding 1.8 billion.

Beneath these figures, a compact table showed revenue from operations, variable cost per order, and free cash flow (FCF) for FY23–FY25. The last row free cash flow had turned from deeply negative in FY22–23 to over ₹1,000 crore positive in FY25 (see Exhibit 1).

"For a company that mostly sells products in the ₹200–₹400 range," said Arjun Deshpande, Meesho's CFO, "this should not be possible. On paper, it looks like a miracle. In practice, it's a miracle balanced on very thin ice."

Across the table sat co-founder and CEO Vidit Aatrey, co-founder and CTO Sanjeev Barnwal, Head of Logistics Neha Sharma, and several business and operations leaders. The slide title, written in Arjun's careful handwriting on the whiteboard behind him, read simply:

Designing a Robust Engine for Value Commerce

By several external measures, Meesho had become one of India's most significant e-commerce platforms by annual transacting users, and a serious contender on order volume. It had built a distinctive value-commerce position: serving price-sensitive consumers with low-priced, largely unbranded or regional products, and insisting that delivery fees remain negligible or zero. For many of its customers, an extra ₹10–₹15 on a ₹250 basket could mean the difference between purchase and abandonment.

Inside the company, leaders understood that Meesho's recent FCF turnaround rested on a fragile combination of scale, disciplined marketing spend, and an aggressive focus on driving fulfilment cost per order into the low-₹40s through its logistics arm, Valmo.

What was less clear and the reason for the meeting was whether that engine was robust. A model that lived on a few rupees of contribution on a ₹250 basket could not afford many shocks.

"What happens," Arjun asked the room, "if fuel prices rise sharply? If labour costs go up with new gig-worker rules? Or if we lose a key corridor because a partner has a labour dispute or a flood shuts down one route for a week?"

Silence hung over the room.

In six weeks, Meesho's board would meet for a two-day strategy offsite followed by a round of pre-IPO investor education sessions. The draft red herring prospectus was being prepared; the story they told about Meesho's engine how it worked, how fragile it was, and how it would cope with shocks would shape investor appetite.

Vidit knew the questions would not be about growth alone. They would be about the durability of Meesho's value-commerce model.

Could Meesho remain both affordable for "Bharat" and structurally profitable for its shareholders?

From "Meri Shop" to Value Commerce

Meesho short for "Meri Shop" did not begin as a logistics or unit-economics story. It began as a social commerce idea.

In the mid-2010s, Vidit and Sanjeev had watched India's smartphone revolution transform how people discovered products. WhatsApp groups, Facebook pages, and Instagram feeds were full of neighbours, relatives, and influencers curating sarees, kurtis, kitchen tools and small electronics from informal suppliers. Many of these sellers had no warehouse, formal storefront, or GST registration.

Meesho's early vision was to formalise this informal trade. The platform allowed small "resellers" often homemakers or micro-entrepreneurs to pick products from a digital catalogue, share them via social media, and earn a margin while Meesho handled logistics and payments.

Initially, most of Meesho's orders were cash-on-delivery (COD) and single-line items, often under ₹500. Returns were high; logistics costs as a percentage of order value were painful. But the team saw something important: a huge, under-served customer base outside the affluent "India 1" that most e-commerce platforms were chasing.
The question was whether Meesho could turn this dispersed, low-ticket demand into a coherent business model.

Over time, as the company shifted from a pure reseller model to a broader marketplace for small manufacturers and brands, its identity evolved as well. Meesho started to speak less about "social commerce" and more about "value commerce" a platform for India's mass-market, price-conscious shoppers buying everyday fashion, home, and lifestyle products at very low prices.

India's E-Commerce Gap

By the mid-2020s, India had become one of the fastest-growing e-commerce markets in the world. Forecasts suggested that online retail could cross US$150–200 billion within the decade. Yet the headline numbers masked a structural gap.

The first generation of Indian e-commerce was built primarily for what analysts called "India 1":

- Urban, relatively affluent customers,

- Comfortable with pre-paid digital payments,

- Buying branded and premium products with AOVs often above ₹1,000.

Quick commerce 10- to 20-minute delivery of daily essentials had deepened this urban, high-income orientation: dense, wealthy neighbourhoods justified dense networks of dark stores.

Beyond these customers, however, lay a larger, more price-sensitive population:

- Households in tier-2 and tier-3 cities and smaller towns,

- Consumers who might be buying one kurti for ₹350 or a pair of sandals for ₹280,

- Comfortable with apps, but extremely reluctant to pay ₹40–₹60 in delivery fees on top.

Internal surveys at Meesho showed that:

- In its core segments, more than 60% of orders had basket values between ₹150 and ₹350.

- When an explicit shipping charge above ₹25–₹30 was shown, conversion dropped sharply, even when product prices were discounted.

At the same time, a substantial part of India's logistics infrastructure ran under-utilised:

- Trucks travelled from large manufacturing hubs to metros or ports partially empty,

- Many vehicles ran full one way and came back under-loaded,

- Smaller towns and semi-urban clusters were often stitched into the network via spot contracts and ad hoc arrangements.

To most large e-commerce players and third-party logistics companies, this "long tail" of India's demand did not clear the unit-economics hurdle. Serving a customer with a ₹250 basket at high service standards looked unviable if the door-to-door logistics cost per order remained in the ₹70–₹90 range.

Meesho's founders saw an opportunity:

If they could lower the effective cost of moving small parcels by intelligently filling otherwise empty truck space and optimising local first and last mile, they could tap into this under-served market and still make money.

That vision would eventually coalesce into Valmo, Meesho's proprietary logistics network and into the "empty-truck engine" that underpinned its value-commerce bet.

Building a Business on ₹274 AOV

The financial trajectory of Meesho between FY23 and FY25 illustrated both the promise and the precariousness of that bet.

Exhibit 1 – Meesho Operating and Financial Metrics (FY23–FY25, Illustrative)

Metric	FY23	FY24	FY25
Placed orders (million)	1,000	1,400	1,800
Average order value – AOV (₹)	337	305	274
Fulfilment cost per order (₹)	65	52	43
Revenue from operations (₹ crore)*	~3,700	~5,100	~5,900
Contribution margin (% of revenue)**	-4%	0%	+3%
Free cash flow – FCF (₹ crore)	-800	-200	+1,050

* Revenue from operations is approximated as Meesho's take-rate on GMV, not total GMV, consistent with a low-ticket, marketplace/value-commerce model.

** Contribution margin here is after discounts, logistics and payment costs, but before fixed overheads, product development and corporate expenses; it is shown to illustrate the shift from negative to slightly positive unit economics.

Note: All figures are rounded and **illustrative**, designed to be internally consistent with the case narrative and realistic orders of magnitude. They are suitable for classroom analysis, not as a substitute for audited financial statements.

1. **AOV drifted downwards:** Average order value declined from roughly ₹337 in FY23 to around ₹274 by FY25, reflecting Meesho's deepening focus on low-price, long-tail categories and the addition of more small-ticket orders.

2. **Fulfilment cost per order fell sharply:** Internal metrics showed average variable logistics cost per shipped order moving from the mid-₹60s towards the low-₹40s, driven by Valmo's network optimisation and scale benefits.

3. **Free cash flow flipped from negative to strongly positive:** While headline profit after tax remained affected by accounting adjustments, Meesho's cash generation turned significantly positive in FY25 as marketing discipline and logistics efficiencies kicked in.

Put simply, Meesho had pulled off something many observers considered unlikely:

- It had built a business largely on ₹200–₹400 orders,
- Kept shipping fees negligible or zero for consumers, and
- Still delivered positive free cash flow at least in the most recent year.

The question was whether this engine would stay intact when subjected to shocks.

Valmo: Filling the Empty Trucks

Meesho's logistics journey initially relied on third-party logistics (3PL) providers for first mile, mid-mile and last mile. As volumes grew and its customers spread into smaller towns, pain points emerged:

- High per-parcel pricing,
- Variable service quality and non-delivery (NDR) rates,
- Limited interest from 3PLs in serving lower-density routes at aggressive prices.

The answer was Valmo short for "Value Movement" a logistics network designed explicitly for Meesho's small parcels and value-conscious segments.

Exhibit 2A – Valmo Network Scale and Internalisation of Logistics (FY23–FY25, Illustrative)

Metric	FY23	FY24	FY25
Pin codes served by Valmo (approx.)	4,500	7,200	10,000
Local / micro-hubs (first & last mile)	250	420	650
Regional hubs / sortation centres	18	26	35
Active delivery partners (riders / DA-equivalents)	25,000	40,000	60,000
Share of Meesho orders handled by Valmo	~55%	~70%	~85%
Share of Meesho orders via 3PL partners	~45%	~30%	~15%
Average drops per delivery route (urban)	14–16	18–20	22–24
Average drops per delivery route (semi-urban / rural)	7–9	9–11	11–13

Note: Figures are illustrative but consistent with the case narrative: Valmo progressively covers more pin codes, increases hub density, scales its delivery partner base, and internalises a larger share of Meesho's logistics while improving route density.

- Valmo covered thousands of pin codes across India,

- Employed or contracted tens of thousands of delivery partners,

- Handled the majority of Meesho's first and last mile, and

- Used a multi-layer network of local hubs, regional hubs, and line-haul routes to move parcels efficiently.

Valmo's design leaned on three principles:

- Orchestrated, not fully owned: Meesho owned core technology, route planning, and some infrastructure, but relied on local partners and contract logistics providers for many line-haul and last-mile operations.

- Hyper-local density: City and town clusters were carved into small catchments where Valmo could build dense routes and achieve high drops per run.

- Empty-space utilisation: Where possible, Valmo filled unused capacity in third-party trucks on key corridors turning "empty miles" into profitable moves for small parcels.

Exhibit 2B – Illustrative Journey of a Parcel Through Valmon
(Seller in Panipat to Buyer in a Village near Lucknow)

Step	Network Node / Leg	What Happens	Typical Time Window (Illustrative)	Key Cost Drivers / Risks
1	**Seller pick-up (Panipat)**	Local Valmo pickup partner receives pickup request on app, visits small textile seller's shop, scans parcel,	Same day, within 4–8 hours of order confirmation	First-mile rider cost, fuel for bike/van, failed-pickup risk if seller not ready.

----

		and confirms handover.		
2	**Local micro-hub (Panipat)**	Parcel is taken to nearest micro-hub; parcels from multiple nearby sellers are consolidated, labelled, and sorted into destination-bound bags.	Same day / overnight	Hub rent, staff wages, sorting and scanning time; error risk in labelling / routing.
3	**Regional hub / consolidation centre**	Bags from multiple micro-hubs in and around Panipat arrive at a larger regional hub. Parcels are sorted by corridor (e.g., "UP East") for outbound line-haul.	+0.5 to 1 day from pickup	Hub operating cost, cross-docking efficiency, mis-sort risk.
4	**Line-haul truck (Panipat → UP corridor)**	Parcels destined for Uttar Pradesh are loaded into a line-haul vehicle, often sharing space with other shippers' freight to utilise otherwise empty truck capacity.	Overnight / 1 day transit	Truck hire or contracted lane cost, fuel, tolls; utilisation of truck space (empty-mile risk).
5	**Destination regional hub (near Lucknow)**	Parcels arrive at a regional hub serving Lucknow and surrounding districts; they are unloaded,	Same day as arrival or +0.5 day	Handling and labour costs; capacity bottlenecks during peaks.

		scanned, and sorted into district / route-level bags.		
6	**Destination micro-hub / spoke (rural cluster)**	Parcels for a cluster of villages near Lucknow are moved to a smaller spoke hub. Routes for local delivery partners are planned based on geography and delivery density.	+0.5 day	Short-haul van cost, hub rent, route planning efficiency.
7	**Last-mile delivery partner (village)**	A Valmo delivery partner picks up parcels from the spoke hub, follows a planned route through villages, delivers the parcel to the end customer, collects any COD payment if applicable, and updates status in the app.	Same day or next day from regional hub sorting	Rider compensation, fuel, drops per route in low-density areas, cash-handling risk for COD.

Teaching use: In class, you can redraw this as a horizontal process diagram with arrows between the nodes (Seller → Micro-hub → Regional hub → Line-haul → Destination hub → Spoke → Customer), and then ask students where Valmo creates savings (e.g., shared line-haul), where fragility resides (e.g., rural last mile), and how shocks (fuel, labour, regulation) propagate through this chain.

- A local pickup partner collected the parcel and moved it to a nearby micro-hub,

- The parcel was consolidated into a line-haul movement often piggybacking on partially empty trucks heading towards major distribution nodes,

- A destination hub and local delivery partner completed the last mile in the buyer's village.

Valmo's economics depended on keeping truck and van capacity consistently utilised and on sharing infrastructure across thousands of small orders. A few percentage points of under-utilisation on multiple segments could quickly erode the margin on a ₹250 basket.

Fragility in the Empty-Truck Engine

In Arjun's words, Meesho had built "a beautiful but fragile machine." Three kinds of fragility worried him. First, volume sensitivity. If order volumes dropped in a few key routes due to a local competitor, seasonal variation, or macro slowdown the per-order cost on those legs could spike. Valmo's efficient cost structure assumed a certain density of parcels; below that, economics deteriorated quickly.

Second, cost shocks. A rise in diesel prices, new social security or insurance mandates for gig-workers, or increased tolls on key highways could raise per-kilometre costs across the network. For a business earning only a few tens of rupees in gross margin per order, even small shocks could compress or wipe out contribution.

Third, partner volatility. Valmo relied on local partners small fleet owners, franchise-like operations, and individual delivery associates. A local labour dispute, partner bankruptcy, safety incident or compliance failure could disrupt entire micro-catchments and force Meesho to scramble for alternatives at higher cost.

Complicating matters, India's policy and competitive environment was shifting:

- Early versions of labour and social security rules for platform-based workers were being discussed, with the possibility of raising effective labour costs in logistics.

- The government-backed Open Network for Digital Commerce (ONDC) was evolving, potentially altering how small merchants, logistics providers, and platforms connected.

None of these developments threatened Meesho's survival overnight but together, they raised a sharp question for the upcoming board offsite:

Was the current architecture of Valmo and Meesho's value-commerce model robust enough to withstand shocks without sacrificing the company's core promise of affordability?

Designing for Robustness

Back in the Bengaluru conference room, Arjun walked to the whiteboard and drew a triangle. At each corner he wrote:

- "Ultra-low AOV",

- "Ultra-thin margins", and

- "Ultra-fragile logistics".

"This is the triangle we chose," he said, "when we committed to value commerce at scale. We decided not to push customers into higher-order values with obvious fees, and not to climb up into premium categories. That means our engine has to be *extremely* efficient. The question is: where do we allow change, and where do we refuse to move?"

The discussion that followed circled around four themes rather than a neat list of options.

Some executives began with the logistics backbone. If Meesho wanted to keep AOV low and shipping fees negligible, perhaps the only place to buy robustness was deeper investment in the network itself. They talked about building or leasing more strategic cross-docks and sortation centres on key corridors,

locking in capacity and pricing through longer-term contracts with selected line-haul partners, and designing redundant routes for lanes that were repeatedly disrupted by weather or infrastructure failures. It would make Valmo a little heavier, more like the asset-backed models Meesho had originally set out to avoid, but it could smooth volatility in per-parcel cost and reduce dependence on fragile spot arrangements.

"Every extra rupee of cost protection we build into the system," Arjun reminded them, "has to earn its keep. We don't have the luxury of hiding inefficiency inside a ₹1,500 basket."

Others turned the conversation toward the basket itself. If the engine was constrained at the logistics end, maybe the real lever was what customers put into their carts. Product and category teams had been experimenting for months with ideas to nudge average order values upward without visibly violating the psychological barrier on total outlay. They had tried smarter cross-sell and bundled offers at checkout, pre-curated "value packs" for typical personas, and an expanded range of repeat-purchase categories like personal care and household essentials that might encourage slightly larger baskets over time.

The results had been mixed. Meesho's users, especially in its core segments, behaved in what one product manager called a "surgical" way. They often opened the app with a single item in mind, checked a few alternatives, and headed straight to checkout. When the final number on the payment screen drifted far beyond what they had mentally budgeted say, from ₹250 to ₹320 or ₹350 drop-off rates spiked. The team knew there was some headroom to grow effective AOV, but the shape of that headroom was still uncertain.

A third line of discussion focused on partners. Valmo's day-to-day execution depended on hundreds of local entrepreneurs: small fleet owners, hub operators, and franchise-like entities who hired and managed delivery associates. The model had allowed Meesho to expand quickly into smaller towns and semi-urban clusters, tapping into local knowledge and flexibility. It had also introduced variability. Service quality, safety practices, and cost discipline varied more than some executives were comfortable with.

One camp argued for more control. They wanted to see deeper, more "franchise-like" arrangements in critical micro-markets, joint investment in local infrastructure, tighter process standards, and the ability to bring certain lanes fully in-house if needed. Others worried that over-centralising would slow expansion and blunt the local edge that had made Valmo viable in harder-to-serve pin codes. The tension was not about whether partners mattered they clearly did but about where the line between orchestration and ownership should be drawn.

Then a more radical idea surfaced: a dual-rail engine inside the same platform. Instead of treating every parcel as if it belonged to the same system, could Meesho design two distinct service rails be running on shared infrastructure?

On one rail, the "value rail", the company would continue to serve its core Bharat customer: ultra-low AOV, minimal or zero explicit shipping charges, a broad assortment of unbranded and regional products, and logistics tuned ruthlessly for cost. Delivery promises might be a little looser, service guarantees a little more modest, and route design entirely optimised for density rather than speed.

On the other rail, a "priority rail" would handle selected categories, customers, or journeys that genuinely justified higher reliability and speed. Here the basket might be slightly larger or structurally better-margin; delivery promises tighter; partner standards higher; and a small, transparent fee or

---

membership model more acceptable. The same network could, in theory, carry both, but with different expectations and operational rules.

"Think of it as two logics coexisting," Arjun said. "We keep the Bharat engine running as lean as we can, but we create a stability rail where both the economics and the customer expectations support more robustness."

The room was quiet for a moment. The dual-rail idea seemed to reconcile several tensions at once, but everyone could see the complexity beneath the simplicity of the metaphor. It would require precise segmentation of products and customers, careful adjustments to pricing and packaging, non-trivial changes to routing logic and service-level agreements, and internal governance strong enough to prevent the higher-margin rail from indefinitely subsidising the value rail.

No one thought the answer would emerge from a single evening's discussion. But by the time the group broke for the night, it was clear that Meesho's empty-truck engine could no longer be evaluated only on how beautifully it worked at full scale. The board and potential investors would want to know how it behaved under stress and whether the company was prepared to redesign parts of it before the next shock arrived.

The Decision

That night, after the meeting had broken up, Vidit sat alone in his office, looking at a printed copy of the slide Arjun had shown earlier.

On one side of the page were the metrics that investors would care about in the coming months:

- Placed orders in the billions,

- AOV around ₹274,

- Fulfilment cost per order in the low-₹40s,

- Strong free cash flow in FY25 (see Exhibit 1).

On the other side scribbled in the margins during the discussion were fragments from the day's debate:

- "Strategic hubs vs asset-light purity?"

- "Bigger baskets without scaring customers at checkout?"

- "How much control over partners is enough?"

- "Two rails or one engine?"

The board offsite and investor sessions would not allow for a vague answer. They would want a coherent narrative:

- What exactly was Meesho promising to its customers?

- How robust was Valmo's engine under fuel, labour and policy shocks?

- Where would the company invest, compromise or refuse to compromise over the next three to five years?

Through the window, the ring road lights traced faint arcs of movement. Somewhere out there, an under-loaded truck was carrying small parcels from one city to another, its empty space partly filled by Meesho's value-commerce engine.

Inside, the company that had turned those empty spaces into a business now had to decide how to make that business durable.

Would Meesho:

- Double down on its pure value rail, trusting scale and incremental improvements to keep the engine afloat?

- Invest in sturdier logistics and a dual-rail design, accepting some asset intensity and complexity?

- Or quietly nudge its customers and assortment towards slightly higher baskets and a somewhat different definition of "value"?

Vidit knew he would have to walk into the offsite with one clear recommendation and be ready to defend it to a board, regulators, and investors who all saw the same numbers but might draw different conclusions.

Exhibits List (for the Case)

Note: These exhibit descriptions are for your document preparation. In the student-facing case, you'll include the actual tables/diagrams and call them "Exhibit 1", "Exhibit 2A", etc., at the relevant points.

Exhibit 3 – Unit Economics Snapshot for Meesho's Core Value-Commerce Orders (Illustrative)

Exhibit 3A – Per-Order Unit Economics (High-Density, Mature Corridor)

Assumptions for a representative FY25 order:

- Typical basket value (GMV): ₹274

- Core value-commerce category, high-density lane (metro or strong tier-2 corridor)

- Valmo network is well-utilised; costs slightly better than company-wide average in Exhibit 1

Per-Order P&L (Illustrative, FY25)

Line Item	Per Order (₹)
Customer basket value (GMV)	274
Less: Merchant payout (to seller)	(224)
Platform revenue (commission + ads/other income)	50
Less: Discounts funded by Meesho	(3)
Less: Fulfilment cost – Valmo logistics	(43)
• First mile (pickup, local hub)	(10)
• Line-haul (inter-city movement)	(15)
• Last mile (delivery, COD handling if any)	(18)
Less: Payment processing & other variable costs	(2)
Net contribution per order	+2
Contribution margin (% of platform revenue)	≈ 4%

Note: This table illustrates a typical "good" lane where density is high and Valmo runs efficiently. Company-wide averages in Exhibit 1 are lower; weaker routes and early-stage regions drag down overall contribution margins.

Exhibit 3B – Sensitivity of Contribution to Key Shocks (Per Order, Illustrative)

Base case (from Exhibit 3A)

- Platform revenue: ₹50

- Total variable cost (discounts + fulfilment + payment): ₹48

- Net contribution: ₹+2 per order

- Contribution margin: ≈ 4% of platform revenue

Impact of Shocks on a Single Order (Illustrative)

Scenario	Key Assumption Change	Variable Cost per Order (₹)	Net Contribution per Order (₹)	Contribution Margin (% of Platform Revenue)
Base case	As in Exhibit 3A	48	+2	≈ 4%
A. Fuel price ↑ 10%	Line-haul and first/last mile costs rise; fulfilment up by ~₹4	52	-2	≈ -4%
B. Labour / regulation cost ↑ 15%	Higher rider / partner costs; fulfilment up by ~₹6	54	-4	≈ -8%
C. Small AOV uplift (+₹30 GMV, same structure)	Basket value rises to ₹304; platform revenue up to ~₹56; fulfilment unchanged at ₹48	48	+8	≈ 14%

Interpretation for discussion:

- Even modest cost shocks (fuel, labour) can push a thin-margin order into negative contribution.

- Conversely, a relatively small effective AOV increase (e.g., +₹30 through bundles or additional items) can significantly strengthen per-order economics without changing the logistics backbone.

- This illustrates why Meesho's value-commerce engine is both powerful at scale and highly sensitive to changes in costs and customer basket behaviour.

Exhibit 4 – Selected Operational and Risk Indicators for Valmo (Illustrative, FY25)

Region / Corridor	On-Time Delivery (%)*	RTO / NDR Rate (% of shipped orders)**	Avg. Cost per Parcel (₹)	Avg. Drops per Route	Typical Issue Frequency (per 1,000 orders)	Notes on Risk / Fragility
Delhi–NCR (urban, high density)	96–98%	4–5%	38–40	24–26	2–3	Mature, dense routes; strong partner base; high utilisation keeps costs low and performance stable.
Bengaluru–Mysuru (tier-1 to tier-2)	94–96%	5–6%	42–44	20–22	3–4	Good density but exposed to weekend traffic and highway works; moderate disruption risk.
Mumbai–Thane–Navi Mumbai	95–97%	4–6%	40–42	22–24	3–4	High drop density and strong COD collection; congestion can cause peak-time delays.
Lucknow urban & peri-urban	92–94%	6–8%	45–48	16–18	5–6	Growing demand; semi-urban stretches create variability; micro-hub performance uneven.
UP East rural cluster (villages)	88–91%	9–11%	50–55	10–12	7–9	Low density and long routes; weather and road quality drive delays; higher COD risk and failed delivery attempts.
Rajasthan mixed corridor (Jaipur + towns)	93–95%	6–7%	46–48	18–20	4–5	Reasonable density around Jaipur; thinner volumes in satellite towns; partner attrition episodically spikes.
North-East (selected pin codes)	85–88%	10–12%	58–65	8–10	9–12	Sparse demand, challenging terrain; heavy dependence

----

					on a few line-haul partners; high fragility if one fails.
Tamil Nadu coastal belt (tier-2/3)	93–95%	6–7%	45–47	17–19	4–6	Stable demand; weather events (cyclones, heavy rains) periodically disrupt hubs and last mile.

* **On-Time Delivery (%):** Percentage of orders delivered within the promised window for that region / lane.

** **RTO / NDR:** Return-to-origin and non-delivery combined; includes refused deliveries, address issues, and repeated failed attempts.

Exhibit 4 – Summary Risk Indicators (Network-Level, Illustrative)

You can add this small summary box below the main table if you like:

Network-Level Indicator (FY25, Illustrative)	Value / Range	Interpretation for Case Discussion
Overall on-time delivery rate (Valmo-handled orders)	~93–94%	Competitive in core corridors; dips in fragile regions.
Overall RTO / NDR rate	~7–8%	Higher for rural / low-density clusters; drives extra cost.
Share of volume in "high-robustness" corridors (e.g., top 5 metro clusters)	~55–60%	Bulk of volume runs through relatively stable, dense lanes.
Share of volume in "fragile" corridors (e.g., rural, North-East, remote clusters)	~15–20%	Disproportionate risk exposure relative to revenue.
Average cost per parcel gap: best vs worst corridors	≈ ₹20–25 difference	Illustrates sensitivity of overall economics to route mix.