



**Government of India**  
**Ministry of Food Processing Industries**

Inter-Ministerial Approval Committee Meeting  
[For proposals received against EoI dated 13.01.2021]

on

26.03.2021

**Minutes of the Meeting**

## **MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF THE INTER-MINISTRIAL APPROVAL COMMITTEE (IMAC) CONSTITUTED UNDER THE SCHEME FOR INTEGRATED COLD CHAIN AND VALUE ADDITION INFRASTRUCTURE HELD ON 26.03.2021.**

Meeting of the Inter-Ministerial Approval Committee (IMAC) constituted under the Scheme of Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure was held through Video Conference (VC) under the chairpersonship of Minister, FPI on 26.03.2021 to consider the proposals received against the Eoi dated 13.01.2021.

**2.** At the outset, Ms. Reema Prakash, Joint Secretary & Convener of IMAC welcomed the Minister, FPI and other members of the Committee and apprised that the Ministry had issued an EOI on 13.01.2021 inviting applications from prospective investors for setting up of integrated cold chain facilities with the financial assistance of the Govt. in accordance with the revised operational guidelines of the Scheme for Integrated Cold Chain and Value Addition Infrastructure issued on 17.12.2019. Last date for submission of proposals was 28.02.2021.

**3.** IMAC was informed by the Joint Secretary and Convener that in response to the EOI, the Ministry had received 79 cold chain proposals on SAMPADA Portal of MoFPI. All the proposals were scrutinized by the Programme Management Agencies (PMAs) viz. M/s Schoolnet India Ltd., M/s PricewaterhouseCoopers and M/s Grant Thornton India LLP for ascertaining the eligibility or otherwise of the proposals, based on provisions of the scheme guidelines. Thereafter, all proposals have been evaluated by the Technical Committee (TC) under the chairpersonship of Joint Secretary (RP) in 4 meetings from 16<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 through Video Conference. In order to have openness and transparency in the appraisal/evaluation of the proposals, the applicants were also invited to the TC Meeting held through VC so that outcome of TC deliberations in respect of their proposals may be shared with them. The submissions/clarifications, if any, made by the applicants based on the interaction, have been factored into the recommendations of the TC.

**4.** A presentation was made before IMAC to explain the criteria & methodology adopted by the TC for ascertaining the eligibility or otherwise of the proposals and subsequent evaluation/ scoring of the proposals found prima facie eligible. The following criteria for evaluation of the proposals adopted by TC were explained point-wise to the members of the Committee and they took note of it.

- (a)** Lending banks/ financial institutions were requested to confirm the authenticity of appraisal note and term loan sanction letters.
- (b)** In some cases, applicants were advised to submit the revised CE Civil and/ or Mechanical Certificates as the component/ facility- wise details are not available.
- (c)** If the collection centres/distribution hub are in same place or close proximity to main processing centre, the same were not considered for grant and marks.
- (d)** Clear correlation between processing and storage capacity to be established, to prevent projects being proposed primarily to establish cold storages.
- (e)** Number of wooden storage bins and pallets were restricted to 50% and 10% respectively of the capacity for proposed storages.

- (f) Crates and milk cans were considered as consumables and not considered for grant purpose.
- (g) Portal for registration of land, except in individual name, in the State of Telangana is under development, hence, the score in case of applicant firm submitted the land document in name of promoter has been accepted and marks have been awarded accordingly.
- (h) In case of link provided by the applicant for availability of raw material is not accessible, marks were not awarded.
- (i) In 7 case of marine proposals, it has been observed that the project cost was highly inflated by taking margin money in promoter's equity. In most of the cases it has been seen that the equity proposed is more than the calculated net worth. All the cases were recommended ineligible by the TC.
- (j) Similarly, in marine proposals, it has been observed that the number of reefer vans proposed are on higher side. In all such cases, capacity of reefer vans were restricted to double the combined installed capacity per day of plate freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day), blast freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day) and IQF (installed capacity per hour x 8 hrs. per day).
- (k) In Irradiation proposals to ensure the utilization for Food Products, it has been decided that applicant Firm would submit following documents: -
- Undertaking stating that irradiation facilities would use at least 65% of its capacity for five years from the date of commencement of commercial production, for the food products.
  - Audited balance sheets and profit & loss accounts clearly indicating breakup of sale of food products and other products separately duly signed and stamped by Statutory Auditor of the Firm for above said five years to be submitted.
  - Non-compliance would lead to recall of grant.

## 5. Decisions of IMAC:

(a) IMAC reviewed the status of each of the 79 proposals scrutinized/ appraised by the Technical Committee. Based on the deliberations, IMAC approved 37 new proposals as eligible, 42 proposals as ineligible. IMAC also approved the 2 proposals referred by CIM i.e. Gurdev Agro Farm Fresh, Muktsar, Punjab and Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd., Khurda, Odisha.

(b) Consolidated merit list of 37 proposals approved by the IMAC as eligible along with their grant and marks secured are at **Annexure-I**. Consolidated list of proposal rejected by the IMAC as ineligible are at **Annexure-II**. Decision of IMAC on each of the proposal is at **Annexure-III**.

## **6. Other decisions**

- (a)** IMAC approved utilizing the available funds under the scheme, after the approval of proposals of SC/ST category and from NER, for proposals from General category.
- (b)** IMAC directed to convey the decision of IMAC to eligible proposals, within the approved allocation, without waiting for minutes.
- (c)** IMAC further approved to keep a waitlist of remaining eligible proposals as in-principle approved against available vacancies on account of cancellation/withdrawal.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair and all present.

## List of proposals approved by IMAC as eligible

S.No	Name of the Company	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (₹ lakh)		Grant in aid (₹ lakh)			Score
					Total	Eligible	Proposed	Calculated	Eligible	
1	Mountain Fruits and Vegetables	Dimapur	Nagaland	F&V	1572.46	1361.95	1000.00	991.34	991.34	80
2	Vasanthi	Thiruchirapalli	Tamil Nadu	F&V	677.00	594.03	400.00	435.02	400.00	62
3	Wholesome Foods	Kheda	Gujarat	F&V	2573.81	1994.41	1000.00	966.15	966.15	90
4	Ariba Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Ujjain	Madhya Pradesh	RTE	3121.63	2217.63	1000.00	1074.46	1000.00	88
5	Maujgarh Farm Fresh LLP	Fazilka	Punjab	F&V	1247.78	1011.00	480.00	467.78	467.78	82
6	Aparna Marine Exports	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	4066.62	2789.84	1000.00	1373.21	1000.00	80
7	Mekworld Marines and Exports Pvt Ltd	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	2821.87	2201.28	1000.00	1083.65	1000.00	80
8	Manan Agro Industries	Hapur	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	2479.70	2147.02	1000.00	1029.65	1000.00	80
9	Lichchwi Foods India Pvt Ltd	Dhar	Madhya Pradesh	F&V	1700.00	1466.55	1000.00	1054.83	1000.00	80
10	Vaisakhi Bio Marine Pvt. Ltd.	Vishkhapatana m	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	4415.50	2957.06	1000.00	1468.63	1000.00	79
11	Kushal Polysacks Private Limited	Kolkata	West Bengal	F&V	3860.26	1816.54	1000.00	882.06	882.06	79
12	The Krishna District Milk Producers' Mutually Aided Co-operative Union Limited	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Dairy	8048.02	3745.21	1000.00	1730.01	1000.00	78
13	National Farms	Panchmahal	Gujarat	F&V	1182.13	937.10	460.00	460.45	460.00	77
14	BVEG Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Sonipat	Haryana	RTE	3366.71	2473.51	1000.00	1187.70	1000.00	76
15	Bizz Corporation	Morbi	Gujarat	RTE	4319.76	3503.96	1000.00	1712.68	1000.00	75

S.No	Name of the Company	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (₹ lakh)		Grant in aid (₹ lakh)			Score
					Total	Eligible	Proposed	Calculated	Eligible	
16	Triveni Foods and Agro	Jaipur	Rajasthan	F&V	2130.00	1758.91	845.37	760.65	760.65	75
17	RM Delicious Foods	Panipat	Haryana	Meat	1840.14	1431.52	700.00	705.79	700.00	75
18	Kiran Foods	Udham Singh	Uttarakhand	F&V	1760.00	1411.34	1000.00	1037.00	1000.00	75
19	Fair Exports India Pvt. Ltd	Ernakulam	Kerala	RTE	5412.97	3748.01	1000.00	1863.39	1000.00	74
20	Sunshine Vegetables Private Limited	Sikandrabad (Bulandshahr)	Uttar Pradesh	F&V	2600.98	1875.50	1000.00	837.11	837.11	73
21	Zippy Edible Products Pvt. Ltd.	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	RTE	2612.91	1660.57	1000.00	1238.93	1000.00	73
22	SSK Dairy	Meerut	Uttar Pradesh	Dairy	3599.71	2729.82	1000.00	1273.00	1000.00	70
23	ABC Fruits	Krishnagiri	Tamil Nadu	F&V	2859.33	2276.91	1000.00	1124.21	1000.00	70
24	Neeli Aqua Pvt. Ltd.	Prakasam	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	2067.46	1192.03	796.00	592.41	592.41	70
25	Sai Maruthi Agro Processing Pvt. Ltd.	Kolar	Karnataka	Meat	3069.58	1532.16	1000.00	737.29	737.29	69
26	Sukshma Gamma LLP	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Irradiation	2477.21	1713.03	1000.00	838.00	838.00	68
27	Far N Beyond Sustainable LLP	Haridwar	Uttarakhand	Irradiation	1954.11	1338.77	1000.00	1004.08	1000.00	68
28	Sri Krupa RGR Agrogatros	Nalgonda	Telangana	F&V	3622.22	1930.67	1000.00	936.23	936.23	67
29	Manorama Gavya Food Industries	Bikaner	Rajasthan	Dairy	988.71	629.31	350.00	305.85	305.85	67
30	Mulpuri Aqua Processors	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	3707.50	2442.85	1000.00	1211.72	1000.00	65

S.No	Name of the Company	District	State	Sector	Project Cost (₹ lakh)		Grant in aid (₹ lakh)			Score
					Total	Eligible	Proposed	Calculated	Eligible	
31	Riann Agriventures Pvt. Ltd.	Chhindwara	Madhya Pradesh	F&V	3054.69	1884.58	1000.00	1361.44	1000.00	65
32	Triveni Food Processors	Barwani	Madhya Pradesh	F&V	1161.57	917.36	610.00	571.77	571.77	65
33	Krishna Coastal Foods Private Limited	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Marine	665.34	322.70	195.15	157.41	157.41	65
34	Firstfish Seafood Processing Pvt Ltd	South Andaman	Andaman and Nicobar Island	Marine	1994.59	1576.47	1000.00	1136.35	1000.00	62
35	Syra Foods	Yamuna Nagar	Haryana	Meat	3034.51	1399.67	1000.00	681.08	681.08	61
36	Maniyarpur Dairy	Bakhtiarpur, Patna	Bihar	Dairy	2577.75	1964.79	1000.00	857.43	857.43	60
37	Freshena Foods Private Limited	Nuh	Haryana	F&V	1612.25	1152.67	475.00	560.98	475.00	60

## List of proposals approved by IMAC as ineligible

S.No.	Name of the Company	District	State	Reason for ineligibility
1	Aadhya Sea Foods Pvt. Ltd.	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
2	Agarwal International	Udham Singh Nagar	Uttarakhand	Agarwal Frozen Foods is already sanctioned under cold chain scheme on the same location and not yet completed.
3	Akshay Food Impex Pvt. Ltd.	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
4	Aljalil Exports	Mandya	Karnataka	Insufficient net-worth and project has commenced commercial production.
5	American Agro Foods	Jammu	Jammu and Kashmir	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient net-worth
6	Anjaneya Breeding Farm and Hatcheries	Belgaum	Karnataka	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient net-worth
7	Arrk Enterprise	Mohali (SAS Nagar)	Punjab	Insufficient net-worth.
8	Avyakth Infraventure LLP	Bangalore Rural	Karnataka	Insufficient net-worth and mandatory component FLI not proposed.
9	B One Business House Pvt. Ltd.	Khorda	Odisha	Expansion/ upgradation of the existing facility in the same premises.
10	Banga Kali Sea Foods Pvt. Ltd.	24 Parganas	West Bengal	Insufficient net-worth.
11	Charis Foods LLP	Belgaun	Karnataka	Insufficient net-worth.
12	Delhi Agrocool Pvt Ltd	Sonipat	Haryana	Insufficient infusion of promoter's equity i.e. 9.09% only.
13	Gayatri Marine Products	Nellore	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
14	Global Agro Foods	Cuttack	Odisha	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient net-worth
15	Govitri Dairy LLP	Faridabad	Haryana	Insufficient net-worth.
16	Green Asia Impex Pvt Ltd	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient infusion of term loan i.e. 17.33% only.
17	GSR Nirman	Guntur	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
18	H S Frozen Foods	Mehsana	Gujarat	Insufficient net-worth.



S.No.	Name of the Company	District	State	Reason for ineligibility
19	Indus Farmers Food Company LLP	Araria	Bihar	Non-submission of NoC for setting up of slaughter house from Competent Authority and not able to justify the rationale for the proposed facilities.
20	Krushu Steritech Services Private Limited	Ramanagaram	Karnataka	Score (58) is less than the required 60.
21	KSE Limited	Dindigul	Tamil Nadu	Existing facility in same land and no separate boundary wall.
22	Kuppanna Poultry Farm	Tirupur	Tamil Nadu	Score (47) is less than the required 60.
23	Laxmi Milk Products	Banaskantha	Gujarat	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient net-worth
24	M Food Art International	Budaun	Uttar Pradesh	Not able to justify the rationale for the proposed facilities.
25	Maa Shakambhari	Sambalpur	Odisha	Insufficient net-worth.
26	Magnum Estates Ltd.	Khordha	Odisha	Non setting up of chill room at FLI, mandatory component.
27	Manjeera Dairy Products	Sangareddy	Telangana	Insufficient net-worth.
28	Marupudi Sea Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Prakasam	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
29	Nand Prakash And Company	Bilaspur	Himachal Pradesh	Insufficient net-worth.
30	Nekkanti Sea Foods Ltd.	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Expansion/ upgradation of the existing facility in the same premises.
31	Rajyalakshmi Marine Exports	West Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Insufficient net-worth. Project cost is inflated and equity is more than the calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
32	Saadi Agro and Allied Industries	Gorakhpur	Uttar Pradesh	Not able to justify the rationale for the proposed facilities.
33	Sabri Food Products Private Limited	Khordha	Odisha	Withdrawn
34	Sam Aqua Exports LLP	Krishna	Andhra Pradesh	Project cost is inflated and equity is almost equal to calculated net worth. Hence, proposal is not viable.
35	SAP Fresh Foods Private Limited	Indore	Madhya Pradesh	Insufficient net-worth.
36	Sharidh Associates	Belgaum	Karnataka	Duplicate proposal
37	Shashi Sidnal Foods Pvt. Ltd.	Belgaum	Karnataka	Minimum two components not proposed.
38	Shree Laxmi Frozen Foods	Farrukhabad	Uttar Pradesh	Insufficient net-worth and name of the firm is different in different legal documents.

<b>S.No.</b>	<b>Name of the Company</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Reason for ineligibility</b>
39	Shree Shankar Cotton Corporation	Barwani	Madhya Pradesh	Project is sanctioned in APC Scheme in Barwani with common facility. Applicant has been asked to set up the unit in the APC.
40	Sri Teja Dairy	Ananthapur	Andhra Pradesh	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note, in-principal term loan sanction letter and insufficient net-worth
41	Srinidhi Sea Foods	East Godavari	Andhra Pradesh	Insufficient net-worth.
42	Star Foods	Ludhiana	Punjab	Non-submission of Bank Appraisal Note and insufficient net-worth

**1. M/s National Farms, Panchmahal, Gujarat**

**TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

Technical committee recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 77 and grant-in-aid of Rs 460 Lakh which may be further revised based on revised CE Mechanical certificate.

**IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that as directed by TC, applicant has submitted revised CE mechanical Certificate mentioning breakup of pre-processing line which will not affect grant calculation as total cost of pre-processing line will remain same as proposed in original CE Mechanical certificate. Therefore, grant will be same as recommended by TC.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of in-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 15.03.2021.

**IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 77 marks, Total Project Cost of Rs 1182.13 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 937.1 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 460.00 lakh.

**2. M/s Riaan Agriventures Private Limited, Chhindwara, Madhya Pradesh**

**TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total revised score of 65 and grant in aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh.

**IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that raw material production data is available and can be accessed from the source mentioned in the DPR, therefore, TC increased 5 marks for the raw material production data under scoring criterion 1(a) leading to increase in total score from 60 to 65.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that the proposed project is located in ITDP area.
- iii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 25.03.2021.

**IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 65 marks, Total Project Cost of Rs 3054.69 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1884.58 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh (restricted to maximum limit).

### **3. M/s Vasanthi, Trichy, Tamil Nadu**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021 and 18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 62 (as per the revised In-principle sanction letter and appraisal note submitted by applicant) with eligible grant of Rs. 400.00 lakh subject to receipt of confirmation of issuance of sanction letter and appraisal note from lending bank.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that TC awarded 5 marks under scoring criterion No. 5 “The project proposed to be set up in States providing concessions/ benefits” considering that all five benefits are being provided by Tamil Nadu for which supporting documents were submitted by the applicant vide mail dated 23.03.2021.
- ii. IMAC was also apprised that as per the revised CE mechanical, applicant has proposed 2 Nos of reefer vehicle of 16 MT each with total capacity of 32 MT only. Therefore, TC reduced 5 marks under scoring criterion No. 8 “Proposals with investment in reefer transport with capacity not less than 70 MT” leading to no change in total score of 62.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 62 marks, Total Project Cost of Rs 677.00 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 594.03 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 400.00 lakh (restricted to grant sought).

### **4. M/s BVEG Food Products Pvt Ltd, Sonipat, Haryana**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 76 and grant-in-aid of Rs. 1000 lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that it was noted by TC that one of promoter M/s Harshna Agro Fresh Pvt Ltd is not in food processing business, therefore, TC decreased the marks from 10 to 7 under scoring criterion No 2. for experience leading to decrease in total score from 79 to 76.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 17.03.2021.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 76, Total Project Cost of Rs 3366.71 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2473.51 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh (restricted to maximum limit).

## **5. M/s Ariba Foods Pvt. Ltd, Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 88 with grant-in-aid of Rs. 1000.00 lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that as directed by TC, revised CE Mechanical mentioning break up of pre-processing line was sought from the applicant is still awaited, however, grant will remain same as recommended by TC since total cost of pre-processing line will remain same as certified by CE Mechanical.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 25.03.2021.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 88 marks, Total Project Cost of Rs 3121.63 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2217.63 lakh and grant-in-aid of Rs 1000.00 lakh.

## **6. M/s Neeli Aqua Private Limited, Prakasham, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

The technical committee recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 70 and grant-in-aid of Rs. 592.41 lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that applicant has submitted receipts of payment of land conversion charges to convert land into non-agricultural land and an intimation letter of payment for the same. Considering notification dated 19.02.2018 issued by Revenue Department, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, TC revised the score for this proposal from 5 to 10 under scoring criterion no 1(c) "Status of project land" leading to increase in total score from 65 to 70.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that as per general recommendation by TC for marine proposals, capacity of reefer vans has been restricted to double the combined installed capacity per day of plate freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day), blast freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day) and IQF (installed capacity per hour x 8 hrs. per day). Accordingly, capacity of reefer vehicles is restricted to 12 MT only and grant has been calculated accordingly.

- iii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 24.03.2021.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total revised score of 70 and Total Project Cost of Rs 2067.46 lakh, eligible project cost of Rs 1192.03 and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs. 592.41 Lakh.

## **7. M/s Vaisakhi Bio Marine Pvt Ltd, Vishakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

The technical committee recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 79 and grant of Rs. 1000 lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that applicant has confirmed that no processing facility is located adjacent to proposed facility.
- ii. IMAC also further apprised that as per general recommendation by TC for marine proposals, capacity of reefer vans has been restricted to double the combined installed capacity per day of plate freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day), blast freezer (installed capacity per batch x 3 batch per day) and IQF (installed capacity per hour x 8 hrs. per day). Accordingly, capacity of reefer vehicles is restricted to 33 MT only and grant has been calculated accordingly.
- iii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 25.03.2021.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 79 and Total Project Cost of Rs 4415.50 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2957.06 and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs. 1000.00 Lakh (restricted to maximum limit).

## **8. M/s RM Delicious Foods, Panipat, Haryana**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 75 and grant-in-aid of Rs. 700 lakh (restricted to grant sought) subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that as directed by TC, grant has been recalculated after considering plant and machinery proposed for slaughtering as ineligible. After recalculation, Eligible project Cost is Rs 1431.52 lakh and eligible grant of Rs 705.79 which is restricted to grant sought of Rs 700 Lakh.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 22.03.2021.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 75, Total Project Cost of Rs. 1840.14 lakh, Eligible project Cost is Rs 1431.52 lakh and eligible grant of Rs 700 Lakh.

## **9. M/s Maniyarpur Dairy, Patna, Bihar**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 60 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs. 857.43 Lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that applicant was awarded 5 marks by TC under scoring criterion No 5. considering all 5 benefits listed in scoring criterion are being provided by Bihar leading to increase of marks under this criterion from 4 to 5.
- ii. IMAC was apprised that marks for scoring criterion No. 1(b) "Status of project land" was increased from 0 to 5 by TC since land proposed for main facility is located at distance of 1.8 km from State Highway.
- iii. IMAC was further apprised that marks for scoring criterion No. 4 were reduced from 5 to 0 by TC as the Ministry has already sanctioned projects in Patna, Bihar.
- iv. After considering observation 1, 2 and 3, total score was increased from 59 to 60 by TC.
- v. IMAC was further apprised that confirmation for issuance of In-principle sanction letter and bank appraisal notes have been received from lending bank vide email dated 26.03.2021.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 60, Total Project Cost of Rs. 2577.75 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 1964.79 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs. 857.43 Lakh.

## **10. M/s SSK Dairy, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with total score of 70 marks and grant-in-aid of Rs. 1000.00 Lakh subject to confirmation of lending bank regarding authentication of sanction letter and appraisal note.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that as per CLU for main facility land submitted with the EOI documents, the land has been declared as “Residential/Non-Agricultural”. It is not clear whether food processing industry can be setup on this plot which has also been declared as “Non-agricultural”.
- ii. IMAC was apprised that TC has recommended the proposal as eligible as the documents with regards to CLU for main facility land have to be submitted with 90 days compliance documents from the issue of approval letter as per point 2(b) of Appendix -VII of scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.
- iii. IMAC is of the view that revised CLU documents or clarifications regarding setting up of industrial unit on the proposed location for main facility may be obtained and checked as per scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 70, Total Project Cost of Rs. 3599.71 lakh, Eligible Project Cost of Rs 2729.82 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of Rs. 1000.00 Lakh subject to condition that revised CLU documents or clarifications regarding setting up of industrial unit on the proposed location for main facility may be obtained and checked as per point 2(b) of Appendix -VII of scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

## **11. Gurdev Agro Farm Fresh, Muktsar, Punjab**

### **A. TC observations & recommendations dated 21.05.2019:**

#### **Observation:**

Technical Committee (TC) observed that the applicant has not uploaded the CLU for the main processing facility. The same was communicated to the applicant in the Technical Committee (TC) meeting.

#### **Recommendation:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with the score of 75, project cost of ₹1743.18 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹1487.19 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1095.04 lakh. [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as grant sought by the applicant].



**B. IMAC observations & decision dated 13.06.2019:**

**Observations:**

IMAC noted that the proposal has been considered in TC meeting held on 21.05.2019. TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with a score of 75, project cost of ₹1743.18 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹1487.19 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1095.04 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as grant sought by the applicant].

IMAC observed that the proposal is for RTE products and the applicant has proposed to manufacture frozen potato tikka and samosa. The main raw material required for the products is potato, which is not available in and around Muktsar, Punjab and there is no market for frozen potato tikka and samosa. Reefer vans 2 nos. of 4 MT each proposed are also not viable for transport of frozen products. Applicant is in business of trading with turnover of around 4 crore/annum only. Applicant has no experience of food processing.

**Decision:**

IMAC is of the view that the proposal is only for seeking grant from the Ministry and as such the proposal is not viable. IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible.

**C. CIM Observations & Recommendation dated 20.08.2020:**

Committee noted that the proposal was considered in IMAC dated 13.06.2019. IMAC rejected the proposal the proposal is only for seeking grant from Ministry and as such the promoter will not be able to complete the project.

Committee noted that the proposal is for RTE products and the applicant has proposed to manufacture RTE Frozen Snacks like Potato tikka and samosa, Indian Foods like Curries, Parantha & Naan. Committee noted that the main raw material required for RTE snacks is Potato, which is available in and around Muktsar, Punjab.

In view of the above, committee is satisfied with the arguments put-forth by the applicant and is of the view that Ministry may re-consider the proposal of the applicant.

**D. IMAC Observation and Decision dated 24.02.2021:**

**IMAC Observations:**

IMAC observed that the proposal was considered by CIM on 20.08.2020 and recommended the Ministry to reconsider the proposal as the potato is available in and around Muktsar, Punjab. IMAC observed that the proposal is for RTE products and Potato requirement is approximately 25% of the total raw material requirement. However, the viability and marking of the proposal is not very clear.

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC deferred the proposal to Technical Committee to re-check the viability and market linkage of the proposal.

**E. TC observations & recommendations dated 17.03.2021:**

Applicant represented by Shri. Suraj Kaundal, Partner attended the TC meeting held on 17.03.2021.

**Observations:**

Technical Committee (TC) observed the following:

- The applicant has proposed 2 locations at FLI (Collection Centre), 1 location at DH and FLI cum processing centre all are at Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab. The applicant informed that the FLI (Collection Centre), DH and FLI cum processing centre locations is in the radius of 30-40 Kms from the main facility. TC recommended not to consider FLI (Collection Centre) and DH due to close proximity to the main facility. Accordingly, TC revised the scoring from 15 to 5 marks in Criterion no. 6 of Scoring.

**Recommendation:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹1430.43 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1058.47 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline].

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹1430.43 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1058.47 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline].

**12. Lichchwi Foods India Pvt Ltd, Dhar, Madhya Pradesh**

**TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1466.55 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1054.83 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per the scheme guidelines].

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

The applicant has proposed 2 Nos. of Frozen Cold Room of 30 MT at distribution Hub at Hajipur, Bihar. IMAC noted that the same is 1200 Km from the main facility and TC recommended not to

consider DH at Hajipur, Bihar. Accordingly, TC has revised the score in criterion no. 6 i.e. "Proposed investment in Cold Chain Components" from 15 to 10 marks.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹1466.55 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1054.83 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per the scheme guidelines].

**13. Maujgarh Farm Fresh LLP, Fazilka, Punjab**

**TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 82, eligible project cost of ₹1011.00 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹467.78 lakh.

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 82, eligible project cost of ₹1011.00 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹467.78 lakh.

**14. ABC Fruits, Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu**

**TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 70, eligible project cost of ₹2276.91 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1124.21 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline].

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

The applicant has proposed 2 locations at FLI (Collection Centre) at Krishnagiri, DH at Krishnagiri and Vellore and FLI cum Processing Centre at Krishnagiri District, Tamil Nadu. IMAC noted that TC recommended not to consider FLI (Collection Centre) and DH due to close proximity to the

main facility and accordingly, TC has reduced the scoring 15 to 5 marks in Criterion no. 6 of Scoring.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 70, eligible project cost of ₹2276.91 lakh and eligible grant of ₹1124.21 lakh [Restricted at ₹1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline].

**15. Sunshine Vegetables Private Limited, Bulandshahr, Uttar Pradesh**

**TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 73, eligible project cost of ₹1875.50 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹837.11 lakh.

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 73, eligible project cost of ₹1875.50 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹837.11 lakh.

**16. Kiran Foods, Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand**

**TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹1411.34 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1037.00 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹1411.34 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1037.00 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

**17. Kushal Polysacks Private Limited, Kolkata, West Bengal**

**TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 79, eligible project cost of ₹1816.54 lakh and eligible grant of ₹882.06 lakh.

## **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

### **Observations:**

IMAC noted that TC has not recommended to consider Ripening Chamber and Pre-Cooling Chamber as banana is not available in and around Kolkata, WB area and Cold Storage proposed by the applicant will be used on rental basis. IMAC agreed not to consider Ripening Chamber, Pre-Cooling Chamber and Cold storage of 2695 MT proposed at DH cum processing Centre.

### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 79, eligible project cost of ₹1816.54 lakh and eligible grant of ₹882.06 lakh.

### **18. Bizz Corporation, Morbi, Gujarat**

#### **TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹3503.96 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1712.68 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

#### **IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 75, eligible project cost of ₹3503.96 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1712.68 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

### **19. Fair Exports India Pvt. Ltd., Ernakulam, Kerala**

#### **TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 74, eligible project cost of ₹3748.01 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1863.39 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

#### **IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 74, eligible project cost of ₹3748.01 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1863.39 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

### **20. Sukshma Gamma LLP, Vijayawada, Andhra Pradesh**

#### **TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as eligible with score of 68, eligible project cost of ₹1713.03 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹838.00 lakh.

#### **IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 68, eligible project cost of ₹1713.03 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹838.00 lakh.

## **21. Aparna Marine Exports, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC recommendation dated 18.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹2789.84 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1373.21 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per the Scheme Guidelines].

### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

#### **Observations:**

The applicant has proposed IQF: 1 MT/Hr. & Plate freezer: 0.75 MT/Hr. x 2 Nos. IMAC noted that as per the general methodology, the capacity of Reefer vehicles has been revised from 80 MT to 41 MT which led to revision of score from 5 to 0 marks on scoring criterion no. 8 i.e. Proposals with investment in Reefer transport with capacity not less than 70 MT.

#### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 80, eligible project cost of ₹2789.84 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1373.21 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per the Scheme Guidelines].

## **22. Mulpuri Aqua Processors, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh.**

### **TC recommendation dated 18.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹2442.85 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1211.72 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

#### **Observations:**

- The applicant has proposed IQF: 0.75 MT/Hr., Plate freezer: 0.5 MT/Hr. x 3 Nos and Blast Freezer: 1 MT/batch x 3 nos. IMAC noted that as per the general methodology, the capacity of Reefer vehicles has been revised from 31.68 MT to 27 MT, however, there will be no change in scoring criterion no. 8 i.e. Proposals with investment in reefer transport with capacity not less than

70 MT, since the total capacity of Reefer vehicle proposed by the applicant was 31.68 MT which is less than 70 MT.

- The applicant has not proposed margin money for working capital.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹2442.85 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹1211.72 lakh [Restricted to ₹1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines].

**23. Krishna Coastal Foods Pvt. Ltd., Krishna, Andhra Pradesh**

**TC recommendation dated 18.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹322.70 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹157.41 lakh.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

The applicant has proposed Plate freezer: 0.75 MT/Hr. x 1 No. and Blast Freezer: 0.5 MT/batch x 2 nos. IMAC noted that as per the general methodology, the capacity of Reefer vehicles has been revised from 20 MT to 10.50 MT, however, after revision in the capacities of the reefer vehicle, there will be no change in scoring criterion no. 8 i.e. Proposals with investment in reefer transport with capacity not less than 70 MT, since the total capacity of Reefer vehicle proposed by the applicant was 20 MT which is less than 70 MT.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with score of 65, eligible project cost of ₹322.70 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹157.41 lakh.

**24. Manorama Gavya Food Industries, Bikaner, Rajasthan**

**TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as eligible with total score of 67, eligible project cost of ₹629.31 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹305.85 lakh.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with total score of 67, eligible project cost of ₹629.31 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹305.85 lakh.

**25. M/s. Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd., Khurda, Odisha [CIM recommended proposal]**

**IMAC observations & Decision dated 24.02.2021:**

Shri. Sasi, representative of the applicant firm attended the IMAC meeting held on 24.02.2021 through video conference.

**Observation:**

- (a) IMAC observed that the proposal was considered by CIM on 16.12.2020 and after accepting the explanation by the applicant that the "Provisional balance sheet" duly certified by CA was not uploaded as they could not get it certified by CA because of lockdown imposed due to Covid-19 outbreak and recommended the Ministry to reconsider the proposal subject to the confirmation of the Ministry for submission of hard copy of the "Provisional balance sheet certified by CA for net worth of the company" before the date of IMAC meeting by the applicant.
- (b) IMAC observed that the Division confirmed the receipt of Hard copy of the Provisional balance sheet certified by CA for net worth of the company and figures mentioned in this CA certified provisional balance sheet is same as the one (Uncertified provisional balance sheet) uploaded on the portal.

**Decision:**

IMAC, after deliberation and interaction with the promoter, considered the recommendation of CIM and accepted the Provisional Balance Sheet duly signed by CA as net worth supporting documents. Further, IMAC deferred the proposal to TC for detailed assessment regarding the net worth, scoring and grant calculation.

**TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 70, total project cost of ₹ 4938.86 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 2199.48 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1076.18 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines).

**IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal was referred back to TC by IMAC dated 24.02.2021, after accepting the recommendation of CIM dated 16.12.2020, for detailed assessment regarding the net worth, scoring and grant calculation.
- b. IMAC noted that proposed project is located in IDCO Mega Food Park. Further observed that the facilities like Frozen storages, ETP etc proposed for the project and available /approved in the Mega Food Park are common. However, as per comparison, required / proposed capacity of Frozen Storage is not available at Mega Food Park and ETP could be used as common facility. Accordingly, ETP was not considered as part of proposed project.
- c. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 09.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.



### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 70, total project cost of ₹ 4938.86 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 2199.48 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1076.18 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per Scheme Guidelines)

### **26. M/s. Mountain Fruits and Vegetables, Dimapur, Nagaland [ST/NER proposal]**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 1572.46 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1361.95 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 991.34 lakh.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Freeze dried and blast frozen Fruits & Vegetables and also for preparation of RTE products.
- b. IMAC further noted that though the applicant is already in the food processing business, the entire net-worth of the applicant is from the land parcel owned by them and no other substantial income / source for the required equity has been indicated.
- c. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 12.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 1572.46 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1361.95 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 991.34 lakh with a condition to submit the proof for source of fund towards infusion of equity for the project within 90 days of date of approval letter.

### **27. M/s. Wholesome Foods, Kheda, Gujarat**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 90, total project cost of ₹ 2573.86 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1994.41 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 966.15 Lakh.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for creating facilities for preparation of Ready to Eat Fruits and Vegetable products.

- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has availed financial assistance for its food processing project from MoFPI in the year 2016 and commenced its commercial operation on 10.07.2018, as per the uploaded bank certificate. Further noted that the final installment of grant was released on 26.05.2020.
- c. IMAC observed that the existing unit is adjacent to the proposed facility and applicant has submitted the geotagged photos of the proposed project location confirming the existence of boundary wall between both units.
- d. IMAC also noted that the proposed facilities are for preparation of Frozen pizza, Frozen tikki, Samosa & Cakes etc., and approved facilities for earlier project are for IQF / Plate Freezer for Frozen fruits & Vegetables and RTE preparatory line for varieties of Parathas.
- e. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 15.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 90, total project cost of ₹ 2573.86 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1994.41 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 966.15 Lakh.

## **28. M/s. Freshena Foods Pvt. Ltd., Nuh, Haryana**

### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 60 and the total project cost of ₹ 1612.26 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1152.67 lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 560.98 lakh (Restricted to grant sought amount of ₹ 475.00 lakh).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Frozen Fruits & Vegetables and also for Convenient foods like Curry Pastes, Sauces, Mayonnaise, Dipping's etc.
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has uploaded the notarized lease deed dated 10.02.2021 for the proposed land, however, required to submit / upload the registered lease deed as per scheme guidelines
- c. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 23.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 60, total project cost of ₹ 1612.26 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1152.67 lakh and eligible grant of ₹ 560.98 lakh (Restricted to grant sought amount of ₹ 475.00 lakh).

### **29. M/s. Triveni Food Processors, Barwani, Madhya Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 65, total project cost of ₹ 1161.57 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 917.36 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 571.77 Lakh.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Frozen Pulps (Mango, Papaya, Musk Melon etc) and Frozen Fruits & Vegetables.
- b. IMAC observed that the applicant has uploaded the website screenshot from Town and Country Planning, Revenue Department for non-requirement of NOC towards for diversion of the land for industrial purpose and also letter dated 06.02.2021 from Revenue Department stating no objection for setting up of cold chain project under PMKSY at the proposed project location. IMAC has also not accepted the same as it is neither on official letter head nor have the name and designation of the official.
- c. IMAC further observed that though no certificate / notification / letter was uploaded for the project being in ITDP area, the grant calculation has been done accordingly, since the proposed location falls under ITDP area, as per the list of Ministry of Tribal Affairs.
- d. IMAC noted that component wise cost break-up was not provided in CE civil certificate and directed to obtain the same
- e. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Trend Sales Pvt. Ltd.) vide email dated 23.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 65, total project cost of ₹ 1161.57 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 917.36 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 571.77 Lakh.

### **30. M/s. Triveni Foods And Agro, Jaipur, Rajasthan**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the revised score of 75, total project cost of ₹ 2130.00 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1578.91 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 760.65 Lakh.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is of IQF frozen Fruits & Vegetables and also for Frozen Fruit Pulp, Slices etc.
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has proposed Blast Freezer of 5 MTPB X 2 nos without any value addition equipment in line for Blast Freezing. Further, IMAC also noted the TC, based on the raw material availability in the proposed cluster, has recommended 1 Blast Freezer instead of 2 nos., for better viability of the project and the grant-in-aid was revised accordingly.
- c. IMAC also noted that TC has not recommended the Distribution Hub proposed at Jaipur because of existing building.
- d. Further noted that the lending bank (Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd.) vide email dated 22.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a revised score of 75, total project cost of ₹ 2130.00 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1578.91 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 760.65 Lakh.

## **31. M/s. Manan Agro Industries, Hapur, Uttar Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the revised score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 2479.70, eligible project cost of ₹ 2147.02 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1029.65 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is of IQF frozen Fruits & Vegetables.
- b. IMAC further noted that project is located at a distance of 1.9 KM from NH9, as per GPS coordinates and accepted the revision in the score from 3 to 5.
- c. IMAC observed that the applicant has uploaded letter from Chief Officer, Dist. Hapur for the permission for implementation of processing plant instead of CLU permission for the project. Accordingly, no score was awarded.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 23.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with revised score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 2479.70, eligible project cost of ₹ 2147.02 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1029.65 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **32. M/s. Zippy Edible Product Pvt. Ltd., Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 73, total project cost of ₹ 2612.91 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1660.57 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1238.93 Lakh (Grant restricted to ₹. 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline).

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for preparation of Vegetarian Mock Meat Analogues with Value added RTC frozen snacks.
- b. IMAC observed that though the applicant has proposed both Spiral freezer and Blast freezer for the RTE products, the Blast freezer is proposed for the gravies and also for cooling of formed products which are at 40°C.
- c. IMAC noted that the applicant to submit the revised CE Mechanical certificate with capacity and cost bifurcation of components such as - packing section, frying section, coating section, etc. as the same is not mentioned in the submitted CE Mechanical certificate.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 23.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 73, total project cost of ₹ 2612.91 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1660.57 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1238.93 Lakh (Grant restricted to ₹. 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guideline).

### **33. M/s. Syra Foods, Yamuna Nagar, Haryana**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 61, total project cost of ₹ 3034.51 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1399.67 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 681.08 Lakh.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for preparation of RTE / RTC poultry products like Salami, Sausages, Frankfurters etc.
- b. IMAC noted that the applicant has uploaded only 3 pages of bank appraisal note issued by Union Bank of India, Yamuna Nagar containing the required parameters without having detailed financial calculations, partners details etc.
- c. IMAC further observed that the proposed number and capacity of reefer vehicles (5 vehicles of 15 MT each) is not in sync with the proposed facilities and observed that the number and capacity of vehicles may be modified with lesser or practicable capacity.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Union Bank of India) vide email dated 24.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 61, total project cost of ₹ 3034.51 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1399.67 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 681.08 Lakh.

### **34. M/s. Far N Beyond Sustainable LLP, Haridwar, Uttarakhand**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 68, total project cost of ₹1954.11 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1338.77 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1004.08 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Irradiation of Fruits & Vegetables.
- b. IMAC noted the explanation of the applicant, for the query regarding the project might be utilized for Pharma Industry since most of partners has experience in pharmaceutical industry, that the project has been conceptualized to promote export of irradiated mangoes from the region and also will help in irradiation of herbs / nutraceutical products from Patanjali Food Park which are considered under Food as per the law.
- c. IMAC observed that as per the CE (Mech) certificate, though both Freeze Dryer and Blast Freezer is proposed, cost of Blast Freezer is not provided. Accordingly, IMAC directed to obtain the cost and capacity break-up for Freeze Dryer and Blast Freezer and also for proposed electrical components.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd.) vide email dated 22.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 68, total project cost of ₹1954.11 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1338.77 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1004.08 Lakh (Restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **35. M/s. Firstfish Seafood Processing Pvt. Ltd., South Andamans, Andamans & Nicobar Island**

#### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 62, total project cost of ₹ 1994.19 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1576.47 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1136.35 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Frozen Tuna Fish, Sword fish etc
- b. IMAC noted that the proposed reefer vehicle capacity is in line with the per day project capacity, as per the General Principle adopted for considering marine projects. Further, the proposed equity is less than the proposed net worth and also no working capital margin money for the project was proposed so as to escalate the project cost for undue advantage in scoring.
- c. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (State Bank of India) vide email dated 20.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 62, total project cost of ₹ 1994.19 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 1576.47 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1136.35 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **36. M/s. Mekworld Marines and Exports Private Limited, West Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the revised score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 2821.87 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 2201.28 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1083.65 Lakh (restricted to ₹. 1000.00 lakh as per the scheme guideline).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for IQF value added frozen shrimps.
- b. IMAC noted that the capacity of reefer vehicles was revised to 54 MT ( 25 MT for reefer vehicles and no change in proposed capacity of Insulated vehicles i.e. 6 MT x 2 Nos. & 4 MT x 1 No.) as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects.
- c. IMAC further noted that there were no other issues in this proposal related to working capital margin, IDC and proposed equity as per the general principle adopted for marine projects.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Indian Bank) vide email dated 26.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a revised score of 80, total project cost of ₹ 2821.87 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹. 2201.28 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹. 1083.65 Lakh (restricted to ₹. 1000.00 lakh as per the scheme guideline).

## **37. M/s. Sai Maruthi Agro Processing Private Limited, Kolar District, Karnataka**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the revised score of 69, total project cost of ₹ 3069.58 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1532.16 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 737.29 lakh.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is for Chilled / Frozen Poultry and its cut-up parts.
- b. IMAC observed that the promoter's experience in egg manufacturing has not been considered as experience of cold chain or food processing and accordingly, score was revised from 4 to 0.
- c. IMAC further noted that the proposed Blast freezer trays (i.e. 2500 units) are too high, but, these many numbers are required for the proposed project (blast freezer: 2 nos of 15MTPB each) as each tray could hold about 12 to 15 kgs of the product.
- d. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Canara Bank) vide email dated 26.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.



### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the recised score of 69, total project cost of ₹ 3069.58 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 1532.16 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 737.29 lakh

### **38. M/s. The Krishna District Milk Producers Mutually Aided Cooperative Milk Union Ltd., Krishna, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal as eligible with the score of 78, total project cost of ₹ 8048.02 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 3745.21 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1730.01 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is from Co-operative milk union proposing to process 3 LLPD with value added products of Pasteurised milk, butter milk, curd, paneer etc.
- b. IMAC noted that the processing capacity of the project, as per DPR & Bank Appraisal is 4.00 LLPD and as per CE (Civil) & CE (Mech) is 3.0 LLPD and the eligible grant was calculated based on the cost norms applicable for 3 LLPD capacity.
- c. IMAC further noted that the total project cost includes many of the in-eligible items also, which may hinder at the time of release of installments. IMAC advised the applicant to submit the revised project cost after removal of ineligible components and accordingly to submit the financial parameters duly authenticated by the lending bank.
- d. IMAC opined that being the Co-operative, the Milk Union may have an existing processing facilities, for which, it was clarified that the proposed facility at Village: Veeravalli is about 35 KM away from the existing facility.
- e. IMAC also noted that the lending bank (Axis Bank Limited) vide email dated 22.03.2021 confirmed the issuance of bank appraisal note and In-principle Sanction letter for the term loan.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with a score of 78, total project cost of ₹ 8048.02 lakh, eligible project cost of ₹ 3745.21 lakh and eligible grant-in-aid of ₹ 1730.01 Lakh (restricted to ₹ 1000.00 lakh as per scheme guidelines).

### 39. M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana

#### TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth.

#### IMAC Observation

- a) IMAC noted that the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded net worth supporting documents (land documents, circle rate, investment detail) of the applicants (₹ 1326.80 Lakhs) is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000.00 Lakhs = ₹ 1500.00 Lakhs) and is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines.
- b) IMAC further noted that one of the land documents uploaded for net-worth supporting is in regional language and the same has not been considered by TC for net worth calculation. As informed by the applicant during the meeting, IMAC noted that the English translated documents were submitted vide email dated 16.03.2021. After detailed discussion, decided to consider the same and directed to re-calculate the net-worth.
- c) IMAC observed that TC awarded and revised the score from 0 to 10 in the scoring criterion for the possession of land as the registration of the land in the name of the firm is not possible, as of now, due to development of new integrated land records management system by the Telangana Government.
- d) IMAC further observed that no score was awarded for the criterion for raw material availability data in the proposed catchment area, though, the same is provided in the DPR (data for the year 2019-20 by Horticulture Department, Govt of Telangana) but the provided link is not accessible. IMAC after discussion decided to award score and revised the score from 0 to 5. The revised score is attached as **Annexure-A**
- e) IMAC was appraised during the meeting that the calculated net-worth of the applicant, after considering the translated land document towards net-worth, is ₹1517.68 lakh which is more than the required net-worth. Accordingly, the proposal is eligible with the revised score of 67, total project cost of ₹ 3622.22 lakh, total eligible project cost of ₹ 1903.67 and eligible grant on aid of ₹ 936.213 lakh. The grant calculation sheet is attached as **Annexure-B**.

#### Revised Net worth calculation:

The applicant has uploaded the CA certificates dated 26.02.2021 for the net-worth duly issued by CA Shiva Kumar Yerrola (bearing membership no. 26402 from the firm M/s. Thirupathi & Associates), as per which total net-worth of the applicant as on 26.02.2021 is Rs. 1781.12 lakh.

After acceptance of the submission of translated English land documents, post TC, by IMAC, the calculated net-worth as per the uploaded balance sheet, land document, circle rate notification, the net worth of the applicant is ₹ 1517.68 lakh, which is more than 1.5 times the grant sought.

S. No.	M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators	As per the CA certificate (₹ lakh)	As per the PMA assessment (₹. lakh)	Remarks
	Particular	Net worth as on 26.02.2021	Net worth as on 26.02.2021	
1	Sriharsha Bashetty	18.39	5.48	
2	Sarita Miriyala	239.84	141.50	Land documents not uploaded for the address mentioned in CA certificate
3	Uma Devi Javvadi	8.94	0.00	
4	Sushmitha Bashetty	4.85	0.00	
5	Ravindranath Yadav Chinthala	969.78	874.94	Document not submitted for shares and investment in other companies
6	Prasanna Anjaneya Sravan Chowdary Chava	539.32	495.76	Land document for Huzurnagar is in regional language and English translation submitted post TC was accepted by IMAC.
	<b>Total Net-worth</b>	<b>1781.12</b>	<b>1517.68</b>	

### IMAC Decision

IMAC approved the proposal as eligible with the revised score of 67, total project cost of ₹ 3622.22 lakh, total eligible project cost of ₹ 1903.67 and eligible grant on aid of ₹ 936.213 lakh.

## **Proposals approved by IMAC as In-eligible;**

### **1. M/s American Agro Foods, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

Technical Committee recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of non-submission of appraisal note from lending bank, insufficient net worth and score being 38 which is less than minimum required score of 60.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that applicant has submitted In-principle sanction letter dated 16.02.2021 issued by Union Bank of India without appraisal note.
- ii. IMAC was also apprised that the net worth assessed by the PMA based on the supporting documents is **Rs. 7.18 Crores** which is less than required net worth of Rs. 15.00 Cr due to non-submission of valuation report which was also agreed by the applicant.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of non-submission of appraisal note from lending bank, insufficient net worth and score being 38 which is less than minimum required score of 60.

### **2. M/s Shree Shankar Cotton Corporation, Barwani, Madhya Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible as there is already a Agro Processing Cluster sanctioned within 20 Kms of the proposed location. TC asked the promoter to contact the promoter of above APC to get the plot over there and set up the project in the above cluster. Mr Trishank Tayal, leading promoter has also agreed for the same.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that there is one existing project M/s Nimar Agro sanctioned under APC scheme which is within 20 Kms from the proposed location and the leading promoter Mr Trishank Tayal is also associated with the promoters of M/s Nimar Agro.
- ii. IMAC was further informed that promoter have already been advised to start the project at M/s Nimar Agro as the promoter would be able to use all the basic/common infrastructure like cold storage, sorting grading line etc. from the sanctioned APC.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as per the above-mentioned observations/reasons.

### **3. M Food Art International, Budaun, Uttar Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible as the project design and business model was not convincing and could not be explained /justified by the promoter.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that during TC meeting, the applicant was asked to justify the proposed capacity of Frozen storage of 4000 MT and cold storage of 5500 MT which is not matching with the other facilities proposed like IQF of 4 MT/hr. The argument presented by the applicant was not justified regarding the project rationale.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that as per clarification provided by the applicant project is mainly for trading business and proposed project is also the expansion of the existing business of renting cold storage.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as the project design and business model was not convincing and could not be explained /justified by the promoter during TC.

### **4. M/s Agarwal International, Rudrapur, Uttarakhand**

#### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible as per the IMAC decision dated 21.08.2020, 24.08.2020, 28.08.2020 and 31.08.2020 which stated that only one project per Family to be assisted financially under PMKSY and Family means immediate family / relatives such as spouse, father/mother, son/daughter, in-laws of son/daughter, son-in-law and daughter-in-law. The second proposal can be submitted only after two years from the date of release of final installment of Grant-in-aid.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that there is already an existing cold chain project named M/s Agarwal Frozen Foods in the location Kh. No. 618, address: Village Shimla Pistor, Tehsil Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand which is the same location for main processing center proposed by the applicant.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that the promoter – Ashish Agarwal is son of Susheel Kumar Agarwal who is promoter of ongoing Cold Chain Project of M/s Agarwal Frozen Foods and 3<sup>rd</sup> and final installment of grant has not yet been released to the project.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as per the general decision taken during IMAC dated 21.08.2020, 24.08.2020, 28.08.2020 and 31.08.2020.

## **5. M/s Saadi Agro and Allied Industries, Gorakhpur, Uttar Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (17.03.2021 & 18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible as the project design and business model was not convincing to the TC as per objective of the scheme and could not be explained /justified by the promoter.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that promoters of the applicant firm are in the business of cold storages and marketing of fresh Fruits and Vegetables and have no experience in cold chain facility.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that capacity of Refrigerated truck is very high and not proportionate with the proposed project and requirement of processing line of 4 MT/hr could not be explained by the promoter.
- iii. IMAC was also apprised that frozen storage of 4000 MT appears to be very high and the same was not justified by the promoter during TC meeting held on 18.03.2021.
- iv. Clarification was sought from the applicant about the project design and business model during TC meeting, however the applicant was not able to explain the same. TC advised the applicant to rework on the project design and re-apply next time.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as the project design and business model was not convincing and could not be explained /justified by the promoter during TC.

## **6. M/s Marupudi Sea Foods Private Limited, Prakasham, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

The technical committee recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of general recommendation by the technical committee in respect of 7 marine/fishery proposals.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that in 7 case of marine/fishery proposals, it has been observed that the project cost was highly inflated by taking margin money in promoter's equity. In most of the cases it has been seen that the equity proposed is more than the calculated net worth. All the cases were recommended ineligible by the TC."
- ii. IMAC was apprised that applicant clarified during TC meeting that Mr. CH Vijay kumar is holding 5% share in the M/s Royal Marine Imp-Ex Pvt Ltd which is engaged in shrimps processing. However, Financial statement of M/s Royal Marine Imp-Ex Pvt Ltd was not legible, turnover could not be verified. Therefore, only 4 marks for experience were awarded by TC.

- iii. IMAC further noted that equity of Rs 21.85 Cr includes Rs 10 Cr as Margin Money for Working Capital which seems very high. In addition, it was also noted that IDC of Rs 1.2 Cr is included in the project cost which seems very high.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of clause (i) of general recommendation of TC for marine proposals as mentioned above.

## **7. M/s Gayatri Marine Products, Chittoor, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of general recommendation by the technical committee in respect of 7 marine/fishery proposals.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that in 7 case of marine/fishery proposals, it has been observed that the project cost was highly inflated by taking margin money in promoter's equity. In most of the cases it has been seen that the equity proposed is more than the calculated net worth. All the cases were recommended ineligible by the TC."
- ii. IMAC observed that source of raw material provided by the applicant in the DPR and Bank appraisal submitted i.e. Socio Economical Survey 2018-19, Andhra Pradesh is accessible on the website from where district wise shrimp production data were provided in DPR. Therefore, marks under scoring criterion no 1 was increased from 0 to 5.
- iii. IMAC was apprised that as decided by TC, maximum capacity of reefer vehicle has been restricted to double of daily production capacity of project in one shift of 8 hour and accordingly, capacity of reefer for the project has been restricted to 30.4 MT only. Therefore, 5 marks have been reduced to 0 under scoring criterion no 8.
- iv. IMAC was further apprised that equity of Rs 20.62 Cr includes Rs 10 Cr as MMWC which seems very high. In addition, it was also noted that IDC of Rs 1.12 Cr is included in the project cost which seems very high. Moreover, networth (Rs 15.26 Cr) of the applicant firm is assessed less than proposed infusion of equity (Rs 20.62 Cr). The same could not be justified by the applicant.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of clause (i) of general recommendation of TC for marine proposals as mentioned above.

## **8. M/s Aadhya Sea Foods Private Limited, West Godawari, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of general recommendation by the technical committee in respect of 7 marine/fishery proposals.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that in 7 case of marine/fishery proposals, it has been observed that the project cost was highly inflated by taking margin money in promoter's equity. In most of the cases it has been seen that the equity proposed is more than the calculated net worth. All the cases were recommended ineligible by the TC."
- ii. IMAC noted that equity of Rs 20.64 Cr includes Rs 6 Cr as MMWC which seems very high. In addition, it was also noted that IDC of Rs 1.21 Cr is included in the project cost which seems very high. Moreover, networth (Rs 17.8 Cr) of the applicant firm is assessed less than proposed infusion of equity (Rs 20.64 Cr). The same could not be explained and justified by the applicant.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of clause (i) of general recommendation of TC for marine proposals as mentioned above.

## **9. Indus Farmers Food Company LLP, Araria, Bihar**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of non-submission of NOC for setting up of slaughter-house from state government and inability of promoter to explain the rationale for proposed capacity.

### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that applicant has proposed buffalo slaughter and meat processing plant in Araria district of Bihar. Applicant confirmed during TC meeting that they did not obtain any separate NOC from state government other than CTE from pollution control board.
- ii. IMAC was also apprised that applicant has proposed Blast Freezer – 20 MT/day x 7 Nos, Plate Freezer – 15 MT/Day x 4 Nos, Product Chiller – 30 MT/day, Offal Blast Freezer – 6 MT/day x 4, Offal Plate Freezer – 10 MT/day x 2, Offal Chiller – 20 MT/day, Cold Storage – 1500 MT x 6 Nos which appear to be on the higher side. IMAC further apprised that the applicant could not explain the rationale for the proposed capacity during TC.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of non-submission of NOC for setting up of slaughter-house from state government and inability of promoter to explain the rationale for proposed capacity.



**10. M/s Charis Foods LLP, Belgaum, Karnataka**

**TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Observation**

- i. IMAC was apprised that the calculated net-worth of the applicant comes to Rs. 68.00 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs. 244.52 lakh = Rs. 366.78 lakh).
- ii. The net worth claimed in CA certificate is of 4 individuals out of which 2 are not even Partners in the LLP (The same was confirmed by the applicant during the TC Meeting also). Accordingly, the claimed NW of Rs. 5.40 Crores comes down to Rs. 2.70 Crores (at Market Rates).

**IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

**11. M/s Magnum Estates Limited, Khordha, Odisha**

**TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of non-setting up of Chill Room at FLI which is a mandatory component at FLI as per clause 4(a) of scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that the applicant has proposed DH cum Main Processing Facility at Khurdha District, Odisha and Pre-processing Centre at FLI at Balasore. It was further noted at the Pre-processing centre at Balasore only Weighing Machine – 2 Nos, Pre-processing/peeling tables – 5 Nos, Trolley – 2 Nos and Showel have been proposed and no chill room has been proposed.
- ii. IMAC was further apprised that as per clause 4(a) of scheme guidelines, Farm Level Infrastructure shall have one or more of the facilities mentioned in sub-para 5.1 (a to j) of guidelines. TC was of the view that without chill room project is not viable.
- iii. IMAC was apprised that during TC meeting, applicant clarified that their existing business in the name of M/s Magnum Sea Foods is located in Balasore at a distance of 400 m from proposed unit which is an asbestos shed taken on rent. Applicant also clarified that they propose to store some of the raw material from FLI at Balasore at the existing business unit at Balasore.

## **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of non-setting up of Chill Room at FLI which is a mandatory component as per clause 4(a) of scheme guidelines.

### **12. M/s B-one Business House Pvt Ltd, Khordha, Odisha**

#### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible considering identical to existing unit which is in the same mega food park and also assisted by MoFPI. The only difference is addition of FLI at Balasore, Odisha and Reefer Vehicles. The facility at Balasore (FLI) is having only tables and no sorting/grading line has been proposed to be setup. Therefore, this facility cannot be considered as FLI. Further, Mega Food Park, which has also been assisted by MoFPI, is also having processing facility at Balasore and provision of reefer vehicles.

#### **IMAC Observations**

- i. IMAC was apprised that M/s B One Business House Pvt Ltd has availed grant of Rs. 5.00 Cr from MoFPI under Kisan Sampada Yojna for CEFPPC and the final grant of Rs. 2.5 Cr was released to the project on 21.01.2019.
- ii. Further, the existing unit for which the above firm has availed grant is also situated in the same Mega Food Park at nearby plot. This food park has also been assisted by MoFPI.
- iii. The proposed project under Cold Chain Scheme is identical to existing unit as mentioned above. The only difference is addition of FLI at Balasore, Odisha and Reefer Vehicles. It is informed that facility at Balasore (FLI) is having only tables and no sorting/grading line has been proposed to be setup. Therefore, this facility cannot be considered as FLI. Further, Mega Food Park is also having processing facility at Balasore and provision of reefer vehicles.
- iv. IMAC was apprised that the applicant confirmed during TC meeting that their existing unit is located at Plot no- 27 Seafood Park, Deras, Khorda district and the proposed main processing centre will be located at Plot no. 23 Seafood Park, Deras, Khorda district which are adjacent to each other. As per clause 8(i) of scheme guidelines Expansion/upgradation of the existing facility(ies) in the same premises will not be entertained.
- v. IMAC was apprised that based on the above reasons, TC has recommended the proposal as ineligible.

## **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible considering identical to existing unit which is in the same mega food park and also assisted by MoFPI. The only difference is addition of FLI at Balasore, Odisha and Reefer Vehicles. The facility at Balasore (FLI) is having only tables and no sorting/grading line has been proposed to be setup. Therefore, this facility cannot be considered

as FLI. Further, Mega Food Park, which has also been assisted by MoFPI, is also having processing facility at Balasore and provision of reefer vehicles.

### **13. M/s Star Foods, Ludhiana, Punjab**

#### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- i. IMAC noted that the applicant is not meeting the net-worth criteria and has also not submitted the Bank Appraisal Note.
- ii. IMAC observed that the calculated net-worth of the applicant comes to Rs. 182.00 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs. 1000 lakh =Rs. 1500 lakh).
- iii. Net worth documents for Rs. 55.20 Crores are submitted in regional language and documents for Rs. 29.00 Crores are not submitted.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

### **14. M/s Banga Kali Seafoods Pvt Ltd, Hoogly, West Bengal**

#### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- i. IMAC observed that the calculated net-worth of the applicant comes to Rs. 1116.00 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs. 1000 lakh =Rs. 1500 lakh).
- ii. The claimed net worth of Rs. 19.75 Crores is reduced to Rs 11.16 Crores if valuation of shares of Private limited Company is done at face value as per Para 8(a) (iv) of the scheme guidelines.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

**15. M/s Govitri Dairy LLP, Faridabad, Haryana**

**TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

**IMAC Observation**

- i. IMAC observed that the calculated net-worth of the applicant comes to Rs. 1076.00 lakh only which is less than the required 1.5 times grant sought (i.e. 1.5 times of Rs. 1000 lakh = Rs. 1500 lakh).
- ii. Net worth documents are not submitted by applicant for FD & Bank documents worth Rs. 2.02 Crores and legible copy of land ownership documents for the land measuring 16.60 Acre (only 1/5th Share is relevant) worth Rs. 1.49 Crores.

**IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth as per the clause 8(a) of the scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019.

**16. Nand Prakash and Company, Bilaspur, Himachal Pradesh**

**TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient net worth i.e. ₹133.91 lakh, which is less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹650.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines; and
- The name of the firm is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant, this contravenes the para 9 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Documents and Fee required.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

- The applicant has proposed Frozen store of 150 MT and Blast Freezer of 2 MT/Batch. However, the applicant has not proposed any value addition equipment's integrated with the blast freezer such as dicing and slicing, Juice extraction, Optical Grader, peeling or other processing. In the view of this project seems to be more of standalone storage facility.
- The name of the firm is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant:

SL No	Name of The Firm as per DPR, Undertaking In-principle Sanction & Bank Appraisal Note	Name of The Firm as per Partnership deed, Lease Deed, Balance Sheet & PAN Card
1	M/s Nand Prakash & Company	M/s Nand Parkash & Company

- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines]; and contravention of para 9 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Documents and Fee required.

**17. Avyakth Infraventure LLP, Bangalore Rural, Karnataka**

**TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- FLI mandatory component not proposed – as per criterion 4 of the scheme guidelines; and
- Insufficient net worth i.e. Nil, which is less than 1.5 time of the grant sought of ₹1000.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (i) of the scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.
- FLI is not proposed, instead two collection centers proposed without any facility.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of FLI mandatory component not proposed [criterion 4 of the scheme guidelines]; and insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (i) of the scheme guidelines].

## **18. Sap Fresh Foods Private Limited, Indore, Madhya Pradesh**

### **TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth i.e. ₹528.69 lakh, which less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹1000.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (i) of the scheme guidelines.

### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

#### **Observations:**

- Applicant has uploaded notarized lease deed, however, as per the scheme guidelines, the applicant has to submit the registered Sale/ Lease Deed.
- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

#### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (i) of the scheme guidelines].

## **19. Arrk Enterprises, Mohali, Punjab**

### **TC recommendation dated 16.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth i.e. ₹829.86 lakh, which less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹1000.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines.

### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

#### **Observations:**

The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

#### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines].

## 20. Shree Laxmi Frozen Foods, Farukhabad, Uttar Pradesh

### TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient net worth i.e. ₹259.02 lakh, which less than 1.5 time of the grant sought of ₹600.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines.
- The name of the firm is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant, this contravenes the para 9 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Documents and Fee required.

### IMAC Observations and Decision:

#### Observations:

- The name of the Partner is different in legal documents uploaded by the applicant:

SL No	Name of the Partner as per DPR	Name of the Partner as per Partnership deed & Undertaking
1	Umesh Chand Agarwal	Umesh Chandra Agarwal

- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

#### Decision:

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines]; and contravention of para 9 of the Scheme Guidelines i.e. Documents and Fee required.

## 21. Krushi Steritech Services Private Limited, Ramanagara, Karnataka

### TC recommendation dated 17.03.2021:

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible, as the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criteria i.e. score of 58, which is less than minimum scoring criterion of 60 Marks - as per criterion 11.1 (b) of the scheme guidelines.

### IMAC Observations and Decision:

#### Observations:

The applicant has uploaded notarized agreement to sale in favour of M/s Krushi Steritech Services Pvt. Ltd. and CLU not uploaded. Accordingly, no marks have been awarded.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of less score [criterion no. 11.1 (b) of the scheme guidelines].

**22. Green Asia Impex Private Limited, West Godavari, Andhra Pradesh****TC recommendation dated 18.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient Term Loan Contribution i.e. 17.33% - as per criterion no. 8 (c) of the scheme guidelines i.e. Availing term loan from the Bank / Financial Institutions (FI) for an amount not less than 20% of the project cost, except in case of North East States; and
- Non-submission of complete Bank appraisal note as the Project cost, means of finance and Financial ratios not mentioned – as per criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines i.e. A detailed appraisal note from the bank/financial institution specific to the proposal. Detailed Project Report /Techno Economic Viability Report merely stamped or endorsed by the Bank/ FI without detailed appraisal note shall not be considered as valid appraisal note and such proposals will not be considered for financial assistance.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:****Observations:**

- Applicant has uploaded Bank appraisal note dated 08.02.2021 from HDFC Bank. The Bank appraisal is incomplete since Project cost, means of finance and Financial Ratio not mentioned.
- The proposed term loan is ₹200.00 lakh and the total project cost ₹1154.09 lakh. The proposed term loan is 17.33% of the total project cost. Accordingly, the proposal does not meet the basic eligibility criterion i.e. Infusion of term loan of at least 20% of the total project cost.
- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible, as the applicant does not meet the basic eligibility criterion i.e. insufficient Term Loan Contribution [criterion no. 8 (c) of the scheme guidelines] and non-submission of valid bank appraisal note [criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines].



### **23. Sam Aqua Exports LLP, Krishna, Andhra Pradesh**

#### **TC recommendation dated 18.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as ineligible, as the applicant has proposed margin money for working capital of ₹1000.00 lakh and Interest during capital of ₹204.00 lakh which seems very high. Accordingly, TC noted that the project is not viable and considered the project as ineligible.

#### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

##### **Observations:**

IMAC noted that in 7 case of marine proposals, it has been observed that the project cost was highly inflated by taking margin money in promoter's equity. In most of the cases it has been seen that the equity proposed is more than the calculated net worth. All the cases were recommended ineligible by the TC. This is one of such case were the calculated net worth i.e. ₹2240.54 lakh is almost equal to proposed promoter's equity of ₹2009.93 lakh [as per DPR].

##### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as the project cost was highly inflated and calculated net worth is almost equal to proposed equity.

### **24. Global Agro Foods, Cuttack, Orissa**

#### **TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient net worth i.e. ₹134.47 lakh, which less than 1.5 time of the grant sought of ₹578.53 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines; and
- Non-submission of Bank appraisal note - as per criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines

#### **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

##### **Observations:**

- The applicant has not uploaded detailed bank appraisal note. The applicant has uploaded the In-principal sanction letter and DPR in place of Bank appraisal note.
- The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of Insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines] and Non-submission of Bank appraisal note [criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines].

**25. Kuppanna Poultry Farm, Tirupur, Tamilnadu****TC recommendations dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of Scoring i.e. 47, which is less than minimum scoring criterion of 60 Marks - as per criterion 11.1 (b) of the scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of less score [criterion no. 11.1 (b) of the scheme guidelines].

**26. Sri Teja Dairy, Anantapur, District, Andhra Pradesh****TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient net worth (Net worth could not be ascertained, since, the grant amount not mentioned in DPR, Bank Appraisal Note and In-principle sanction letter) - as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines; and
- Non submission of valid In principle sanction letter and Bank Appraisal Note as per 8 (c) & 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:****Observations:**

- The applicant has uploaded in principle sanction letter dated 06.02.2021, however, the same is for the purpose of small and medium enterprises scheme.
- The applicant has uploaded the internal note instead of Bank Appraisal Note.

- The applicant has not mentioned the grant amount anywhere in DPR, bank appraisal notes, In principle term loan sanction and CA Certificate. Accordingly, the Net worth of the Project cannot be ascertained.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines] and Non submission of valid In-principle sanction letter and Bank Appraisal Note [8 (c) & 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines].

**27. Laxmi Milk Products, Banaskantha, Gujarat**

**TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on the following accounts:

- Insufficient net worth i.e. ₹124.74 lakh, which less than 1.5 time of the grant sought of ₹300.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines; and
- Non submission of valid Bank Appraisal Note - as per criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

- The applicant has uploaded Note to Regional Manager Level Credit Committee (RMCC – AGM), Regional Office – Banaskantha instead of Bank Appraisal. The same is not on the letter head of the bank and is not signed and stamped.
- The letter head of bank, signature of authorized signatory and stamp is not visible on the uploaded bank appraisal note.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines] and Non submission of valid Bank Appraisal Note [criterion no. 8 (d) of the scheme guidelines].

**28. Sharidh Associates, Belgaum, Karnataka**

**TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal as ineligible, since, the same applicant M/s Shashi Sidnal Foods Pvt. Ltd. has applied another proposal ICC-EOI-CC/2019-20/1897.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

M/s Shashi Sidnal Foods Pvt. Ltd. has applied another proposal ICC-EOI-CC/2019-20/1897.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible.

**29. KSE Limited, Dindigul, Tamilnadu**

**TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee (TC) recommends the proposal as ineligible, as in the absence of the boundary wall between two projects, it will be considered as single premises and hence contravenes the clause 8 (i) of scheme guidelines dated 17.12.2019 i.e. "Expansion/Upgradation of the existing facilities in the same premises will not be entertained.

**IMAC Observations and Decision:**

**Observations:**

Applicant already have the existing plant for dairy processing on the same land and no separate wall has been constructed.

**Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible as per the clause 8 (i) of scheme guidelines i.e. "Expansion/Upgradation of the existing facilities in the same premises will not be entertained".

**30. Manjeera Dairy Products, Sangareddy, Telangana**

**TC recommendation dated 19.03.2021:**

Technical Committee recommends the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth i.e. ₹829.86 lakh, which less than 1.5 times of the grant sought of ₹1000.00 lakh – as per criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines.

## **IMAC Observations and Decision:**

### **Observations:**

The applicant has not uploaded complete net-worth supporting documents and accordingly is not meeting the net-worth criteria.

### **Decision:**

IMAC approved the proposal as ineligible on account of insufficient net worth [criterion no. 8 (a) (ii) of the scheme guidelines].

### **31. M/s. H S Frozen Foods, Mehsana, Gujarat**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) (ii) regarding net worth.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC observed that the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded supporting document of the applicant is ₹ 1348.55 Lakhs, which is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000 = ₹ 1500.00).
- b) IMAC noted that the applicant has not uploaded complete net worth supporting documents (building valuation certificate and Investment proof for deposit against Amit Pharma) and accordingly is not meeting the net worth criteria.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the requirements of clause 8 (a) (ii) of scheme guidelines regarding net worth.

### **32. M/s. Delhi Agrocool Pvt. Ltd., Kundli, Haryana**

#### **TC Recommendation (16.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 4 for project components, clause 8 (d) for non-submission of detailed bank appraisal note and 8 (e) for minimum required infusion of equity.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC observed that the proposal is proposed as standalone cold storage for the project without any processing/value addition infrastructure

- b) IMAC further observed that documents required for assessment of basic eligibility of the proposal viz, bank appraisal report, term loan sanction letter and required infusion of equity have not been uploaded.
- c) Accordingly, does not meet the requirements of the guidelines regarding project components and bank appraisal note.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 4 for project components, clause 8 (d) for non-submission of detailed bank appraisal note and 8 (e) for minimum required infusion of equity.

## **33. M/s. Srinidhi Sea Foods, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC observed that the proposal is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines.
- b) Further, IMAC noted that uploaded land documents towards net-worth are in vernacular language and no other supporting documents has been uploaded by the applicant to assess the net worth.
- c) IMAC also noted that as per the general principles adopted by the TC for determining the reefer vehicle capacity, the score (55) is less than the minimum required score as per the guideline i.e. 60.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines and score (55) less than the minimum required score as per the guideline i.e. 60.

### **34. M/s. Akshay Food Impex Private Limited, Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to project design issues as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC observed that applicant has proposed working capital margin of ₹ 1000.00 lakh, IDC of ₹ 105.00 lakh and the proposed equity (i.e. ₹. 2112.25 lakh) for the project is more than the net-worth proposed (i.e. ₹. 1696.20 lakh).
- b. IMAC noted that the proposal is ineligible as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects where the disproportionate margin money was proposed so as to inflate the project cost and equity for scoring advantage. IMAC observed that the financial parameters for the project would be changed if margin money from the project as well from equity is removed and accordingly revised bank appraisal report is required in such proposals for assessing the projects.
- c. IMAC, after detailed discussion, decided to accept the recommendation of the Technical Committee in this regard.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC considered the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal due to project design issues as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects.

### **35. M/s. Rajyalakshmi Marine Exports, East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh**

#### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines and also due to project design issues.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC observed that the proposal is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines. Further, IMAC noted that some of the land documents i.e 10 out of 27 documents uploaded as net-worth supporting document are not in the name of any of the partners and accordingly could not be considered for calculation of net-worth.
- b. IMAC further noted that the proposal is also ineligible as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects where the disproportionate margin money was proposed so

as to inflate the project cost and equity for scoring advantage. IMAC observed that the financial parameters for the project would be changed if margin money from the project as well from equity is removed and accordingly revised bank appraisal report is required in such proposals for assessing the projects.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines and also due to project design issues.

## **36. M/s. GSR Nirmaan, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to project design issues as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC observed that applicant has proposed working capital margin of ₹ 800.00 lakh, IDC of ₹ 206.25 lakh and the proposed equity (i.e. ₹. 2144.68 lakh) for the project is more than the net-worth proposed (i.e. ₹. 1513.29 lakh).
- b. IMAC noted that the proposal is ineligible as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects where the disproportionate margin money was proposed so as to inflate the project cost and equity for scoring advantage. IMAC observed that the financial parameters for the project would be changed if margin money from the project as well from equity is removed and accordingly revised bank appraisal report is required in such proposals for assessing the projects.
- c. IMAC, after detailed discussion, decided to accept the recommendation of the Technical Committee in this regard.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal due to project design issues as per the general methodology adopted for marine projects.

## **37. M/s. Nekkanti Sea Foods Ltd., East Godavari, Andhra Pradesh**

### **TC Recommendation (18.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible as per the clause 8 (i) i.e. Expansion /upgradation of the existing facility(ies) in the same premises will not be entertained.



### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC observed that the proposal is proposed at Nekkanti Mega Food Park which was approved by AP Food Processing Society and also the clarification given by the representative of the applicant that proposed TCW & P&M are not part of existing project submitted to AP Food Processing Society seeking grant.
- b) Further, IMAC observed that the existing as well as the proposed facilities are adjacent to each other without any boundary wall between it. IMAC observed that in the absence of the boundary wall, the proposed facility will be an expansion of the existing facility and accordingly, IMAC accepted the recommendation of the Technical Committee.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal as per the clause 8 (i) i.e. Expansion /upgradation of the existing facility(ies) in the same premises will not be entertained.

## **38. M/s. Anjaneya Breeding Farm and Hatcheries, Belagavi, Karnataka**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible due to insufficient net worth (as per point 8(a) of the guidelines) and Non submission of term loan appraisal note (as per point 8 (d) of the guidelines).

### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC observed that the proposal is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines. IMAC, further, noted that as per the uploaded net worth supporting documents such as ITR supported Balance sheet of applicant firm and land documents, the calculated net-worth (₹. 179.32 Lakh) is less than the required 1.5 times the grant sought (₹ 1500.00 Lakh).
- b) Further, IMAC observed that the applicant has not submitted term loan appraisal note issued by the term loan lending bank against the basic eligibility criteria.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines & non submission of term loan appraisal note (as per point 8 (d) of the guidelines).

### **39. M/s. Aljalil Exports, Mandya, Karnataka**

#### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines, non-submission of latest bank appraisal after the date of EoI and existing project.

#### **IMAC Observation**

- a) IMAC noted that the proposal is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines. IMAC further noted that the Net worth of the applicant as per the balance sheet is ₹ 927.15 lakhs which is less than 1.5 times the grant sought
- b) IMAC also noted that uploaded term loan sanction letter from the lending bank is for additional sanction of term loan for Upgradation of the existing slaughter house and not for the present proposal. Further, the term loan sanction letter is before the date of EoI.
- c) IMAC also noted that uploaded detailed bank appraisal note is prior to the date of EoI and is also for the slaughtering unit. Further, noted that no grant was proposed for the project in the bank appraisal and as per the uploaded bank certificate for commencement of commercial operations, trial production is already done, indicating that the project is already complete.

#### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines, non-submission of latest bank appraisal after the date of EoI and also as the project is already complete.

### **40. M/s. Sabri Food Products Pvt. Ltd., Khurda, Odisha**

#### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC for withdrawal of project.

#### **IMAC Observation**

IMAC observed that the promoter vide letter dated 19.03.2021 (received vide email dated 20.03.2021) informed the Ministry that they are withdrawing the proposal submitted against EoI dated 13.01.2021 and requested to consider the application uploaded against the EoI dated 29.01.2020 which was referred back to TC for re-consideration.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the request of the promoter for withdrawing the proposal.

#### **41. M/s. Shashi Sidnal Foods Pvt. Ltd., Belgaum, Karnataka**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 4 for project components of the scheme guidelines.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 4 for project components of the scheme guidelines.
- b. IMAC also noted that as per CE certificates, no components / cost has been proposed at the FLI cum CC (BMCs) or DH locations and also no reefer vans proposed for the project. IMAC observed that in the absence of Milk Collection and reefer transport, the facility is of standalone Ice cream manufacturing. Accordingly, the proposal is not meeting the eligibility condition as per Clause 4 for project components.
- c. IMAC further noted that the bank appraisal note issued by State Bank of India does not mention the MoFPI grant details under the Means of Finance and hence is considered.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 4 for project components of the scheme guidelines.

#### **42. M/s. Maa Shakambhari Foods, Sambalpur, Odisha**

### **TC Recommendation (19.03.2021)**

TC recommended the proposal to be placed before IMAC as ineligible on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines.

### **IMAC Observation**

- a. IMAC noted that the proposal is ineligible on account of insufficient net worth i.e. the calculated net worth, as per the uploaded land documents of the applicants (₹ 1474.23 Lakhs) is less than the required 1.5 times of the grant applied (i.e. 1.5 times of ₹1000.00 = ₹ 1500.00 lakh).

- b. Further, IMAC noted that copy of passbook submitted as a proof of PPF account is not updated in all cases and not submitted the 6 months moving average price for the L&T shares held by the applicant which were not considered for calculation of net-worth.

### **IMAC Decision**

IMAC approved the recommendation of TC for rejection of the proposal on account of not fulfilling the basic eligibility criteria as per clause 8 (a) (ii) for minimum required net worth of the scheme guidelines.

## Annexure-A

## A. Revised Score Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators

S. No.	Criteria for Evaluation of Integrated Cold Chain Proposals	Max Marks	Marks Obtained	Remarks
1	<b>Adequate Volume and Wider Mix of Raw Materials (Suitability of Location, Project Site and Status of Possession of Land)</b>	20		
	i. <b>Raw Material availability:</b> a. Raw material availability backed by latest data (not later than 3 years old) published by Central/ State Government: 5 marks b. Raw material availability data not published but duly authenticated by concerned block/district/state authority: 3 marks c. If no raw material data has been submitted by the applicant: 0 mark	5	5 (Pg. 57 of DPR)	The applicant has provided the raw material availability data in the proposed catchment area (for the year 2019-20) published by Horticulture Department, Telangana. However, the link mentioned in DPR is not accessible, therefore no score awarded.  <b>IMAC awarded the mark as the data for the raw material availability is provided but the link is not accessible which may be due to technical error. Accordingly, revised the score from 0 to 5.</b>
	ii. Suitability of project location(s) for proposed operations and their connectivity through road, railways etc. If land is in close proximity to state/national highway/freight corridors/golden quadrilateral marks may be awarded, as follows: a. Within 2 kms: 5 marks b. 2 to 5 kms: 3 marks c. >5 kms to 10 kms: 2 marks d. > 10 kms: 0 mark	5	0 (Pg. 6 of DPR)	As per the uploaded DPR, the project location is connected with <a href="#">NH 167</a> at a distance of 22 km.
	iii. <b>Status of project land</b> a. Main facility land in possession of the Applicant with approval for industrial use: 10 marks b. Main facility land in possession of the Applicant without approval for industrial use: 5 marks	10	10	The applicant has uploaded the registered regional & Notarized English version sale deed in the name of partner (Chava Prasanna Anjaneya Sravan Chowdary) for the land situated at S. No. 52/E1, Vajinepalli Village, Mellachervu Mandal, Nalgonda dist. Telangana along with copy of proceeding of the component

				<p>authority, Revenue divisional officer, Suryapet which state that land converted from agriculture to non-agriculture. As the uploaded document is in the name of the partner and not in the name of the applicant firm, no score has been awarded.</p> <p><b><i>TC awarded the score for the criterion as the portal for the registration of the land in the name of firm is under development in the state of Telangana, which was also reported by promoters of earlier phase proposals (i.e Sneha Farms and Chandana Milk Products). Accordingly, revised the score from 0 to 10.</i></b></p>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Experience in Cold Chain/ Food Processing:</b></p> <p>a. Already in cold chain and food processing business having annual turnover of Rs. 5 crore and above during previous year: 10 marks</p> <p>b. If in cold chain or food processing business having annual turnover of Rs. 5 crore and above during previous year: 7 marks</p> <p>c. If in cold chain or food processing business having annual turnover of less than Rs. 5 crores during previous year: 4 marks</p>	<b>10</b>	4	<p>As per the uploaded Bio data/ DPR, the 2 out of 6 partners already have cold chain and food processing experience with the turnover Rs. 2.15 Cr. as per the uploaded balance sheet (FY19-20) for M/s. Bhandra Naturall Fruits Pvt. Ltd.</p>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Economic Viability of the proposal</b></p> <p>Economic Viability of Project Based on Bank Appraisal (Key financial parameters viz. IRR, DSCR, RoI)</p> <p>(The average of score for IRR and DSCR would be considered. IRR and DSCR will be taken from bank appraisal note. In case, IRR and/ or DSCR are not given in the bank appraisal note then the same will be taken from the DPR.</p> <p><b><u>Max marks shall be given for IRR = 5</u></b></p> <p>a. 5 marks shall be given if IRR is &gt;20%</p>	<b>10</b>		
		5	5 (Pg. 23 of Bank appraisal)	<p>As per the bank appraisal note, the IRR for the proposed project is 22.35 %, which is more than required 20%.</p>

	<p>b. 3 marks shall be given if IRR is between 15%-20%</p> <p>c. 1 mark shall be given if IRR is between 10%-15%</p> <p>d. Nil marks shall be given if IRR is less than 10%</p>			
	<p><b><u>Max marks shall be given for DSCR = 5</u></b></p> <p>a. 5 marks shall be given if DSCR &gt;2.5</p> <p>b. 3 marks shall be given if DSCR is between 2.0 and 2.5</p> <p>c. 1 mark shall be given if DSCR is between 1.5 and 2.0</p> <p>d. Nil marks shall be given if DSCR &lt;1.5)</p>	5	5 (Pg. 23 of Bank appraisal)	As per the Bank appraisal note, avg. DSCR of the project is 2.84, which is more than 2.5.
4	<b>Project proposed to be set up in Districts having no projects sanctioned by the MoFPI in any of its scheme</b>	5	0	MoFPI has already approved project in Nalgonda, Telangana.
5	<p><b>The project proposed to be set up in States providing concessions/benefits on the following:</b></p> <p>(i) Power tariff subsidy (1 mark)</p> <p>(ii) Exemption form stamp duty on land (1 mark)</p> <p>(iii) Capital subsidy (1 mark)</p> <p>(iv) Interest subvention on loan (1 mark)</p> <p>(v) Reimbursement of SGST (1 mark)</p> <p>[Supporting document to be submitted]</p>	5	3	<p>The applicant has uploaded the documents issued by Industries &amp; Commerce Department, Government of Telangana dated 28.03.2019. The benefits are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Power tariff subsidy: As per point 4.2.5, Fixed power cost reimbursement @ Rs.1.00 per unit for a period of 5 years from the date of commencement of commercial production.</li> <li>2. Exemption form stamp duty on land: As per point 4.2.1, 100% reimbursement of Stamp duty and transfer duty paid by the industry on purchase of land meant for industrial use.</li> <li>3. Reimbursement of SGST: As per 4.2.6, Reimbursement of 75% for a period of 7 years from the date of commencement of commercial production for Medium Scale Enterprises or</li> </ol>

				up to realization of 100% fixed capital investment, whichever is earlier.
<b>6</b>	<b>Proposed investment in Cold Chain Components</b>	<b>15</b>		
	a. Proposals creating farm level infrastructure, distribution hub and processing at different locations along with reefer/ insulated vans	15		
	b. Proposals creating farm level infrastructure and distribution hub but have combined the processing facility either at farm level infrastructure or distribution hub along with reefer/ insulated vans.	10		
	c. Proposals creating farm level infrastructure with or without processing along with reefer/ insulated vans.	5	5	The applicant has proposed 1 FLI cum processing unit along with 6 reefer vehicles. There is a mention of 1 DH on MIS portal, however, no component details of DH have been provided in DPR/Bank appraisal, therefore the same has not been considered for scoring.
	d. Proposals for setting up irradiation unit.	10		
<b>7</b>	<b>Project proposing value addition/ processing facilities such as IQF, vacuum freeze drying, spiral/tunnel/ blast freezers, etc. for manufacturing of chilled/frozen value-added products including value added fruits &amp; vegetables/ meat/ fisheries/ RTE/ frozen products, etc.</b>	<b>10</b>	10	The applicant has proposed to set up IQF with capacity 2 MTPH
<b>8</b>	<b>Proposals with investment in reefer transport with capacity not less than 70 MT</b>	<b>5</b>	5	As per DPR & CE Mechanical, 6 reefer vehicles proposed for project with total capacity of 72 MT.
<b>9</b>	<b>Proposed Investment in Farm Level Infrastructure</b> [Excluding Cost of Project Land] a. Up to 30% of Project Cost: 5 marks b. More than 30% to 50%: 7 marks c. More than 50%: 10 marks	<b>10</b>	10	As per CE civil & CE mechanical certificates, the applicant has proposed the investment of Rs. 3104.21 lakh in Farm Level Infrastructure (excluding cost of project land), which is 85.68 % of the project cost.
<b>10</b>	<b>Leveraging of Investment in the Project</b>	<b>10</b>		
	<b>For General Areas</b>			



	a.	Proposed equity investment excluding land < 2 times of grant sought: 5 marks		5	The proposed Private Investment (Equity) excluding land is Rs. 1550.21 lakh, which is less than the grant sought (i.e. 2 x 1000.00 = Rs. 2000.00 Lakhs).
	b.	Proposed equity investment excluding land >= 2 times of grant sought: 10 marks			
	<b>For Difficult Areas</b>				
	a.	Proposed equity investment excluding land < grant sought: 5 marks			
	b.	Proposed equity investment excluding land >= grant sought: 10 marks			
	<b>Total</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>67</b>	

## Annexure - B

## Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana

Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana										
Technical Civil Work										
(₹ in Lakhs)										
Sr. No.	Description	As per DPR			As per cost norms		Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
		Proposed Area (in sq mt.)	Rate per sq. mt. (in ₹)	Proposed Cost	Rate per sq Meters	Amount				
<b>Main Processing Facility</b>										
1	Frozen Store	1716.48	6996.54	120.09						Cost considered with P&M
2	Processing Store	1352.41	6996.54	94.62	10000.00	135.24	94.62	50.00%	47.31	As per MoFPI cost norm
3	Ripening Area	283.22	6996.54	19.82						Cost considered with P&M
4	Cold storage area	279.25	6996.54	19.54						
5	Minimal Processing Area	362.74	6996.54	25.38	10003.00	36.28	25.38	50.00%	12.69	As per MoFPI cost norm
6	Pre-Cooling Area	244.65	6996.54	17.12						Cost considered with P&M
7	Utility Area	444.39	6996.54	31.09	10005.00	44.46	31.09	50.00%	15.55	As per MoFPI cost norm
8	High Speed Doors	4 nos.		24.00						Cost considered with P&M
9	Sliding Door Big Size	8 nos.		20.00						
10	Sliding Door small Size	10 nos.		15.00						
11	Flip Flop Double Doors	7 nos.		2.45						
12	Single Doors	19 nos.		3.04						
14	Roofing Shutters	10 nos.		5.00						
15	Puff Panels for Frozen Cold Store- wall & Sealing	5181.72	3500.00	181.36						

**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Technical Civil Work**

(₹ in Lakhs)

Sr. No.	Description	As per DPR			As per cost norms		Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
		Proposed Area (in sq mt.)	Rate per sq. mt. (in ₹)	Proposed Cost	Rate per sq Meters	Amount				
16	Puff Panels for Frozen Cold Store-Ground insulation	1288.80	700.00	9.02						
17	Puff Panels for IQF- wall & Sealing	427.57	3500.00	14.96						
18	Puff Panels for IQF-Ground insulation	54.34	700.00	0.38						
19	Puff Panels for Blast Freezer- wall & Sealing	696.47	3500.00	24.38						
20	Puff Panels for Blast Freezer-Ground insulation	64.17	700.00	0.45						
21	Puff Panels for Pre-Cooler area- wall & Sealing	759.83	2700.00	20.52						
22	Puff Panels for Pre-Cooler area-Ground insulation	151.00	500.00	0.75						
23	Puff Panels for Cold Storage- wall & Sealing	768.69	2700.00	20.75						
24	Puff Panels for Cold Storage-Ground insulation	170.64	500.00	0.85						
25	Puff Panels for Ripening Chamber- wall & Sealing	813.36	2700.00	21.96						
26	Puff Panels for Ripening Chamber-Ground insulation	190.76	500.00	0.95						

Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana										
Technical Civil Work										
(₹ in Lakhs)										
Sr. No.	Description	As per DPR			As per cost norms		Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
		Proposed Area (in sq mt.)	Rate per sq. mt. (in ₹)	Proposed Cost	Rate per sq Meters	Amount				
27	Puff Panels for Processing hall	4829.59	2200.00	106.25						
13	Emergency Exit Doors	6 nos.		1.20					Ineligible	
	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>800.94</b>			<b>151.09</b>		<b>75.55</b>	

Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana									
Plant and Machinery									
(₹ in Lakhs)									
Sr. No.	Name of Component	Proposed Quantity	Capacity	Basic Cost	As per Cost Norms	Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
1	IQF Freezer	1 Pc	2 MTPH	383.04	615.65	615.65	50%	307.82	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
2	Refrigeration for IQF	1 Lot	2100 MT	271.75					
3	Refrigeration for Frozen Store	1 Lot		176.40					
	Puff for Frozen			190.38					
	Puff for IQF			15.35					
	Civil work for Frozen Store			120.09					
4	IF Chiller	1 Lot		308.72		308.72	50%	154.36	Cost norm not available
5	IF balncher (IFB-4)								
6	Floatation washer (Corn Kernels & Beans)								
7	Dicer								

**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Plant and Machinery**

**(₹ in Lakhs)**

Sr. No.	Name of Component	Proposed Quantity	Capacity	Basic Cost	As per Cost Norms	Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
8	Line transfer Conveyor System								
9	Blast Freezer	1 Lot	1 MTPB	50.00	35.00	35.00	50%	17.50	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
	Puff panel blast freezer			24.83					
10	Multi- Stage Fruit & vegetable washer	1 Pc		52.50		52.50	50%	26.25	Cost norm not available
11	Peeling Machine	1 Pc		37.50		37.50	50%	18.75	
12	Boiler & Allied piping	1 Lot	2 MT	30.50	35.00	30.50	50%	15.25	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
13	Chillers & Pasteurizer with Ethylene Glycol	1 Lot		45.30		45.30	50%	22.65	Cost norm not available
14	Air compressor	1 Lot	59.3 CFM	10.55	4.95	4.95	50%	2.47	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
15	WTP	1 Lot	60 KLD	30.33	39.60	30.33	50%	15.17	
16	ETP	1 Lot	50 KLD	45.00	10.00	10.00	50%	5.00	
17	Twin Cell cooling tower	1 Lot		7.30		7.30	50%	3.65	Cost norm not available
18	Racking system	1 Lot		85.84	52.00	52.00	50%	26.00	As per MIDH cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
19	Frozen Store Accessories (Automated door, dock leveler, dock shelter)	1 Lot		47.25	7.00	7.00	50%	3.50	
20	Pallet	2000		44.00	3.84	3.84	50%	1.92	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
21	Double Deep fork lift	1 Pc		40.00	17.00	17.00	50%	8.50	As per MIDH cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation

**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Plant and Machinery**

**(₹ in Lakhs)**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Component</b>	<b>Proposed Quantity</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Basic Cost</b>	<b>As per Cost Norms</b>	<b>Approved Cost</b>	<b>Eligible grant %</b>	<b>Eligible grant</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
22	Crates	4000 Pcs		9.60					Ineligible
23	Sorting, grading, cutting task	40 Pcs		8.80		8.80	50%	4.40	Cost norm not available
24	Ripening Chamber	1 Lot	20 TPD	35.00	20.00	20.00	50%	10.00	As per MIDH cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
	Puff for Ripening Chamber			21.96					
	Civil work for Ripening Chamber			0.95					
25	Pre-Cooling Machinery	1 Lot		88.40	83.33	83.33	50%	41.67	As per MIDH cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
	Puff for Pre-cooling chamber			21.27					
	Civil work for Pre-cooling chamber			17.12					
26	Laboratory	1 Lot		15.00		15.00	50%	7.50	Cost norm not available
27	Reefer Van (8)	6 nos.		144.00	144.00	144.00	35%	50.40	As per MIDH cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
28	Refrigeration of Cold Storage	1 Lot	500 MT	45.00	50.00	50.00	35%	17.50	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
	Puff for Cold Storage			21.61					
	Civil work for Cold Store			19.54					
	Puff Panels for Processing hall			106.25		106.25	50%	53.13	Cost norm not available
29	Electrical Equipment	1 Set							
	33 Kv Substation(1800 KW)	1		75.00	10.20	10.20	50%	5.10	As per MoFPI cost norm. Capacity as per DPR & Quotation
	Department VCB (630 Amp)	1							
	Customer VCB (630 Amp)	1							
	1000 KVA Transformer	1							
	OLTC	1							
	MCB's	500		4.00					

**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Plant and Machinery**

**(₹ in Lakhs)**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Component</b>	<b>Proposed Quantity</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Basic Cost</b>	<b>As per Cost Norms</b>	<b>Approved Cost</b>	<b>Eligible grant %</b>	<b>Eligible grant</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
	Legrand Power DB	30		3.00					
	Vertical Distribution Boxes	5		0.50					
	400 Sq.mm Armor Cables	4 Bundles		8.00					
	180 Sq.mm Armor Cables	2 Bundles		3.00					
	120 Sq.mm Armor Cables	3 Bundles		2.70					
	90 Sq.mm Armor Cables	2Bundles		1.80					
	5 core flexible Cu cable 16 sq. mm	20 Bundles		8.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 10 sq. mm	20 Bundles		6.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 6 sq. mm	30 Bundles		6.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 4 sq. mm	50 Bundles		6.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 2.5 sq. mm	100 Bundles		8.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 1.5 sq. mm	100 Bundles		6.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 1 sq. mm	100 Bundles		4.00					
	5 core flexible cu cable 0.5 sq. mm	100 Bundles		1.70					
	1 core flexible cu cable 25 sq. mm	100 Bundles		6.00					
	1 core flexible cu cable 16 sq. mm	100 Bundles		5.50					
	1 core flexible cu cable 10 sq. mm	100 Bundles		4.00					

**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Plant and Machinery**

**(₹ in Lakhs)**

Sr. No.	Name of Component	Proposed Quantity	Capacity	Basic Cost	As per Cost Norms	Approved Cost	Eligible grant %	Eligible grant	Remarks
	1 core flexible cu cable 6 sq. mm	100 Bundles		2.00					
	Switch & Sockets with surface box	400 Nos.		3.00					
	Aluminum Lugs(O.5 sq mm to 400 Sq. mm)	600 Nos.		0.80					
	Main LT Panel	1		25.00		25.00	50%	12.50	cost norm not available
	Sub LT Panel	1		12.00		12.00	50%	6.00	
	Ammonia Low Stage Panel	1		6.00		6.00	50%	3.00	
	Ammonia High Stage Panel	1		6.00		6.00	50%	3.00	
	WTP Power Panel	1		2.50		2.50	50%	1.25	
	ETP Power Panel	1		2.50		2.50	50%	1.25	
	Process line panels	3		6.00		6.00	50%	3.00	
	Hydrochiller Panel	1		2.00		2.00	50%	1.00	
	Industrial plug & Tops	300		2.00		2.00	50%	1.00	
	Factory Internal lights (Total 400 No's)	400 Nos.		10.00					
	Factory External lights (Total 30 No's)	30 Nos.							
	Street light poles	30 Nos.			3.00				
	De-Hydration unit Main control panel	1		2.50		2.50	50%	1.25	cost norm not available
	De-Hydration unit sub control panel	1		2.50		2.50	50%	1.25	
	Online UPS	1		6.00		6.00	50%	3.00	
	Emergency siren	1		0.30					Ineligible



**Grant Calculation Sheet of M/s. Sri Krupa RGR Agrogators, Nalgonda, Telangana**

**Plant and Machinery**

**(₹ in Lakhs)**

<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Name of Component</b>	<b>Proposed Quantity</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Basic Cost</b>	<b>As per Cost Norms</b>	<b>Approved Cost</b>	<b>Eligible grant %</b>	<b>Eligible grant</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
	Cable trunches (4" to 2')	300 Nos.		7.00		7.00	50%	3.50	cost norm not available
	Earth strips (25 mm to 110 mm) (Al & cu)	1000 Lengths		1.80		1.80	50%	0.90	
	lightening Arrestor	10 Nos.		0.60					Ineligible
	Earth Pits	40		0.30		0.30	50%	0.15	cost norm not available
	Earth Pipes	40		0.30		0.30	50%	0.15	
	<b>Total P&amp;M</b>			<b>2489.07</b>		<b>1779.57</b>		<b>860.69</b>	<b>Grant Sought 1000.00</b>
	<b>Total (TCW+P&amp;M)</b>			<b>3290.01</b>		<b>1930.67</b>		<b>936.23</b>	
<b>Approved grant-in-aid is ₹ 936.23 lakh</b>									