DEEPAK CYBIT | VADODARA · PUNE · MUMBAI

SALES DECK
2026 EDITION

COMPLIHUB

One system of record.
One audit trail.
Every standard you are held to.

ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and ISO 45001 conformity, statutory occupational-safety compliance, pollution control board returns and consents, and a defensible 21 CFR Part 11 position — on one platform, across every plant.

ISO 9001:2015 **ISO 14001:2015** **ISO 45001:2018** **ISO/IEC 17025:2017** **21 CFR Part 11** **Factories Act 1948** **Water Act 1974** **Air Act 1981** **EP Act 1986** **Hazardous Wastes Rules 2016** **EIA Notification 2006** **29 CFR 1910 PSM**

THE PROBLEM

Manufacturers do not fail audits because they were careless.

They fail because the evidence that they were careful lives in eleven different places. The work was done. Proving it was done, in the order it was supposed to be done, by people authorised to do it, is a separate project — and it is the project that consumes the fortnight before every audit.

WHY IT HAPPENS

Four failure modes, none of which are about effort

Parallel systems that must agree

A findings spreadsheet, a shared drive of signed PDFs, a training register in HR's system, a CAPA tracker owned by one person. Every one of them has to say the same thing on audit day.

Evidence reconstructed, not recorded

The permit was approved on WhatsApp. The approval that mattered happened somewhere the record does not reach, so it gets written up afterwards from memory.

Authority assumed, not enforced

Nothing stops the person who raised a nonconformity from closing it. The rule exists in the procedure and nowhere in the software.

Records without meaning

A signature that records a click, not what the signer was attesting to. It proves somebody pressed a button.

WHAT IT COSTS

The same four costs, at every plant we walk into

- A fortnight of senior time before every certification and surveillance audit — six people, two weeks, reconstructing what was already done.
- Findings that stay open because nobody owns the clock, and nobody can see the clock.
- A second plant that cannot be compared to the first, because neither counts the same things the same way.
- The audit finding you did not need to take, because the evidence existed and could not be produced in the room.

THE IDEA

Make evidence a by-product of doing the work.

Not an activity that follows it. If the permit is issued in the system, the approval trail already exists. If the finding is raised from the checklist item, the link to its evidence already exists. Nothing has to be assembled later, because nothing was ever apart.

WHAT IT IS

One platform, not three systems reconciled by hand

45
Workflow modules, independently licensable

17
Frameworks mapped clause by clause

10/14
OSHA PSM elements covered

1
Audit trail, across every module

A finding raised from an audit checklist, an unsafe act observed on the shop floor and a corrective action arising from an incident are the same workflow in the same place — one register, one severity scale, one aging clock, one closure rule.

Quality, environment, safety, process safety and the statutory layer

MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

- Audits and audit programme
- Findings, root cause, CAPA
- Controlled documents and revisions
- Objectives and management review
- Risk, context and interested parties
- Compliance obligations and evaluations
- Suppliers, customers, design

PLANT, STATUTORY AND THE REGULATOR

- Permit to work, with configurable forms
- Incidents, emergency preparedness
- Management of change, HAZOP, PSSR
- Occupational health, exposure, PPE
- Statutory registers and appointments
- Consents, clearances, board correspondence
- Waste log, consumption, monitoring
- MPCB Form IV and Form V, derived
- Batch manufacturing records, recall

HOW IT IS BUILT

Four decisions that make the evidence hold up

One authorisation model, enforced everywhere

The same rules apply in the screen, the query, the export and the admin console. There is no back door that a report can walk through.

One approval engine, used by everything

Sequential approvals, refusal of self-approval, and a refusal to route at all when no approver is configured. It never auto-approves and never picks a default.

Approved records are immutable

Nothing submitted, approved or effective is quietly edited or deleted. The revision that was effective on a date three years ago is still retrievable, with its approval history.

One audit trail, written by the transaction

Not a log somebody remembered to write. The trail is produced by the same transaction that changed the record, with the acting user on it.

MULTI-SITE

The boundary between plants is structural, not conventional.

One organisation, a corporate office and its plants. Every operational record is site-scoped in one place, enforced by a registry that a regression test checks on every build — a module added without registering fails the build rather than leaking across plants. Corporate sees every site side by side; a plant sees its own.

THE POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

The annual returns are not a form. They are a year of records you either kept or did not.

Form IV and Form V ask for waste by category and movement, water and fuel by category, production against consented quantity, and stack and effluent results against prescribed limits — for a year that has already ended. A fortnight in June spent reconstructing them from weighbridge slips and meter books is the normal way this is done, and it is why the figures are hard to defend when somebody asks where one came from.

HOW WE DO IT DIFFERENTLY

The return derives itself, and then a person reviews it

Four registers, kept as the year happens

The consent and its conditions, the waste log with its Form 10 manifests, water, fuel, raw material and production readings, and stack and effluent monitoring against the consent's own limits.

The return is a query, not a compilation

Raise it for the period and every derivable cell fills from those registers. Parts A to F of both MPCB forms derive. What is left is review, not archaeology.

An override is a signed variance

Change a derived figure and the system keeps what the records said beside what you declared, and asks why. A form that quietly accepted the edit would be a spreadsheet with extra steps.

Filed means filed

Draft, submitted, approved, filed — with filing a separate permission from preparing. Once filed the return is immutable, because the figures are what you told a regulator. A correction is a revised filing, not an edit.

A consent used to appear when granted and vanish until it expired

- The application that produced it — fees, the board's query, your reply, the decision — so a renewal sitting with the board for four months stops looking identical to one nobody has started.
- Every numbered condition as a tracked obligation with an owner and an evaluation cycle. "Never evaluated" is reported separately from "compliant", because a condition nobody checked is not one that passed.
- Directions and show-cause notices, with the deadline they set. That reminder runs at 6am — earlier than every other clock in the system, because every other one chases paperwork and this one chases the thing that can close a plant.
- Board inspections, where each observation becomes a finding and runs through the same closure route as any other nonconformity.
- Environmental clearance, its conditions, and the half-yearly compliance report — plus public liability insurance and the Environment Relief Fund contribution a board asks for by name.

WHAT THIS CATCHES

Four findings an inspector produces that a spreadsheet cannot

A Form 10 copy that never came back

The manifest is a six-copy document, and the copies that return are what prove the consignment arrived. A dispatch still missing them after thirty days is surfaced.

Waste held past the permitted period

Aged from the date it arrived in store. A holding with no arrival date is reported as unanswerable rather than as compliant — the wrong answer confidently given is the failure mode here.

A facility whose authorisation had lapsed

Checked on the day the waste left, not today. Sending waste to a lapsed TSDF is the generator's breach, not only the operator's.

A consent limit laxer than the notified standard

Put side by side as a question, never asserted as a finding. A consent may lawfully be stricter; it may not be laxer, and a site working to it in good faith has no way of noticing.

What we map, clause by clause — and where we declare gaps

Framework	Position
ISO 9001 / 14001 / 45001	Mapped clause by clause, with the gaps named in the mapping document
Factories Act 1948 · OSH Code 2020	The statutory register layer a labour inspector opens first
Water Act · Air Act · EP Act · waste rules	Consents and their conditions, the annual returns, environmental clearance — mapped duty by duty for MPCB and GPCB
29 CFR 1910.119 (PSM)	10 of 14 elements. We say which four, in writing
21 CFR Part 11	No product is compliant — half of Part 11 is procedural. We state what ships, what is yours, and what is being built
ISO/IEC 17025	Covered in half, and it is the predictable half. The laboratory verdict is not ours
Not in the product	LIMS. Payroll, wages and attendance. Written lock-out/tag-out procedures per machine. Said before you find out yourself

HOW TO JUDGE ANY VENDOR

Four questions most vendors will not answer in writing

- Can one person raise, investigate and close the same major nonconformity? — Ours refuses it in the service layer.
- Show me the SOP revision that was effective on the date of an incident three years ago. — Approved revisions are immutable and stay retrievable.
- What happens if no approver is configured for this permit type on night shift? — It refuses to route and says so.
- Can I export everything, and what happens to my data if we part ways? — Standard PostgreSQL, documented schema, CSV on every list. No proprietary format.

Ask these of us and of everyone else you are evaluating. Ask for the answers in writing.

IMPLEMENTATION

Evidence inside the first month, the spine inside ninety days

Phase	Scope	What exists at the end of it
Weeks 1–2	Foundation	Sites, departments, users, roles, access matrix. The site boundary is real from day one, so a later plant is an addition, not a migration
Weeks 3–5	First live module	The workflow with the sharpest daily pain — usually Permit to Work, Findings or Documents — genuinely in production with real users
Weeks 5–8	The improvement loop	Findings, root cause, CAPA, effectiveness. Every other module now has somewhere to send a problem
Weeks 7–10	Governance	Controlled documents, audit programme, objectives, management review — the certification-facing spine
Weeks 9–12	Domain modules	Incidents, MOC, HAZOP, PSSR, occupational health, BBS, emergency preparedness

COMMERCIALS

Priced by edition and by plant, not by seat games

Edition	Who it is for	Per year
Starter	Single plant chasing certification. Up to 50 named users	**₹2,40,000**
IMS Core	Certified manufacturer consolidating spreadsheets	**₹5,50,000**
Process Plant	Chemical, petrochemical, pharma, fertiliser	**₹9,50,000**
Enterprise IMS	Multi-plant group with a corporate HSE function	**₹17,50,000**

Additional plants at roughly 55% of the first. Implementation from ₹75,000 one-time, billed 50% on signing, 40% on UAT, 10% on go-live. Cloud or on-premise. Subscription or perpetual licence — capital budget is often easier to find than revenue budget. All figures exclude GST.

THE BENEFIT CASE

Built from your numbers, not our benchmarks

- We model the activities this replaces — audit administration, certification prep, chasing open actions, compiling management reports, permit paperwork — as people × hours × occurrences, at your loaded cost per hour.
- Only activities from modules you are actually buying can appear. A saving from a module you did not buy is how a deal dies at the second meeting.
- Year one is discounted for realisation: nobody gets the full benefit while the old spreadsheet is still open 'just in case'.
- You leave the meeting with the model populated with your figures, and you are free to argue with every one of them.

AI-POWERED

ComplianceBuddy — your AI compliance assistant, built in

Ask questions in plain language

"Which clauses of ISO 45001 apply to our permit-to-work process?" — ComplianceBuddy answers using your own data, scoped to what the asking user can see.

Site-scoped and permission-aware

Every response is bounded by the user's own access rights and the active site. It cannot reveal records or modules the user does not have permission to see.

Powered by Azure OpenAI

Enterprise-grade AI with your data staying within your Azure tenant. No training on your data, no third-party model access. Configurable per deployment.

Context from your live system

ComplianceBuddy pulls context from your actual findings, documents, permits, audit results and compliance evaluations — not from a generic knowledge base.

NEXT STEP

Thirty minutes on your worst workflow

WE SHOW

One complete workflow end to end, on your terms — the one you named on the call, not our favourite screen.

YOU TEST

Ask the four questions. Try to break the authorisation. Ask for a record we have not prepared.

YOU DECIDE

A scoped quotation and a benefit case built from your own numbers, inside a week.