**Investment in Infrastructure for the Pad Factory**

The table below outlines the expenses incurred for setting up a semi-scale menstrual pad production facility. These costs were fully covered by NIDISI and its partners.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Investment in infrastructure for the pad factory**  | **Amount (NRS)**  |
| 1  | Pad factory building   | 5,499,212.45  |
| 2  | Solar panels    | 1,738,372.80  |
| 3  | Packaging machine   | 15, 000  |
| 4  | Mattress Making Machine- Absorbent core   | 1,7 00,000  |
| 5  | Furniture   | 202,000.00  |
| 6  | Printer and Computer   | 2, 30,000  |
| 7  | Pad assembly machine  | 1,200,000.00  |
| 8  | Raw Material Storage Rack   | 850,000  |
| *Total* *(Nepali Rupee)*  | 9,489,585.25  |

**Equivalent in Euros:** €95,000 – €100,000

**Note:** These figures are provided solely for informational purposes and are based on our specific experience setting up the factory in Nepal. Actual costs may vary significantly depending on location, available infrastructure, materials, and local suppliers. We strongly encourage independent research and feasibility analysis before replicating this setup.

**Analysis and Recommendations**

The investment breakdown shows that a significant portion—over 58%—of the total budget was allocated to constructing the factory building. This represents a substantial upfront cost, particularly given that the product has not yet entered the market. In future implementations, it may be more practical to lease an existing facility during the initial phase. Leasing would reduce financial risk, offer operational flexibility, and allow for quicker adaptation to market feedback. Funds saved could be redirected toward enhancing product quality, marketing, or scaling production.

Another notable investment was the development of the absorbent core machine, which had to be engineered from the ground up. This included costs related to research, prototyping, and specialized labor. Similarly, the pad assembly machine required several custom modifications, driving its cost above that of standard market alternatives.

However, these are one-time investments. Now that both machines have been developed, tested, and optimized, future replication efforts will benefit from existing blueprints and lessons learned. It is estimated that machinery costs can be reduced by 30–40% for replication units, with significantly shorter setup timelines.