

SilentMeet

AI meeting protocol enforcer — requires agendas, kills overruns, scores meeting effectiveness. Universal complaint (every company says 'too many meetings'); behavioural enforcement is novel + actually effective. \$9/seat/month.

Category	Set 7 · Verticals & Creator
Customer	Companies (50-2,000 employee size) where meeting overload is identified as a problem; engineering + product + design teams especially
Monetisation	\$9/seat/mo Standard · \$19/seat/mo Pro (with org-wide analytics + meeting-replacement workflows)
Build effort	Med
Plan version	v1.0 — 2026-05

Executive Summary

SilentMeet is an AI meeting protocol enforcer. The premise: every company has meeting overload + everyone agrees this is a problem + no one fixes it because the cultural change needed (cancelling meetings + requiring agendas + ending on time + replacing meetings with async) is hard. SilentMeet provides the enforcement layer that humans can't or won't enforce on themselves.

Product: integrates with Google Calendar + Outlook + Zoom + Meet + Teams + Slack. Requires meeting creator to provide agenda + meeting type + intended outcome before invitations send. AI evaluates meeting against quality criteria (does it have agenda? is it the right meeting type? are the right people invited? is there a clear outcome?). For ongoing meetings: time-tracker + outcome-capture + effectiveness scoring. Quarterly org-wide reports identify which meetings are draining time without producing outcomes.

Year-1 target: 250 paying companies (~4,500 seats) generating ■3.4 crore annual revenue against ■65 lakh costs. Cash-positive month 4-5. The wedge against generic meeting tools (Fellow + Hugo + Otter) is enforcement focus (most tools assume the user wants better meetings; SilentMeet assumes the user mostly doesn't).

The Problem

Meeting overload is universal complaint in mid-size companies. Typical knowledge worker spends 12-22 hours/week in meetings, 40-60% of which produce no specific outcome + could have been an email + are scheduled without clear agenda + overrun their allocated time + drain attention from focused work. The cumulative productivity loss is enormous.

Existing solutions fail. (1) Cultural campaigns ('let's have fewer meetings') don't last beyond initial enthusiasm. (2) Meeting hygiene tools (Fellow + Hugo + Otter + Loom-async-replacement) provide better-meetings infrastructure but don't enforce; user can ignore. (3) Calendar-blocking + focus-time tools (Reclaim + Clockwise) help individual focus but don't reduce meeting volume. (4) Asana + Notion + similar work-management tools provide async alternatives but don't prevent meetings from happening.

The structural gap: behavioural enforcement that pushes back when meetings don't meet quality bar. This requires the tool to be inconvenient when meetings are bad — which is exactly why incumbents avoid it (their user is the meeting-organiser who wants minimal friction).

The Solution

SilentMeet's enforcement model. Integration with calendar + video-meeting + chat platforms. When meeting created, SilentMeet intercepts: requires agenda (free-text or structured), requires meeting type selection (decision / status update / brainstorm / 1:1 / etc.), requires intended outcome statement, validates invitee list (too many people? right people?). Sends invitations only after these are filled.

AI quality evaluation: scores meeting against quality criteria + flags concerns ('this looks like it should be an email — proceed?', 'you have 14 invitees + this is decision-type meeting — too many people?', 'no agenda provided — proceed?'). User can override but the override is logged.

During meeting: time-tracker visible to all participants; 5-minute-warning + end-time notification; structured outcome-capture at end (what did we decide? what are action items? who owns them?).

Post-meeting: AI-generated meeting summary + effectiveness scoring (decisions made? action items captured? participants engaged?). Pushes outcomes to user's chosen system (Slack + Notion + Asana + Linear).

Quarterly org-wide reports: which meeting series consistently produce outcomes? Which drain time without outcomes? Which participants are over-scheduled? Recommendations for cancellation + restructuring.

Three structural differences. First, enforcement-first (most tools are voluntary; SilentMeet creates friction at bad-meeting creation). Second, org-wide quarterly reporting (most tools are individual-focused; SilentMeet provides org-level visibility). Third, meeting-replacement integration (async-first culture support via Loom + Notion + Slack handoffs).

Market Opportunity

Addressable mid-size company segment globally: ~200,000 companies (50-2,000 employees) with structured meeting culture + productivity tools. Engineering + product + design + consulting teams especially.

At ~\$30,000/yr per company average (mix of seat-count + tier), SAM is ~\$6B annually. Realistic 4-year capture: 0.1-0.3% = \$6-18M ARR.

Adjacent expansion. Year 2: enterprise tier (Fortune 500 with formal change-management partnerships). Industry-specific tiers (consulting firms + agencies where meeting culture is most acute).

Target Customer

Primary persona: a 41-year-old VP Engineering at a 280-person SaaS company where engineering meeting overload is documented complaint. Will pilot SilentMeet for 25-person engineering team at \$9/seat/mo = \$225/mo.

Secondary persona: a 47-year-old COO at a 600-person consulting firm where meetings consume 50%+ of consultant time. Will pay \$19/seat/mo Pro tier for org-wide analytics + meeting-replacement workflows.

Tertiary persona: a 36-year-old design director at a 120-person startup. Will champion SilentMeet for design team adoption as productivity intervention.

Product

Calendar + video + chat platform integration: Google Calendar + Outlook + Zoom + Meet + Teams + Slack.

Pre-meeting enforcement: agenda + type + outcome + invitee validation before invitations send.

AI quality evaluation: scores meetings + flags concerns + suggests email/async alternative when appropriate.

During-meeting: time tracker + warnings + outcome-capture prompts.

Post-meeting: AI summary + effectiveness scoring + outcome push to chosen systems.

Quarterly org reports: meeting-series effectiveness analysis + recommendations.

Pro tier additions: org-wide analytics dashboard + meeting-replacement workflow (Loom + Notion + Slack handoffs) + meeting-budget tracking by team.

Technical Architecture

Frontend: Next.js + Tailwind.

Backend: Python on Hetzner cloud, Postgres.

Integrations: Google Workspace + Microsoft 365 + Zoom + Slack APIs.

AI: GPT-4o for meeting evaluation + summary generation (~\$3/seat/mo at average usage).

Payments: Stripe.

Compliance: SOC2 from year-1 (enterprise table-stakes).

Business Model & Unit Economics

Two tiers. Standard \$9/seat/mo. Pro \$19/seat/mo (adds org analytics + meeting-replacement workflows + meeting-budget tracking).

Conversion: 30-day trial (longer because behavioural change takes time to demonstrate value); 18% conversion. Distribution: 70% Standard, 30% Pro. Annual contracts standard.

Gross margin: 78%. Major cost: AI inference + integration maintenance.

LTV: \$108/seat × 28 mo avg = \$302 (Standard); \$228/seat × 36 mo = \$821 (Pro). Strong because enterprise switching cost is real.

Unit Economics (Year-1 base case)

Year-1 paying companies	250
Year-1 paying seats	~4,500
Blended ARPU per seat	\$144/year
Year-1 revenue	\$410,000 (~₹3.4 crore)
Gross margin	78%
CAC per company	\$2,200
Year-1 all-in costs	~₹65 lakh
Year-1 net contribution	~₹2 crore

Go-to-Market

Channel 1 — Founder + ops-leader content (40%): substantive content on meeting-overload research + cultural change + enforcement strategies.

Channel 2 — Productivity-creator + book partnerships (25%): Cal Newport-style productivity influencers + asynchronous-work advocates.

Channel 3 — Direct outbound to mid-size companies (25%): targeted outreach to VP Eng + COO + Chief of Staff titles at qualified companies.

Channel 4 — Paid acquisition (10%): LinkedIn Ads to leadership titles.

Roadmap (first 12 months)

- Month 1-3: MVP with Google Calendar + Zoom integration + Standard tier. 30 paying companies (400 seats).
- Month 4-5: Outlook + Teams + Slack integrations, 80 companies (1,400 seats), ₹13 lakh MRR.
- Month 6-8: Pro tier with org analytics + meeting-replacement workflows, 150 companies (2,700 seats), ₹22 lakh MRR.
- Month 9-10: Quarterly org reports + meeting-budget tracking, 200 companies (3,800 seats).
- Month 11-12: 250 companies (4,500 seats), ₹3.4 crore annualised.

Key Risks

- Cultural rejection: meeting culture is sticky; orgs may reject enforcement. Mitigated by champion-led adoption + opt-in trial periods + visible early-win metrics.

- Fellow + Hugo + Otter adding enforcement features — possible. Mitigated by enforcement-first product identity (their existing user base wants opposite of enforcement).
- Google + Microsoft adding native features — possible long-term. Mitigated by multi-platform + cross-cutting positioning.
- Pro-tier adoption friction: org-wide analytics requires admin buy-in + change management. Mitigated by structured implementation playbook + customer-success team.
- Slow trial-to-paid: behavioural change requires time; 30-day trial may not be enough. Mitigated by extended trial-with-conversion-incentive + early-value-metric reporting.