IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

# Heritage-Based Corporate Gifting as an Entrepreneurial Model: A Business-Model Study of Kala Vistaar for the Revival of Lesser-Known Indian Art Forms

[1]Janhavi Rampalliwar [2]Mallika Dabhade-Samant

[1]Student, Masters of Design, School of Fashion Technology, Pune

[2]Assistant Professor, School of Fashion Technology, Pune

University – School of Fashion Technology, Pune

***Abstract:*** Corporate gifting in India has grown from a seasonal courtesy into a structured marketing and HR function. The organised segment is now worth over Rs. 12,000–18,000 crore and is expanding two to three times faster than consumer gifting. Even so, most of what is on offer is generic and mass-produced, carrying little cultural or emotional meaning and easy for competitors to copy. India's craft economy faces a different problem. It supports more than seven million artisans and several critically endangered art traditions, but suffers from weak market links and the real risk that skills will not pass to the next generation. This paper enquires whether one entrepreneurial model can bridge both gaps at once. Using the heritage-based corporate gifting venture “Kala Vistaar” (Craft expansion) as a conceptual case, the study looks at the venture's business model rather than its product catalogue. The Business Model Canvas serves as the main analytical lens, and a unit-economics and break-even assessment tests financial viability. The analysis works through the model across its value proposition, customer segments, channels, customer relationships, revenue streams, key resources, activities, partnerships and cost structure, and places it within the literature on relationship-based gifting, cultural entrepreneurship and inclusive 'bottom-of-the-pyramid' enterprise. The findings suggest that a culturally anchored, artisan-collaborated gifting model can hold gross margins in the 55–63% range, reach operational break-even within the first year on a lean initial investment of about Rs. 3.5 lakh, and grow revenue from roughly Rs. 18 lakh to Rs. 75 lakh over three years. Artisan income sits directly inside the cost of goods sold rather than being treated as philanthropy. The paper concludes that heritage-based corporate gifting is a commercially viable and socially defensible form of cultural entrepreneurship, one where craft preservation is paid for by commerce, and it sets out directions for experiential testing.

***Index Terms* -** Corporate Gifting, Heritage Entrepreneurship, Business Model, Business Model Canvas, Cultural Entrepreneurship, Artisan Livelihood, Social Enterprise, Bottom of the Pyramid

## I. Introduction

Gifting holds a particular place in how business relationships are built. Beyond its symbolic and ceremonial roots, the corporate gift has become a deliberate tool for managing relationships. Companies use it to win and keep clients, recognise employees, mark milestones, and signal who they are to outside stakeholders. In India this practice has become noticeably more professional over the past decade. What used to be an ad-hoc, festival-bound courtesy now sits inside structured marketing, HR and CSR functions, with dedicated budgets and formal procurement. Industry assessments put the organised corporate gifting segment at roughly Rs. 12,000–18,000 crore and report that it is growing two to three times faster than the wider consumer gifting market. The drivers are rising business formation, the normalisation of hybrid work, and a clear shift in buyer preference toward gifts that are personalised, sustainable and experience-led [1].

What hasn't kept pace with this growth is the meaningfulness of what is actually sold. Most corporate gifts are still mass-manufactured electronics, branded stationery and confectionery hampers. These are convenient and predictable, but they carry little story or emotional weight. Competitors can copy them easily, recipients often regift or discard them, and they rarely say anything about the giver or the cultural moment of the exchange. The result is a paradox. The market is fast-growing and well-funded, yet it struggles to deliver anything distinctive, memorable or meaningful. A structural gap separates the scale of corporate demand from the supply of gifts that are culturally resonant and sustainability-conscious.

A second gap, seemingly unrelated, sits inside India's cultural economy. Handicrafts are one of the country's largest sources of non-farm rural employment, supporting more than seven million artisans and generating exports of over Rs. 32,000 crore in 2023–24 [2], [3]. Yet many of these artisans remain economically precarious. They depend on occasional fairs, seasonal demand, and layers of middlemen that shrink their share of the final price. A few art forms have earned national and international recognition, but many narrative and ritual traditions stay commercially invisible. Several are now kept alive by just a handful of families and risk dying out for lack of a viable market [9]. For these crafts the real constraint is not artistic quality but demand. Without paying, repeatable commercial channels, it makes little economic sense for an artisan's own children to carry the tradition forward.

At first glance these two gaps belong to different worlds, one a matter of corporate procurement and the other of cultural preservation. This paper argues that they are actually complementary, and that a single entrepreneurial model can bridge both. The venture examined here, Kala Vistaar ("Craft expansion"), is built on exactly this idea. It tries to turn the unmet demand for meaningful corporate gifts into a steady, recurring market for artisan work, so that craft preservation is funded by commerce instead of charity. The focus here matters: this paper studies the venture's business model, the logic by which it sets out to create, deliver and capture value, not any specific product line or catalogue. The analysis therefore steps back from individual offerings and concentrates on how the enterprise is structured.

Four questions guide the enquiry. First, how is the venture's value-creation logic structured, and can it be represented clearly through an established business-model framework? Second, how large and how reachable is the market opportunity it targets? Third, is the model financially viable given the capital and cost assumptions it makes? Fourth, what are its social and theoretical implications for cultural entrepreneurship? The objectives follow from these questions: (i) to set out the business model using the Business Model Canvas; (ii) to assess the market opportunity and competitive position; (iii) to test financial viability through unit economics and multi-year projections; and (iv) to examine the model's social impact and what it contributes to theory.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section II reviews the literature on corporate gifting, relationship marketing, cultural and craft-based entrepreneurship, and inclusive enterprise. Section III sets out the methodology. Section IV presents the business model in detail across the nine building blocks of the Business Model Canvas. Sections V and VI look at market opportunity and financial viability. Section VII covers operations and the go-to-market strategy, and Section VIII analyses risk. Section IX draws the findings together with their implications, and Section X concludes.

## II. Review of Literature

### *A. Corporate Gifting as a Relational and Branding Instrument*

Research on business gifting tends to treat the gift as a relational and communicative device rather than a simple transaction. Between buyer and seller, gifts signal commitment and help start and sustain reciprocity, smoothing exchange relationships and building trust. Between employer and employee, recognition gifts work within the wider machinery of engagement and retention. A second line of work sees the gift as an extension of brand identity: the object carries brand values, and its design, provenance and packaging communicate meaning to the person who receives it. Recent industry analysis records a strong shift in buyer preference toward personalisation, sustainability and storytelling, along with spending moving to organised players who can deliver these qualities reliably [1]. Together, these observations point to an unmet demand for distinctive, culturally anchored gifts that go beyond the standard hamper.

### *B. Relationship Marketing and the Economics of Reciprocity*

Two broader theoretical traditions sit beneath the gifting literature. The first is relationship marketing, which shifts the focus away from one-off transactions and toward building long-term, mutually beneficial relationships [12]. In this view the corporate gift is an investment in relational capital, and its returns come through retention, referral and goodwill rather than an immediate sale. The second is the anthropology of gift exchange, where the gift is bound up in cycles of obligation and reciprocity that tie giver and receiver into an ongoing relationship [11]. Both traditions suggest that a corporate gift's value is only partly practical; much of it comes from the meaning, story and recognition it carries. This supports the idea that culturally rich, story-laden gifts can generate relational value out of proportion to their unit cost, which is exactly the logic the venture is built on.

### *C. Cultural and Craft-Based Entrepreneurship*

A growing body of work looks at cultural and craft-based entrepreneurship as a route to inclusive development. Studies of Indian craft enterprises point to craft revival, livelihood creation and the empowerment of marginalised producers as the main goals of design-led, sustainability-oriented work [4], [5]. This literature builds on the idea of cultural capital, the notion that artistic and symbolic traditions are a form of capital that can be put to economic use [13]. It also draws on case evidence that profit and social purpose can sit together when artisans are treated as stakeholders and co-creators rather than cheap inputs [6]. One theme comes up repeatedly: such efforts work only when they are rooted in the artisan's own context and community, and when they create lasting market links rather than occasional, grant-dependent demand. The venture studied here can be read as an attempt to build exactly that kind of durable link through the corporate channel.

### *D. Inclusive and Bottom-of-the-Pyramid Enterprise*

Closely related is the work on inclusive business and bottom-of-the-pyramid enterprise, which argues that underserved producers and consumers can be brought into mainstream value chains in ways that are both profitable and developmental [8]. For the craft economy, this implies that artisan welfare need not be funded from outside. It can be built into the cost base of a commercially run enterprise, so that every unit sold directly pays for producer livelihoods. The Business Model Canvas offers a useful design vocabulary for showing how such an enterprise organises value creation, delivery and capture across nine connected building blocks [7]. The Canvas fits ventures with mixed commercial and social aims especially well, because it makes plain how social impact is wired into resources, activities, partnerships and costs rather than tacked on as a separate activity.

### *E. The Preservation Imperative for Endangered Crafts*

Records of India's folk traditions show that several narrative and ritual art forms are now critically endangered. Some are kept going by a single practising family and once depended on systems of patronage that have largely vanished [9]. The case for preservation is therefore as much economic as cultural. Without paying markets, these crafts are less and less likely to pass to the next generation. That reframes preservation as a problem of market design, not just conservation, and it calls for entrepreneurial responses rather than purely custodial ones.

### *F. Research Gap*

Corporate gifting, relationship marketing and craft entrepreneurship have each drawn scholarly attention, but bringing the three together has not. A business-to-business gifting enterprise built specifically around endangered art forms, with those crafts at the core of its value proposition, remains largely unexamined. Most existing craft-enterprise cases are direct-to-consumer or grant-assisted. The B2B gifting route, with its own economics of bulk orders, customisation and recurring corporate demand, has not been studied as a model for craft revival. This paper pursues that enquiry through a structured, single-case study of the Kala Vistaar business model.

## III. Research Methodology

### A. Research Design

This study uses a qualitative, conceptual single-case design. The case method suits a study like this one, where the subject is a current phenomenon examined in depth in its real-world setting and the question is exploratory, aimed at analytical rather than statistical generalisation. The unit of analysis is the Kala Vistaar venture and its documented business plan for the financial year 2025–2026. Because the venture has not yet launched, the design has to be analytical and descriptive. It tests how coherent and plausible the proposed model is, rather than measuring actual market results.

### B. Data Sources

The analysis draws on secondary data. The internal sources are the venture's own planning documents, including its objectives, value proposition, revenue design, cost structure and financial projections. The external sources are published industry reports on the Indian gifting and handicrafts markets, government data from the Office of the Development Commissioner (Handicrafts), and academic and practitioner literature on gifting, relationship marketing and craft entrepreneurship [1]–[6], [8], [9]. Checking the venture's internal projections against external benchmarks lets its assumptions be weighed for reasonableness rather than taken at face value.

### C. Analytical Framework

Two analytical lenses are applied in turn. The first is the Business Model Canvas, used to break the venture into its nine building blocks (value proposition, customer segments, channels, customer relationships, revenue streams, key resources, key activities, key partnerships and cost structure) and to check whether the design holds together [7]. The second is a unit-economics and break-even analysis, used to judge financial viability by looking at per-unit margins, the split between fixed and variable operating costs, and the revenue path needed to reach and hold profitability. The two lenses complement each other. The Canvas shows whether the model is coherent; the financial analysis shows whether it is viable.

### D. Scope and Limitations

This design carries several limitations. First, the figures are planned rather than realised; the favourable projections rest on assumptions about conversion rates, artisan capacity and seasonal demand that have not been tested against real trading data. Second, a single case supports analytical but not statistical generalisation, so the conclusions are propositions to test further, not settled facts. Third, in line with the venture's own preference, the study stays away from specific product details and keeps to the business model. The concluding section returns to these limits and names empirical validation as the priority for future research.

## IV. The Business Model

This section sets out the venture's business model using the nine building blocks of the Business Model Canvas. In keeping with the study's scope, it deals with the structural logic of value creation, delivery and capture rather than any particular product or offering.

### A. Value Proposition

The venture's value proposition rests on one connecting idea: a corporate gift can serve three groups at once whose interests are usually treated as separate. For the corporate buyer it offers differentiation, story and recognition, an artisan-collaborated object that shows cultural intent and is hard for competitors to copy. For the artisan it offers access to a premium, recurring and well-paying market. For the endangered tradition it offers a commercial reason to survive. So the proposition is not mainly about the object that changes hands but about the meaning, provenance and impact bundled with it. Value is created where corporate need, artisan livelihood and cultural revival meet, and it is communicated through storytelling and verifiable provenance rather than material specification alone. This makes the venture a cultural-storytelling brand that uses gifting as its medium, rather than an ordinary seller of goods.

### B. Customer Segments

The model targets two segments of different priority. The primary one is business-to-business: HR, administration and marketing decision-makers in mid-sized and larger organisations in sectors such as technology, financial services, consulting, FMCG and design, mostly in metropolitan markets. Their buying is tied to occasions, including festivals, onboarding, employee milestones, conferences and CSR campaigns, and it comes in bulk with a willingness to pay for customisation. The secondary segment is a direct-to-consumer market of culturally aware urban professionals and the diaspora, valued less for volume than for the brand visibility and margin it adds. In terms of mindset, both groups prefer authenticity and provenance over generic luxury, and both show a clear willingness to pay more for story and uniqueness.

### *C. Channels*

Distribution is deliberately direct and asset-light. The main channel is relationship-led B2B outreach to procurement and people-function decision-makers, backed by a digital storefront, social media, and a presence at design fairs and trade shows that lend credibility and visibility. Going direct protects margin, keeps the brand narrative intact, and, most importantly, holds a direct link between buyer and artisan that is central to the value proposition. The channels therefore do double duty, acting as routes to market and as vehicles for storytelling, carrying the provenance story along with the sale.

### *D. Customer Relationships*

Customer relationships rest on personalised service, narrative and experiential engagement, and features built to bring in recurring revenue. These include consultative customisation for corporate clients, referral incentives that turn happy buyers into a low-cost acquisition channel, and subscription or programmatic gifting that converts one-off festival demand into predictable, repeat orders. The relationship also continues after delivery: the social impact of each order is documented and sent back to the client for use in its own reporting. That turns the relationship into an ongoing exchange of value rather than a single sale, and it raises switching costs through shared narrative and impact data.

### *E. Revenue Streams*

Revenue is spread across four streams that balance scale, margin and seasonality. Bulk corporate orders make up the largest share, providing most of the first-year revenue along with volume and predictability. Customised and premium-tier solutions, which carry higher unit values and brand-specific personalisation, form the second stream. A direct-to-consumer stream adds extra margin and brand reach, while limited-edition, scarcity-marketed festive pieces capture the seasonal peaks. The venture prices on value rather than cost, setting prices against the cultural and emotional value delivered, not production cost alone. It arranges its offering across tiered price points, which lets it charge different buyer types and budgets differently without splintering the brand.

### *F. Key Resources*

The model's key resources are mostly intangible and relational. The first is the network of direct relationships with artisan clusters, which secures authenticity, supply and a defensible cost advantage by cutting out middlemen. Just as important are the brand's intellectual property and storytelling method, the set approach to documenting provenance and turning craft into narrative, along with its design and curation skill. Physical assets are kept to a minimum early on, reflecting a lean, founder-led structure. Holding value in relationships and method rather than fixed assets is a defining feature of the model, and it is a major reason the venture is both capital-efficient and hard to copy.

### *G. Key Activities*

The venture's key activities run along the value chain from sourcing to fulfilment: curating art traditions and turning them into functional, brandable formats; commissioning and coordinating artisan production; running quality control to get the consistency corporate clients expect; assembly and packaging; and marketing and demand generation. Underpinning all of these is storytelling, the steady work of documenting and communicating provenance and impact. This is not a side activity but a central one, because it is how cultural heritage is turned into perceived and, in the end, realised economic value.

### *H. Key Partnerships*

The model leans heavily on partnerships. Artisan clusters are the primary partners, brought in as long-term collaborators rather than one-off suppliers, and the durability of these relationships is itself a strategic asset. Secondary partners include packaging and print vendors working print-on-demand, courier and logistics providers, and freelance design and content specialists hired by the project. This setup lets the venture stay asset-light and scale capacity up or down with demand without taking on heavy fixed commitments, shifting much of the risk of swinging volumes into a flexible cost structure.

### *I. Cost Structure*

The cost structure is dominated by variable, production-linked costs, and artisan payments are the single largest item. By design, this puts producer welfare directly inside the cost of goods sold. The other variable costs are raw materials, packaging, logistics and quality assurance. Fixed and semi-fixed costs, such as a modest founder stipend, part-time marketing support, workspace, software and compliance, are kept deliberately low in the early stage. Having more variable than fixed cost lowers operating-leverage risk and helps the venture break even early, as the financial analysis in Section VI shows. Table I brings the model together across all nine building blocks.

TABLE I

*BUSINESS MODEL CANVAS — KALA VISTAAR*

| Building Block | Description |
|---|---|
| Value Proposition | Differentiated, narrative-rich corporate gifts that revive endangered art forms while serving buyer, artisan and tradition |
| Customer Segments | Primary premium B2B (HR/Admin/Marketing); secondary D2C and diaspora buyers |
| Channels | Direct B2B outreach, digital storefront, social media, design fairs and expos |
| Customer Relationships | Consultative service, storytelling, referral and subscription/programmatic gifting |
| Revenue Streams | Bulk B2B, customisation, D2C, limited-edition seasonal drops; value-based pricing |
| Key Resources | Direct artisan network, brand IP, storytelling methodology, design capability |
| Key Activities | Curation, artisan commissioning, quality control, assembly, marketing, storytelling |
| Key Partnerships | Artisan clusters, packaging/print vendors, courier and design partners |
| Cost Structure | Variable-dominant: artisan payments, materials, packaging, logistics; lean fixed costs |

## V. MARKET OPPORTUNITY AND COMPETITIVE POSITIONING

### *A. Industry Overview and Sizing*

India's corporate gifting market is one of the fastest-growing B2B segments in the economy. The wider gifting market is estimated at around Rs. 15,000–20,000 crore and is expected to grow at 12–15% a year through 2028, with the corporate segment outpacing the consumer one [1]. A few structural forces keep this going: a steadily more formal economy and a rising number of registered firms; employee engagement and recognition becoming standard HR priorities; growing CSR budgets; and a cultural move toward premium, personalised business relationships. Within this growing market, the heritage and artisan-gifting niche is still young, with penetration estimated below three per cent. That low figure points both to a large unmet demand for culturally meaningful gifts and to plenty of room for an early entrant to take category leadership.

### *B. Segmentation and Target Market*

The venture segments the market by firm type and by occasion. The core target is mid-sized and larger organisations that have structured gifting budgets and a brand sensibility that values cultural intent, typically firms in technology, financial services, consulting, design and FMCG in metropolitan markets. Inside these organisations, the relevant decision-makers sit in HR, administration and marketing. Occasions give a second cut: festival gifting, client onboarding and appreciation, employee milestones, conference and event favours, and CSR campaigns each carry their own demand patterns, volumes and price sensitivities. A secondary direct-to-consumer segment of culturally aware professionals and the diaspora widens reach and helps build the brand without diluting the main B2B focus.

### *C. Competitive Landscape and Differentiation*

The competitive landscape splits into two groups, and neither holds the position the venture is aiming for. The first is generic corporate-gifting vendors that compete on scale, price and logistics but bring no cultural depth, storytelling or artisan link; their products are weakly differentiated and easy to swap out. The second is ethnic and craft marketplaces that sell artisan-made goods but are built mainly for direct-to-consumer retail, are not set up for B2B bulk and customisation, and do not concentrate on lesser-known, endangered traditions. The venture stands apart by working on several fronts at once: an exclusive focus on lesser-known art forms, built-in storytelling, direct artisan sourcing, modern everyday usefulness, and deep B2B customisation. It is the combination of these traits, not any single one, that incumbents in either group would find hard to match quickly.

### *D. Positioning Strategy*

The venture positions itself in a premium tier, above mass-market gifting but below ultra-luxury. In this band buyers expect distinctiveness and quality yet stay within the reach of corporate procurement budgets. The brand's narrative-first identity reinforces this position, as does the scarcity that comes with sourcing from endangered traditions, which adds authenticity and a sense of urgency. Together, the many-sided differentiation and the direct artisan relationships give a first-mover advantage and the basis for a defensible moat, examined further in Section IX.

## VI. Financial Viability and Unit Economics

### *A. Capital Structure and Initial Investment*

The venture is built around a deliberately lean capital structure. The initial investment is estimated at about Rs. 3,50,000, spread across brand and identity work, a website and e-commerce capability, early sample and prototype production, packaging development, content creation, a launch-marketing budget, statutory registrations, and a working-capital buffer for the first few months. The small size of this requirement is itself strategic. It lowers the barrier to entry, reduces the need for outside financing early on, and lets the founder keep control while the model is being proven. The asset-light design, leaning on partner capacity rather than owned production, is the main reason the capital requirement stays low relative to the revenue the model is meant to support.

### *B. Operating Cost Structure*

Monthly operating cost in the early stage is estimated at about Rs. 1,64,000: direct production costs of around Rs. 77,000, indirect and operational costs of around Rs. 70,000, and overheads of around Rs. 17,000. The direct part, mostly artisan payments and materials, rises and falls with volume and so behaves as a variable cost, while the indirect and overhead parts are largely fixed or semi-fixed. The fairly high share of variable cost matters. It means margin holds even at low volumes, and the enterprise is not weighed down by heavy fixed obligations that would push back break-even or deepen losses during the ramp-up.

### *C. Unit Economics*

Unit economics are favourable across the range. As Table II shows, representative gross margins fall between 55% and 63%, reflecting value-based pricing and the cost advantage of sourcing straight from artisans. Entry-tier sets earn margins of about 60%, mid-tier sets a little higher at around 63%, and premium sets around 60%. Fully customised B2B orders, which use more production inputs, still hold margins near 55%. Because margin stays steady across tiers, the model's profitability does not hinge on a single price point but holds up across the spread of buyer budgets it serves.

TABLE II

*REPRESENTATIVE UNIT ECONOMICS BY TIER*

| Tier | Price (Rs.) | COGS (Rs.) | Gross Margin |
|---|---|---|---|
| Entry-tier set | 1,500 | 600 | 60% |
| Mid-tier set | 2,800 | 1,050 | 63% |
| Premium-tier set | 5,500 | 2,200 | 60% |
| Custom B2B (avg.) | 3,200 | 1,440 | 55% |

### *D. Revenue Projections and Break-even*

Overall, the venture projects gross revenue of about Rs. 18,00,000 in year one, rising to Rs. 36,00,000 in year two and Rs. 75,00,000 in year three, as both the artisan-partner base and the corporate-client base grow. Table III summarises the three-year path. Year one runs an operating deficit covered by the initial investment, which is normal for a venture still finding its feet. From year two onward, operating spend is planned to grow more slowly than revenue, which narrows the losses and turns earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortisation (EBITDA) positive by year three, at a net margin in the mid-teens. The venture aims to reach operational break-even within the first year, around the ninth or tenth month. That target looks credible given the mix of high gross margins and a low fixed-cost base. The main sensitivities are the rate of client conversion and how reliably artisans can deliver during seasonal peaks. Because fixed costs are low, though, the model bends rather than breaks under bad scenarios, a point taken up in the risk analysis.

TABLE III

*THREE-YEAR FINANCIAL SUMMARY (RS.)*

| Metric | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gross Revenue | 18,00,000 | 36,00,000 | 75,00,000 |
| COGS (~40%) | 7,20,000 | 13,50,000 | 27,00,000 |
| Gross Profit | 10,80,000 | 22,50,000 | 48,00,000 |
| Total OPEX | 19,68,000 | 24,00,000 | 36,00,000 |
| EBITDA | (8,88,000) | (1,50,000) | 12,00,000 |

## VII. OPERATIONS AND GO-TO-MARKET STRATEGY

### *A. Organisational Structure*

The venture runs on a lean, founder-led structure, with a thin layer of operational and marketing capability and a wider network of outside partners. Early on, the founder focuses on brand vision, curation, key client relationships and the storytelling framework, while a small core team handles day-to-day coordination and marketing. Artisan partners, designers, packaging vendors and photographers are brought in flexibly, by the project. This keeps fixed staff costs low and the venture nimble, though, as the risk analysis notes, it also concentrates dependence on the founder. The venture addresses that weak point through early documentation and delegation.

### *B. Fulfilment and Quality Model*

Fulfilment follows a set, repeatable sequence: client briefing and specification; commissioning the right artisan cluster; confirming material availability; artisan production; quality inspection against a documented standard; in-house assembly and packaging with the narrative collateral; dispatch through established courier partners with tracking; and post-delivery follow-up, including a record of artisan impact. Lead times vary by order type, from short turnarounds for samples to several weeks for customised, higher-value orders, with a faster option at a premium. The quality model, built on standard checklists and a clear rework policy, is essential to the proposition, because corporate clients need a consistency that handcrafted production does not guarantee on its own. Managing the tension between artisanal variation and corporate uniformity is therefore a core operational skill for the enterprise.

### *C. Technology Enablement*

The technology is deliberately lightweight and built on accessible platforms: a storefront with integrated payments, standard design and CRM tools, inventory tracking, and, central to the value proposition, digital storytelling through codes that link the physical object to artisan documentation and impact content. This stack supports operations and reinforces the brand narrative without much capital cost, in line with the venture's asset-light philosophy.

### *D. Go-to-Market Phasing*

The go-to-market strategy runs in three phases over the first year. The foundation phase sets up the brand identity, the digital presence and a qualified pipeline of target organisations, and starts relationship-led outreach. The pilot phase wins an initial group of clients, launches the digital catalogue and inquiry tools, and switches on a referral mechanism, using early orders to build proof points and testimonials. The scale phase focuses on the pre-festival procurement peak, brings in scarcity-marketed limited editions, and widens outreach to larger procurement and CSR functions. Entering the market in this order lets the venture learn and refine its proposition on a small base before spending to scale, which lowers the risk of expanding too soon.

### *E. Marketing and Demand Generation*

Demand generation is content-led and split by channel. Visual, story-rich content on image-based social platforms builds brand affinity and reach with the secondary consumer segment, while professional-network content aimed at people-function and procurement decision-makers serves the primary B2B segment. Search-oriented content, email to existing clients, and targeted paid acquisition round these out. The marketing model is therefore tied closely to the storytelling at the heart of the value proposition. The same narrative assets that make the offering distinctive also drive its discovery, so spending on brand-building and on demand generation works together rather than at cross purposes.

## VIII. Risk Assessment and Mitigation

The model faces a set of identifiable risks, each with a matching response. Supply and quality risk comes from depending on a small number of artisans, several of them practising endangered crafts, which leaves the venture open to disruption and to uneven output. The responses are keeping more than one partner per art form, holding buffer stock for peak demand, enforcing documented quality-control standards with a clear rework policy, and investing in artisan training to reduce variation over time. Demand risk, the slow awareness and adoption that an early-stage brand creating a new category tends to face, is handled through a strong digital presence, seeded gifting to build visibility, referral incentives that turn early adopters into advocates, and revenue spread across B2B, D2C and seasonal streams so the venture does not lean on any single source of demand.

Founder-dependency risk is built into the lean structure, which holds critical knowledge and relationships in one person. The venture reduces this by writing down standard operating procedures from the start and delegating operational responsibility early, so the enterprise depends less and less on any single individual over time. Financial risk centres on the late-payment patterns common in B2B sales and the strain they put on working capital. Advance-payment policies, clear contract terms and disciplined cash management address this, and the low fixed-cost base means discretionary spend can be cut quickly if revenue disappoints. Competitive and pricing risks, namely imitation by larger players and pressure on artisan prices, are longer-term. Here the defence lies in the depth of the venture's first-mover relationships and curation, which are slow to copy, and in fair-trade pricing that keeps supply stable. A formal contingency plan covers bad scenarios, including cutting spend, focusing on existing accounts, and adding a subscription option to lock in advance cash flow if revenue falls well short of target. The risk profile is what you would expect of an early-stage venture, but it is contained by the model's low fixed costs and diversified demand.

## IX. Findings and Discussion

### *A. Commercial Viability*

The analysis produces four main findings. The first is about commercial viability. For the artisan-collaborated model, gross margins of 55–63%, a cost base tilted toward variable rather than fixed costs, and a diversified revenue mix together support an early operational break-even and a believable path to profitability by year three on modest capital. The financial logic holds together: low fixed costs both cut the volume needed to break even and limit the downside if growth comes slower than planned. On the venture's own assumptions, then, the enterprise is not just aspirational but structurally able to sustain itself within a realistic time frame.

### *B. Social Value Creation*

The second finding is about social value. Because artisan payment sits directly inside the cost of goods sold rather than being added on as philanthropy, every unit sold automatically funds producer livelihoods. This feature lines the venture up with inclusive-business and bottom-of-the-pyramid thinking, where underserved producers are brought into mainstream value chains on commercial terms [8]. The model thus turns craft preservation into a question of market design. Instead of relying on grants or subsidies, the art form's survival is paid for by the same transactions that generate commercial return. Social impact and commercial activity do not pull against each other here; they are produced together, which is arguably the model's most distinctive contribution.

### *C. Strategic Defensibility*

The third finding is about strategic defensibility. The venture's advantage comes not from any single feature but from several working at once, namely direct artisan relationships, deep cultural curation, storytelling capability and B2B customisation, combined with first-mover depth in a young niche. Relationships with artisans practising endangered crafts are scarce by nature and slow to build, and the brand's narrative method is tacit and built up over time rather than easily copied. These conditions form a moat that price-based competitors cannot wear down quickly, which suggests early entry brings lasting rather than fleeting advantage.

### *D. Theoretical and Managerial Implications*

The fourth finding is about what this means for theory and practice. In theory, the case adds to the literature on craft and cultural entrepreneurship [4], [5], [6] by showing a B2B, gifting-anchored route to craft revival that differs from the mostly direct-to-consumer or grant-assisted models documented before. It also shows, concretely, how the Business Model Canvas can wire social impact into the structural parts of a venture, namely resources, activities, partnerships and costs, rather than treating it as a separate corporate-responsibility activity [7], [8]. For managers and entrepreneurs, the case offers a template they can reuse: find a high-value, meaning-seeking commercial demand; connect it directly to an underserved pool of cultural producers; and capture the resulting value through narrative and customisation while keeping producer welfare in the cost base. For policymakers focused on craft preservation, the model suggests that support aimed at creating and linking markets may last longer than conservation funding alone. Given the venture's pre-revenue status, these implications are offered as propositions to test rather than settled conclusions.

## X. CONCLUSION

This paper examined Kala Vistaar ("Craft expansion") as an entrepreneurial model that bridges two structural gaps in the Indian economy at once: on the demand side, the shortage of meaningful, differentiated corporate gifts, and on the supply side, the precarity of artisans practising lesser-known and endangered art forms. Keeping to the business model rather than any product line, the study used the Business Model Canvas to set out the venture's logic of value creation, delivery and capture, and a unit-economics and break-even analysis to test its financial viability.

The analysis supports four conclusions. The model is commercially viable on its stated assumptions, holding healthy gross margins and a credible path to profitability on lean capital. It is socially generative, funding artisan livelihoods through commerce rather than charity by keeping producer payment inside its cost of goods sold. It is strategically defensible, drawing a durable moat from scarce artisan relationships and a storytelling capability built up over time. And it is theoretically instructive, showing a B2B, gifting-anchored route to craft revival and a concrete way to wire social impact into the structure of a venture.

The paper's contribution is to bring together two areas, corporate gifting and craft revival, that have so far been studied apart, and to show that joining them can be both profitable and developmental. Its main limitation is that the evidence rests on planned rather than realised performance; the projections, though internally coherent and benchmarked against outside data, still need to be proven in the market. Future research should test the model against real trading data once the venture is running, look at how well it transfers to other art forms and regions, move to experiential testing of how recipients respond, and measure its effect on artisan livelihoods over time. Subject to that validation, heritage-based corporate gifting looks like a commercially viable and socially defensible model of cultural entrepreneurship, one where the preservation of cultural heritage is paid for, sustainably and at scale, by the very commerce it makes possible.

## XI. Acknowledgment

The authors thank the School of Fashion Technology, Pune, for institutional support during the preparation of this study, and gratefully acknowledge the guidance received throughout the research and business-planning process.

## References

**[1]** TechSci Research, "India Gifting Market — By Type, Occasion and Distribution Channel: Forecast and Opportunities, 2030," 2024.
**[2]** India Brand Equity Foundation (IBEF), "Indian Handicrafts Industry: Trends, Growth and Export Opportunities," 2024.
**[3]** Office of the Development Commissioner (Handicrafts), Ministry of Textiles, Government of India.
**[4]** S. Dhar et al., "Sustainable Craft Culture: Socio-Cultural Drivers and Economic Impact on Sustainable Development," Sustainable Development, Wiley, 2025.
**[5]** "Designing Innovative Craft Enterprises in India: A Framework for Change Makers," She Ji / Elsevier (ScienceDirect), 2022.
**[6]** "Bridging Profit and Purpose through Social Entrepreneurship: The Case of Rangsutra Crafts India," Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 2021.
**[7]** A. Osterwalder and Y. Pigneur, Business Model Generation. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
**[8]** C. K. Prahalad, The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty Through Profits. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing, 2005.
**[9]** Robb Report India, "Six Indian Art Forms That Are Disappearing and the Artists Keeping Them Alive," 2023.
**[10]** Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), industry briefings on corporate gifting and premium B2B procurement trends, 2023–2024.
**[11]** M. Mauss, The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies. London: Routledge, 1990 (orig. 1925).
**[12]** L. L. Berry, "Relationship Marketing," in Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing, American Marketing Association, 1983.
**[13]** P. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, New York: Greenwood, 1986.